

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Monday, May 27, 1968 – Friday, June 28, 1968

No. 94

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, May 27, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 27, 1968

Training Schools Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading 3385

Department of Correctional Services Act, 1968, bill intituled, Mr. Grossman, first reading 3385

Employment Standards Act, 1968, bill intituled, Mr. Bales, first reading 3386

Wages Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 3386

Industrial Safety Act, 1964, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 3386

Ontario human rights code, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 3386

Statement re appointment of a Lakehead interim municipal committee, Mr. McKeough 3387

Statement re fatal accident at Chapleau, Mr. Brunelle 3388

Introducing Mr. T. M. Hegab of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Yaremko 3388

Questions to Mr. Dymond re a comprehensive dental care plan, Mr. Nixon 3388

Question to Mr. McKeough re the Hardy report, Mr. Stokes 3388

Questions to Mr. Bales re fatality involving three Italian-born labourers, Mr. Pilkey 3389

Questions to Mr. Wishart re the abduction of Valerie and John Martin, Mr. Shulman .. 3389

Questions to Mr. Rowntree re food plan operators, Mr. Makarchuk 3390

Questions to Mr. Dymond re self-care units, Mr. Ben 3390

Presenting report, Mr. Dymond 3390

Third readings 3391

Estimates, Department of Social and Family Services, Mr. Yaremko, continued 3391

Recess, 6 o'clock 3424

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 27, 1968

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon in the Speaker's gallery we have students from Sunnyview public school, Toronto, and in the other two public galleries from Beamsville high school in Beamsville.

Later this afternoon in the west gallery we anticipate having the members of the women's institute from Collingwood with us.

I am sure we welcome these young people who are with us now.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE TRAINING SCHOOLS ACT, 1965

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Training Schools Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide relief to the local property taxpayer for a cost which he now bears, relating to training schools. The bill will relieve municipalities of the cost of transferring wards from the courts to training schools, and of the *per diem* charges for maintenance of wards in these schools.

The bill is one of a series transferring costs of the administration of justice from municipalities to the province as recommended in the report of the Ontario committee on taxation.

THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT, 1968

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of bill intituled, The Department of Correctional Services Act, 1968.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the objectives of this bill are:

1. To consolidate into one Act 18 present Acts having to do with adult offenders. With the recent transference of the costs of the administration of justice from municipalities to the province, the department is now charged with the responsibility of operating the county and city jails, hence new legislation is needed to effect this change.

2. To change the name of The Department of Reform Institutions to The Department of Correctional Services, in keeping with the practice followed by most, if not all, jurisdictions within the western world concerned with the correction and rehabilitation of offenders.

3. To provide for the incorporation into this bill of the proposed amendments contained in the federal Bill C-195 which deals with the temporary absence of an inmate for medical, rehabilitative or humanitarian reasons, and the equalization of provincial with federal remission of sentence.

Bill C-195 received its first reading in the House of Commons, December 21, 1967. While this bill died with the dissolution of the last federal Parliament, there is little doubt it will be reintroduced when the next Parliament convenes—at least, I and my department hope so. And, as a matter of fact, we hope they will accept other recommendations we made at the same time.

It is felt advisable to be ready to institute into our system, as soon as federal legislation is enacted, many of the progressive measures for which we have been awaiting legal authority.

4. To grant the Minister authority to establish a programme whereby inmates will be able to participate in vocational or educational training programmes in the community. It will also provide for a work release on a live-in, work-out basis, with the possibility of remaining in the community for stated comparatively short periods.

One of the most important aspects of this bill is to give the department authority to grant temporary absence to certain selected

inmates from correctional institutions for the following reasons:

(a) Medical—for an unlimited period.

(b) For a period not exceeding 15 days at any one time to assist in his rehabilitation. This will apply to situations such as:

(1) Humanitarian reasons, e.g. visiting members of the family who are seriously sick attending family funerals, etc.;

(2) Job interviews with prospective employers.

(3) Any urgent family matter requiring the inmate's personal attention, e.g. problems with children, and so on.

(4) To make special arrangements to permit a convicted person to be able, where it is deemed advisable to continue in his employment in the community, to visit his business during crucial periods, or to permit someone like a farmer to be absent for a period not exceeding 15 days at any one time during a critical period, such as the harvest. This bill will reduce the possibility of a family break-up due to prolonged absence and lack of a breadwinner.

(5) The foregoing will be conducive to keeping families together and will reduce the necessity of carrying families of some inmates on public welfare. It is, of course, to be understood that it is only in those cases where having regard for public safety, all of the factors are such that it appears an inmate is likely to benefit from and can be trusted to participate in such a programme, that such a privilege will be made available. This is now in effect in some jurisdictions particularly in the United States and Europe where it is meeting with some success.

All of the foregoing is dependent upon the passage of the federal legislation which is pending. All prisoners in these programmes will, of course, be under varying degrees of supervision by our rehabilitation staff.

Another important feature of this bill—section 21—is that, as soon as proposed federal legislation is enacted, provincial remission of sentence will be equalized with that allowed in institutions under federal jurisdiction.

At the present time prisoners in federal penitentiaries, under The Penitentiary Act, are automatically granted statutory remission of one quarter off their total sentences and, in addition, they may earn three days per month good conduct remission. Prisoners sentenced to provincial institutions are not granted any statutory remission, but may earn only good conduct remission at a rate not exceeding five days per month, in accordance with section 10 of The Prisons and Reformatories Act, Canada. The net result is that, under present federal legislation, a prisoner sentenced to two years less one day in reformatory actually serves over four months more than he would have served had he been sentenced to two years in penitentiary.

This change in legislation should bring about the following beneficial results:

1. In keeping with our statement of purpose our task of changing attitudes should be less difficult as the inmate will not feel cheated out of remission time because he was sentenced to reformatory rather than penitentiary. Obviously it is more difficult to rehabilitate a person whose hostility to society is increased by inconsistencies in the law.

2. The number of escapes should be reduced. At the present time, a person serving a sentence of two years less one day who escapes and subsequently receives an additional six months in penitentiary for escaping actually serves less time than he would have served had he not escaped and remained in a provincial institution.

3. The granting of statutory and earned remission provides an incentive to the inmate to conduct himself in such a manner as to earn release from the institution at an earlier date, thus contributing to his successful rehabilitation and, at the same time, alleviating the cost to the taxpayer of maintaining him in prison longer than is necessary.

THE EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ACT, 1968

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour) moves first reading of bill intituled, The Employment Standards Act, 1968.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE WAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE INDUSTRIAL SAFETY ACT, 1964

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Industrial Safety Act, 1964.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE, 1961-1962

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ontario human rights code, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to improve working conditions for many employees in Ontario. At the same time, it will make it easier for employers to fulfill the terms of our employment standards legislation.

This bill will consolidate and considerably strengthen the legislation which forms the basis of my department's continuing efforts to protect that segment of our work force that has little or no bargaining power.

A number of existing provisions have been revised and several new standards introduced. The net effect will be to bring Ontario's employment standards legislation into line with working conditions that have wide acceptance in this province.

And, Mr. Speaker, I intend, in the future, to introduce further changes to this legislation as time and circumstances permit, so it will become truly a bill of employment rights assuring modern working conditions to all employees of this province.

Under the authority of this new Act, it is the government's intention to establish new and higher minimum wage rates this year. This step will be taken during the next months on the basis of surveys and studies in the course of preparation.

The bill brings together in one modern Act the following separate statutes or employment standards provisions that are located, at present, in other statutes:

The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act.

The Minimum Wage Act.

Section 10 of The Wages Act.

Homeworker provisions of The Industrial Safety Act.

Equal pay for equal work provisions of the human rights code.

This consolidation will give employers and employees a more concise picture of their obligations and rights. It also will make it possible for my department to streamline its administration in this field.

One of the prime aims of the new Act is to ensure that employees are not required to work excessive overtime hours.

While this bill retains the existing maximum weekly hours of 48 and the permit system for overtime, it requires that workers who do work overtime must be paid at a rate which is time and one half their regular rate for all hours beyond 48. We feel that this will curb the use of excessive overtime and perhaps create additional employment opportunities.

The bill also requires that employees be paid at a rate of time and a half their regular pay for all work performed on seven statutory holidays: New Year's day, Good Friday, Victoria day, Dominion day, Labour day, Thanksgiving day and Christmas day.

The provisions contained in section 10 of The Wages Act which call for a statement of earnings, time worked and deductions are transferred to The Employment Standards Act.

The department will also be empowered to collect unpaid wages for employees up to a total claim of $1,000.

Mr. Speaker, at present, the Ontario human rights code requires that women doing the same work as men, in the same establishment, receive equal pay.

But the commission acts only on the receipt of a complaint. This provision has been transferred to The Employment Standards Act where it will be enforced on a regular basis by the appropriate field staff of the department. The wording of the section has been broadened and clarified to assist field staff in making on-the-job assessments.

Also, Mr. Speaker, through this legislation, the authority for setting minimum wage rates will be transferred from the industry and labour board to the Lieutenant-Governor in council to establish from time to time by regulation. This is in accord with comments in the report of the Royal commission on civil rights.

In this connection my department's research branch is conducting a province-wide wages survey, which will be used as a basis for determining a more appropriate level of minimum wage. The extent of the increase will be announced after the legislation is approved and we review the results of the survey in the light of wage and price increases and other economic factors.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Municipal Affairs has a statement.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on releasing the

final report of the Lakehead local government review at the Lakehead University on Tuesday, April 16, I invited municipal councils, interested organizations and individuals of the Lakehead and Thunder Bay district to express their views regarding the recommendations. These views are to be submitted to me by June 28 of this year.

An interim municipal committee has been appointed so that I may have the counsel of representatives from the Lakehead and Thunder Bay district on the recommendations and any views and proposals that they may have received. The committee has now been formed and I am pleased to advise the House that the committee consists of the following: from Fort William, his worship Mayor Reed, Aldermen Hennessey and Bryan; from Port Arthur, his worship Mayor Saul Laskin and Aldermen Arnup and McNeil; from Neebing, Reeve Tronson and from Shuniah, Reeve Arthur. And from the Thunder Bay district, the president, vice-president and second vice-president of the Thunder Bay district municipal league, namely, Mrs. Sadine, Councillor Walsey and Mr. Rosengrin. And from the Algoma district, Mr. Bracci, the chairman of the improvement district of White River.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Lands and Forests has a statement.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I advise the members of the House of a fatal accident involving one of our Turbo Beaver aircraft at Chapleau Saturday morning. The aircraft was taking off on a flight to a fire with three men plus the pilot on board and was barely airborne when it nosed in, turned over and sank. The pilot and two firefighters were able to escape. However, one of our seasonal employees, Mr. Lorne McWatch was trapped inside and was drowned.

The Department of Transport is investigating the accident to determine the exact cause.

This is the first fatality involving one of our department aircraft in many years. So far this season we have had 736 fires reported and extinguished to date, which is much higher than normal. I certainly express my deepest condolences to the family of Mr. McWatch, in this very unfortunate mishap.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence I should like to extend a word of welcome to a particular visitor. The federal government, through The Department of External Affairs, through liaison with The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, places students from about the world within our civil service, so that they may learn of our practices and procedures. One of those is present this afternoon. He is Mr. T. M. Hegab, a United Nations Fellow, and in his capacity at home, he is chief of Sections of Societies and Associations in law affairs in the Cairo district of the Ministry of Social Affairs of the United Arab Republic. At this moment, he is with our child welfare branch studying programmes. On behalf of you and members of the Legislature, I extend a welcome to this United Nations Fellow.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health.

Is the Minister in a position to make a statement to the House regarding the announcement by the president of the Ontario dental association at its annual convention, that a comprehensive dental care plan for the young, from age three to 18 might be introduced in the province by late 1969? And will such a plan be similar to the Ontario medical services plan now in operation?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to comment to any great extent upon this. The programme has been spoken of in the press and I believe it was discussed before the dentists at their recent association meeting. The newspapers reported that I had warmly endorsed it; this is true in part but not as wholly as the report might have led to believe. I have no knowledge of the details. I did warmly endorse the programme in principle but withheld further comment pending information concerning details of the programme.

Mr. Nixon: Might I ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, if he has a group that can assess the need for such a programme, when the details from the profession are available, or would this be something that OMSIP might undertake on his behalf?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, we have a group capable of assessing it and we have a good deal of information already on hand.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay has a question?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Will the Minister extend to the end of September, rather than the end of June, the time for studying the Hardy report on regional government by municipalities in the Thunder Bay area, as requested by them in a resolution forwarded to the Minister?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the very simple answer would be "no" but perhaps I might put on the record a letter which I have written to several of the municipalities who have requested this extension. My letter to the municipalities reads as follows:

> I am replying to your letter enclosing a resolution requesting an extension of the date for submissions of briefs in reply to the recommendations contained in the final report of the Lakehead local government review.
>
> The date of June 28 was based upon the time allowed for such submissions in other local government review areas where the period of ten weeks was found to be sufficient for municipal councils to prepare their submissions. By the same time I will have received the views of other organizations and departments of government to whom I have made similar requests. In order, therefore, that I may give fair and equal consideration to the various replies delivered to me by June 28, I must reaffirm this date in keeping with my original announcement of April 16 on the occasion of the meeting at the Lakehead University when the final report was distributed to representatives of Lakehead and district municipalities.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): To the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker: Would the Minister inform the House if there was any negligence involved in the death of three Italian-born labourers on a North York apartment project, which was described as an unfortunate freak accident by a Department of Labour spokesman, as reported in the Toronto *Daily Star* May 24? Is it true that the safety inspector on this project had some 220 other projects to investigate in regard to safety practices, and does the Minister intend to increase safety inspection on all construction sites in the future?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the hon. member for Oshawa, the accident is still under investigation and there will be an inquest. These steps will help to establish what actually caused the tragedy and where the responsibility lies.

The second part: Under The Construction Safety Act the responsibility for inspections belongs to the municipalities. I have, therefore, had my officials contact the officials of the borough of North York to check the accuracy of this claim. I have not yet been able to obtain confirmation.

With reference to the third part of the question, as I stated in answering the second part, the responsibility for construction safety inspections rests with the municipalities. However, the municipalities across the province, with a total of approximately 250 inspectors, are increasing their volume of inspections. In the calendar year 1965, for example, separate inspections totalled 106,000. The figure rose to 118,000 in 1966, and to 132,000 in 1967.

Mr. Pilkey: A supplementary question, please. If a municipality foregoes this safety inspector and they do not put anyone on the job, does the Minister or The Department of Labour step in to that kind of a situation?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We have a close liaison, Mr. Speaker, with the municipalities and we work closely with them on this and many matters.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the Attorney General.

1. Does the Minister intend to cancel the licence of the Argus Protection and Investigating Service Limited, of Windsor, because of the part they played in the abduction of Valerie and John Martin in Oakville on Wednesday, May 15, 1968, as submitted to the Attorney General by the Oakville police?

2. Does the Minister intend to cancel the investigator's licence issued to Duncan Stewart, of Windsor, Ontario, for the part he played in the abduction of Valerie and John Martin in Oakville on Wednesday, May 15, 1968, as submitted to the Attorney General by the Oakville police?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, this matter is being investigated at this time and I am not in a position to say at the moment what action the facts may warrant.

Mr. Shulman: The Minister will let us know in due course?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I prefer to have a question submitted in proper form in due course.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): There is an outstanding question which has been asked of me by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk).

It was in two parts. The first part related to the failure of a business known as Shoppers' Guide Food Service which, after it went out of business, had left some of its customers in the position of owing money to finance companies arising from loans which they had secured to make cash purchases from that business.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the food plan operator in question demanded cash in advance for his services. It was then a matter for the individuals concerned to determine whether or not it was a wise choice to raise money through private sources to participate in such a plan. Other alternatives are available, such as plans where a deposit is made and food is paid for on delivery.

As far as my department is concerned in this matter, I am informed that officials of the consumer protection bureau have a working knowledge of the activities of some 20 food plan operators and have investigated numerous complaints. Our bureau personnel have, through mediation, been able to obtain a large measure of satisfaction for the consumer, and at the same time to correct certain undesirable practices. It is my hope that, based on this experience, we will be able to determine whether an investigation into this general area is warranted.

The second part of the question was to do with legislation covering so-called non-interest charging contracts. With respect to that matter, Mr. Speaker, I might say that it is under consideration.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day; the hon. member for Humber asked a question of me on Friday, which I took as notice. The question was: How many hospitals in Ontario have self-care units, and what is the Minister's department doing to encourage or compel the establishment of such units in all other public hospitals?

Mr. Speaker, short of polling every hospital in the province—and there are more than 200 of them—we cannot tell how many such units now exist. We can say this: They have never been very popular. The first, which was highly advertised and publicized at the time of its establishment, has now asked to discontinue the unit and revert to normal care. It is our belief that there is no need to encourage, and certainly no intention to compel hospitals to indulge in this practice. It is our belief that when a patient is able to care for himself, he no longer needs the service provided in costly hospital facilities and should be encouraged to go home or to some other kind of facility.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Would you allow a supplementary question? I do agree with what the Minister said about encouraging patients to go home. But, since they are not going home, is the Minister's department planning to take any action to compel hospitals to—for want of a better word—evict those who do not need medical attention, to make room for operative patients?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We have insisted upon this constantly and consistently, Mr. Speaker, and we shall contine to do so. I might say that this is not a popular undertaking.

May I now present to you, sir, and the House, the 43rd annual report of The Ontario Department of Health for the year 1967.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Oshawa.

Mr. Pilkey: I would like to ask you a question, sir, and perhaps you could give some guidance. There is a situation in the province of Ontario that I think is appalling and critical. I have not discussed this with any one, not even the people in my party. The guidance that I wish to get is this—and I would like to tell you that specifically I am talking about the question of housing.

What I would like to know is how a member in this House can attempt to project some ideas and some of the things that are necessary to relieve this appalling and critical situation? As a new member in this House, how do you make these proposals?

It appears to me—and since I have been elected, sir, I would like to point out that this has become more pronounced, this question of housing and particularly for accommodation on the basis of rental accommodation, even in my own municipality. I have a few ideas, that I would like to project. I think that it should be taken out of the political arena—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member was asking for the Speaker's opinion and now he is giving his.

Perhaps I might reply to that; off hand, I would say that there were several ways. One

would be for the member to lay his views before the Minister in charge of these matters for the government. The second would be, during the estimates of that particular department, to place his views before the Minister. The third would be to place his views on the record in the Budget debate, which is still available to members; I am sure that they would be read, if not heard, by the officials concerned.

It would seem to me that this would give a very wide latitude to the member.

Mr. Pilkey: Someone said. "call a press conference." I do not think that this is the way that you attack this one. But, the point that I would try to make is that where the situation is critical and is an emergency—

Mr. Speaker: Well, then I would suggest that the member refer to the rules of the House, which provide for a debate on matters of immediate public importance. If the member and his party feel that this is so, then the matter can be submitted to Mr. Speaker, and if deemed proper in that regard, there will be a space on the orders of the day for that debate.

Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion.

Bill 7, An Act to amend The Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1965.

Bill 41, An Act to amend The Lord's Day (Ontario) Act, 1960-1961.

Bill 63, An Act to amend The Children's Institutions Act, 1962-1963.

Bill 64, An Act to provide for provincial courts and judges.

Bill 65, An Act to amend The Centennial Centre for Science and Technology Act, 1965.

Bill 66, An Act to amend The Public Commercial Vehicles Act.

Bill 69, An Act to provide for the administration of justice.

Bill 70, An Act to amend The Coroners Act.

Bill 71, An Act to amend The County Courts Act.

Bill 72, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Bill 73, An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

Clerk of the House: House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND FAMILY SERVICES

(Continued)

On vote 2007:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2007, day nurseries branch.

The member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

When we were last here in committee discussing the estimates of this particular department, there was some discussion—I refer you to page 1968-2 of the preliminary *Hansard*, in which the hon. Minister of this department, the Minister of Social and Family Services stated that I had lied. I quote him in line 13: "I say that the hon. member lied."

If you will look in the next paragraph, I demanded a retraction. I did not get my retraction and I once again request a retraction. If the Minister still does not retract, I request that you, sir, report this Minister to the Speaker of the House.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has heard the comment from the member for High Park—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): I have not seen a photocopy of the—I do not recall seeing that retraction—the request for a retraction, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, let us read this into the record again:

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, in pursuance of our policy I looked into this matter to see the truth of the allegations made by the hon. member and he read from the letters and the letter he wrote to Mr. Markle—one of the questions was, was the mother informed that her child was going to Peru? [That is the question in the letter from the hon. member to Mr. Markle] and then he got a reply and the reply contained a paragraph which stated: [I direct your attention, Mr. Chairman, to these words] "this case illustrates one of the reasons why natural mothers who give up their babies for adoption are never informed as to placement.

Prior to making a statement, in this House, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member wrote a letter and got a reply. I read the reply, which tells me categorically—and it is as clear as daylight—that Mr. Markle, in replying to the hon. member, indicated that the mother was not informed.

The hon. member then got up in the House and said that Mr. Markle lied. Now, here, in the correspondence, it is very clear that Mr. Markle did not lie—at least that is the way I interpret it. The hon. member said that Mr. Markle lied. I interpret Mr. Markle as having told the truth and if I interpret Mr. Markle as having told the truth and the hon. member says that Mr. Markle lied, my interpretation of the hon. member's statement is that the hon. member lied.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Surely not lied?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What else? He told an untruth, a falsehood.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, once again I say to you, sir, under the rules of this House and inasmuch as the facts have been gone over, I will state them once again so there will be no question in the mind of anyone. It is very true that Mr. Markle said one thing in one letter, but he said quite another thing publicly which was reported in the press.

However, this is completely irrelevant. The hon. Minister has stated in this House, and he has repeated it again today, that I have lied. I again ask that he retract; if he refuses to retract I ask you to report him to the Speaker so that he may be called before the bar of this House.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if I might speak to the point of order. I certainly remember the situation that the two hon. members are discussing. It came at the end of a long day of questioning and debate, and I believe it is quite understandable that under circumstances such as that, the Minister or anyone else might very well use a word that he might not use under normal circumstances. My understanding of the rules of this House would indicate that it is not permissible to use a word like that under those circumstances. Surely the hon. Minister has an occasion now on which he can set the records straight—withdraw that word.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have never understood it to be one of the rules of the House that if a member utters a falsehood, you cannot point that falsehood out to the House. If it is the rule that it cannot be pointed out, and you have so ruled that it cannot be pointed out, then I will withdraw it but if it is—

Mr. Shulman: That is not acceptable, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Perhaps the member could assist me by telling me wherein I am wrong in the statement that he said aloud—

Mr. Shulman: I would be only too glad, Mr. Chairman, and I would be glad to produce a witness. The circumstances were as follows:

It became a matter of public knowledge that a certain child had been sent to Peru. This was reported in the press. It was made a matter of public knowledge because a Canadian citizen who is not a member of this House became privy to all the facts—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary to give the whole story. Let us get back—

Mr. Shulman: I would like to give the whole story. You have asked me a question. May I give the answer?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Let us get back to the root of the matter. Not the whole story.

Mr. Shulman: I am coming to the root of the matter, Mr. Chairman, if I can be so allowed.

The circumstances were that this became public knowledge because of this individual. At that time, Mr. Ward Markle was asked three questions, and I will tell you the person who asked him the questions—Miss Sally Barnes. He was asked three questions; the answers were then printed in the Toronto *Daily Star,* and the questions were as follows:

Was the mother informed that the child was sent to Peru? He is reported to have answered "yes." Secondly, were the parents related to the adoptive parent? The answer was "yes," also untrue, and the third question was the—sorry, I have forgotten the third question but in any case, these were the three questions that were so reported in the press.

These three questions were subsequently proved to be untrue. The parents in Peru were phoned; they said they were not related in any way. We checked with the family here in Toronto; they said they did not know the child had gone to Peru nor did they know who these people were, nor were they related to them. And I will repeat it again: Under these circumstances this man, Mr. Markle, lied. Now if this has anything to do with the rules of the House, and this particular point, I am glad that you have set the matter straight.

But now, I come down to the point of issue again, and it is not whether or not Mr. Markle lied, it is the fact that in this House, the hon. Minister has accused me of lying. I have told the truth and I want a retraction.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, let me put it this way, as I put it the other night. Like the judge of the Supreme Court of Ontario, when it comes to a question of believing either Mr. Markle or the hon. member, I believe Mr. Markle.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Retract.

Mr. Shulman: Retract.

Mr. Chairman: I would say that the procedures of this House do not permit one member to call another a liar, or accusing him of having lied. And I would respectfully suggest to the Minister, that he do so retract the accusation to the member for High Park that he is a liar.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, having put myself on the record the way I—

Mr. Shulman: You must retract!

Mr. J. Renwick: Not acceptable.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Just a minute now. Do not get all excited.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: By the rules of this House—

Mr. J. Renwick: You retract.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: By the rules of this House which I abide by strictly, and you having pointed this out to me, Mr. Chairman, by the rules of this House I am not permitted nor is any hon. member permitted to call another member a liar. That is the rule of the House. There is no rule of the House which says that when there are two opposite positions being given as to whom you should believe when it comes to believing either Mr. Markle or the hon. member, I believe Mr. Markle.

Mr. J. Renwick: Retract.

Mr. Shulman: Retract.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: But because the rules of the House—

Mr. Shulman: This is intolerable.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —because the rules of the House do not permit me to do other than to point that out and do not permit me to call the hon. member a liar, I retract that statement.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, that is not acceptable. He must retract unconditionally.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The Minister's last words were "I retract the statement".

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry, sir, that was a part of a sentence which indicated he was not retracting. I demand a retraction—an unconditional retraction.

Mr. Chairman: There were no conditions attached. The Minister said "I withdraw the statement".

An hon. member: Let us go on with the debate.

Mr. Shulman: It is not a retraction. You are making a very bad precedent.

Mr. Chairman: In the opinion of the chair that the Minister has withdrawn the accusation to the member for High Park.

Vote 2007. Day nurseries branch.

The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister if he has considered requesting industry to include day nurseries in some of their operations to enable mothers to become once more gainfully employed rather than have to spend their time at home taking care of their young offspring?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to such a day nursery being set up in conjunction with an industry. Unfortunately, there has been very little interest shown on the part of industry, management or union, in setting up such day nurseries. The only significant example is the one that was set up in the Riverdale hospital. It has a day nursery which, although it is not associated with an industry, is associated with employment. I believe that has been highly successful. We would encourage the other type. And I hope the interdepartmental committee will investigate how we can stimulate the other type.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's department specifically does not approach industry and does not suggest to them that they include day nurseries as part of their operation? I notice that in the city of

Minneapolis this seems to be the case rather than the exception, that industry does provide day nursery facilities in many of the plants to enable mothers to take advantage of the opportunity of working.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Wherever there have been inquiries we have followed them up but nothing has come of it. It may be that we will re-stimulate this since we have made provision for broader subsidization, that we will let all industry know, in particular through the interdepartmental committee, what is available.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may ask one other question on the day nurseries. Has the Minister been in touch with the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) so that in any of the housing projects that they may presently supervise or may in the future construct, they include day nurseries in, or as one of, the ancillary facilities in the housing project? I look back at my own community and I find that there happen to be 1,003 children under the age of six, who come from one-parent homes, headed by a mother. Of the 1,003 children, 122 have only a father rather than a mother. Were day nurseries provided in some of the housing areas, these people could once more be gainfully employed, rather than obtaining assistance from the Minister's department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, there are presently two large Ontario housing developments, Lawrence Heights and Regent Park, which are providing half-day nursery programmes, with the parents taking part. Lawrence Heights has a day nursery for the children where the mothers are employed. All of these nurseries, where needed, can be subsidized.

Mr. B. Newman: What the Minister says is absolutely correct and it is good, but this should not be restricted only to this one community. There are other communities in the province of Ontario which could benefit substantially by the day nurseries in their midst. It would be a tremendous asset to the department, because the Minister would not have to provide the funds he has to provide now for the care of these children.

So, if the Minister sort of made it a rule, rather than an exception, to go into communities and talk them into, or see that housing provides, day nurseries in their housing projects—will the Minister do this?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, the interdepartmental committee will look into that.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Chairman, my earliest recollection of the day nursery field in this city goes back to the war years. I want very much today to try to present to this assembly that thousands of women work in our province, to present that they work for economic need, and that the facilities are unrelated to the need and that they are growing at a snail's pace.

I would like, first of all, to point out that during the war years, the federal government and the provincial government joined together to provide 20 day nurseries approximately in this city, so that mothers could be released to go into the labour forces in munitions and arms and airplane factories. They sent talented help to Birmingham, in the midlands of England, to study the system that led to established day nurseries post-haste in the areas of Toronto and some other cities.

It has never ceased to amaze me that, when the war was over, the federal government abandoned their part of the responsibility. The women and the children who were in the day nurseries, and the women who worked in the crèches of this city, had no idea how the care was going to be carried on. Then the province and the city and municipalities joined together to carry on those day care services.

By comparison, since then we have indeed moved at a snail's pace without any relationship to the need. The time has changed when women worked, built a hope chest, and then got married. Working women in Ontario are a fact, not a fad; 20 years ago one in 20 women worked. Even in 1965 one in five worked and, in 1967, in Ontario one in three women worked. This is a total of 905,000 working women in Ontario.

And I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that if they ever stopped it would be tantamount to a strike, to a national strike.

Now, of these women, 881,000 are in the labour force, 60 per cent are married, 10 per cent were at one time married, and 30 per cent are single. What one wonders is what happens to the children of the women who are married? Why are women in the labour force? This was not proved in any of the previous debates during the last estimates or the estimates of 1965 in the assembly, because the figure of the numbers of women who worked were not available.

Women who work have an average income of $2,000, in Canada; 79 per cent of these, according to 1961 DBS statistics, earn less than $3,500, and their husbands earned less than $4,000 per year. The average family, where both are working, has an income of $7,900 approximately. Where there is one wage earner, the man, the average income is closer to $6,500.

So women are really working to bring up the family income of two people in the work force to be within a very small amount of money from the average income.

In Ontario, 53 per cent of the children were in families where the mother earned less than $2,000 a year and the father's average wage was $3,800 a year. So a child in Ontario has a 50/50 chance of being born into a family where the mother works. And the question is, what is happening to the children?

I have a number of basic questions that I would like to ask the Minister because, in my view, we urgently need a crash programme in day nursery expansion. We need this department to embrace day care facilities, right down to young children who are being left at the present time in makeshift arrangements, for mothers who are working for economic need. But we need also, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister to give his views on the possibilities of his department supporting some of the fine pilot projects that have gone on in this city for after-four care and lunch time care of children of mothers who work.

Mr. Chairman, there are 90,000 one-parent families in Ontario, also in need of this service.

I would like to ask first of all, Mr. Chairman, what is the cost per child to the day nurseries branch and the cost to the mother for the day care, per day?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would facilitate matters if the hon. member has a series of questions if she would place all her questions and I might deal with them all at one time.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Very well, Mr. Chairman.

Has the successful project in the Riverdale hospital extended to any other hospital or any other institution in Ontario? I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, when that project was started, because this was a pilot project which was much needed. I think much should have been learned from the Riverdale nursery school project as to how many women it brought back as nurses into the hospital.

I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, of the Minister, how many children have been refused because of not being able to meet the requirements under the new rates—refused day care service in the Metropolitan area?

I would like to ask, also, how many have been refused because there was no room for them, and are there any specific experiments going on in this department in the field of day nurseries?

I think, Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to keep track of four or five questions at a time, if that is all right with the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The cost per child varies from municipality to municipality and it may vary from $4 to $5.50 per day. Now, the cost to the mother—the cost of the family—is, of course, based upon our needs test, an explanation of which I gave in detail at the amendment of the regulations not so very long ago.

The Riverdale hospital programme has not been extended to my knowledge to any other institution or any other commercial venture, as I pointed out to the hon. member for Windsor a few moments ago. As to the number of children who have been refused, of course, it is impossible to have such a figure because nobody comes forward; they do not come forward so there is no answer possible to that.

Now, as to how many have been refused because of lack of space: From the figures I have it is believed that any such number would be very small in the Metropolitan Toronto area in proportion to the number enrolled.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister, are you saying then that we have no record of how many people have been refused day-care service in the Metropolitan area?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, I do not have those statistics.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I was not in the House, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister read this statement on the basis of the new ratio of cost per child. I wonder if I might ask him to extend me the courtesy of giving me that information.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is a very full statement in *Hansard*. At that time I made the statement and I supplied the members of the House with a *pro forma* of the needs test. The needs test is a very simple formula; we calculate all the income which comes into

a family and then we have figures which indicate the budget which is necessary for the very basic needs of a family of that size, and in those basic needs we now include a provision for debt payments and incentive with respect to earnings. We believe that the needs test is one of the most generous—in fact it is to my knowledge the most generous—needs test compiled in respect of any programme, certainly in respect of a day-nurseries programme. Based on that are worked out the figures of what the parents should pay as their proportion. This is not a universal service. In accordance with the Canada assistance plan, this is tailored to the needs test.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, could I just ask if the Minister would give me a rough range of what that cost might be? I have the form, Mr. Chairman. I just want to get some idea of what women are being asked to pay now in order to leave children in the care of subsidized day nurseries, and I think it is a very important question. My understanding from the field is that many children have been taken out of the day nurseries and I am wondering if the Minister can tell me how many have been taken out since the institution of the new rates?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not know, Mr. Chairman. That amount would vary of course. If a mother were earning $10,000 a year she would probably have to pay the full amount of $5.50. If she were earning just enough to get along she would not have to pay anything at all so the amount would vary up to the $5.50 with a very large substantial income, and nothing in cases where the income is not sufficient to pay for any part of the service.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, may I ask: Surely we keep some sort of record of those who are refused this service? Do we not have any idea how many people are asking for this service and whom we are not able to accommodate because of the lack of facilities? I am thinking, Mr. Chairman, of a private day nursery which is not far from where I live, which I have used and worked in. The waiting list in that day nursery for one year is no less than 1,500 applications—and that is just one school. I would like to get some idea of the truth about how many women are seeking assistance from the day nurseries established in our Metropolitan area and how many are being refused.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the only figures I have before me show that presently the municipality-operated day nurseries have a capacity of 450 with an enrolment of 407 and a waiting list of 31. Private day nurseries receiving public funds have a waiting list of eight and day-care programmes for school-age children have a waiting list of eight.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): I wonder who compiled those figures.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not know where the hon. member gets her figures, but I will say this, Mr. Chairman, that the Canadian welfare council is engaged upon a national study of day-care programmes. They will be analyzing the situation in the province of Ontario; they will have the facts and the figures. Now, as to the figures the hon. member is concerned with: We passed the regulations under The Day Nurseries Act, representations were made to this department, and those regulations have been amended. I have no doubt that the agencies involved will be keeping figures and the inter-departmental committee which will be studying this matter will no doubt be meeting with representatives of the agencies. At that time those figures will, no doubt, be forthcoming.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister give us some indication when that study will be available?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Ontario welfare council has, I believe, already embarked upon that on a national basis and will be coming into Ontario quite quickly, I imagine.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister tell me how many children there were room for in the subsidized day nurseries in the province in 1967 and take us back, if he will, to the number in 1966 and 1965?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not have the exact figures, but I do have figures that the nurseries in operation in Ontario now total 455 and there is preliminary application for 75. These are the nurseries that are licensed under our department. Approximately one quarter of these give care to children of working mothers. The total programme encompasses approximately 21,000 children and the rate of increase has been about 10 per cent. As to the exact numbers that are being subsidized, there were, in 1965, 16,000, and in 1967, 20,000.

Mrs. M. Renwick: We have made room for 4,000 more children under the day nurseries in a year? Any of the reports that I have

read—the study of day care in the greater Windsor area, the study of day care in eastern Toronto—show that this is taking care of about 4 per cent of the children of mothers who work, and that many of these nurseries are turning away three out of four applications. I submit that the figures that we have heard today and the talk about the waiting list and about crying need simply show that people cannot stay forever on a waiting list.

What I need now, Mr. Chairman, is to really understand the situation—because I have worked a little bit in it and I am quite interested in the fact that there is a desperate need, and to me it is not operating well at the present time. In past estimates, the hon. Mr. Cecile gave the number of nurseries, and I particularly would like to know the subsidized nurseries in each of the counties in our province. When he got to the Toronto area, he broke them down so that we might understand it more clearly, into the county of York, taking in East York, Forest Hill, Newmarket, King and the various areas. I ask specifically if the Minister is not able to do this, both in the number of nurseries and the number of subsidized nurseries.

If 50 per cent of our women earn less than $2,000 a year, they cannot afford private day nurseries. Also, how many children is there room for? We have got to know how many children in the Metropolitan area there is room for, for the present needs, under the subsidized system and then under the conglomeration of taking in all the other kinds of nursery schools in Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would facilitiate matters if I were to table with you the distribution of nurseries throughout Ontario by counties and districts. It will show that there is a total of 482, compared with 441 on December 31, 1966, and there were, as I say, 20,000 children enrolled in these nurseries. The breakdown of figures is not yet complete for 1967.

I may say this, Mr. Chairman, that I welcome the study of the Ontario welfare council. We will be getting the figures as a more or less objective organization will find them. Then we will be in a position to say what the situation is in Ontario and also to make a comparison with other jurisdictions in Canada and presently throughout the United States. This province has made great strides and is at present, I trust, one of the foremost on the continent in the provision of day care.

Mr. Trotter: One moment, on a point of order. If you are going to table that report, would it be possible to have two or three copies made, because if it is tabled we have to go and copy it down. I would like to get a copy of it and it could easily be run off on a machine. That would be far better than just tabling.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I will arrange to have that done.

Mr. Trotter: I would appreciate that, thank you.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I hope, sir, that you can understand my view that I would like the statement that the Minister is referring to, to be read into the record. I feel that if the hon. Mr. Cecile could give us a lucid explanation of the situation, then we have every right to know what it is. We are talking about thousands of children—500,000 or 700,000 families of children. We do not really know how they are being cared for in our province. If they are preschoolers, they should be in proper cared-for nurseries.

Because the Minister, Mr. Chairman, mentioned my figures as if they were something that I dreamed up, I would like to read you a small memo.

"To Margaret Renwick from Miss Belle of women's bureau, Department of Labour." That is in this building.

"In 1965, 50 per cent of the male heads of families earned less than $4,800. To maintain a decent standard of living, we estimated that it would require about $6,000. Therefore a second income is necessary."

Now, from Miss Betcherman upstairs, or in the related buildings, I learned that the average income for a woman in our province is $2,000. If the man is earning less than $4,000 that is coming up to the $6,000 bracket. We are not talking about $10,000-a-year incomes, as the Minister previously said.

I think that we have got to stop dragging red herrings over various issues like this or they are going to cause a national crisis, because, Mr. Chairman, here we are once again at the stage where the people who suffer are the children. I think that this is wrong. There are children in our city without proper after-four supervision. They wear latch keys around their necks. I think that what we are doing to them by failing to modernize our Department of Social and Family Services is criminal.

The Minister said that we are very modern. We are going ahead great shakes. I would just like to point out one small paragraph in relation to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville's question, and my own questions, and that of any member who lives or works in a riding where there is an Ontario housing corporation development.

They want to know what we are going to do about the children in those developments, because from the eleventh floor, Mr. Chairman, it is very hard to supervise teen-age children and small children 11 or 12 floors down. The Minister maintained that we are very modern? Well, I would just like to read and I quote from Sweden—*The Middle Way*, by Marquis Childs, a primer on socialism, that is, democratic socialism!

> Most remarkable of all are the co-operative nurseries in each apartment.

This is under low-cost housing, Mr. Chairman.

> On the top floor, they are done in white and soft colours – often with charming decorative detail. Here, working mothers may leave their children in charge of trained nursery school attendants, from 6:30 in the morning to 6:30 in the evening for a small sum, each day. Even small babies may be left with the nurseries.

This takes us into the day care, Mr. Chairman.

> Assured of the most scrupulous care, children are put at the first signs of illness into a small infirmary in connection with each nursery. Ample play equipment and open-air play spaces on the roof, provide activity for the older youngsters. Adult groups in many apartment houses convert a part of the nursery into a gymnasium in the evening and, in some houses, there are special rooms for meetings and discussions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that book was written in 1938. Here we are 30 years later, saying that if we look after 4,000 children in Metro Toronto, or 5,000 in day care, that we are in fact modern. In fact, we are not. We are growing at a snail's pace, Mr. Chairman. There are many women who have spent their lives in the field of day care and nursery interests, that have valuable contributions to make to the Minister as to how quickly this could be done. I think that the after-four centres are something which have to be co-related. Because of the educational factor involved in pre-schoolers, perhaps the pre-school should be under education, because they have now come down to junior kindergartens with 4-year-old children in the education department. They are pre-schoolers in the old style of education.

The after-four centres for the latch-key children could come into this department and be handled, because they have taken their schooling for the day and they now will be children in custody. The small children who are in day nurseries are not in custody, Mr. Chairman. They are learning every day that they are in the school. I would like to ask the Minister if he has the same report, broken down as to what nurseries we have in each county, which of those are subsidized, and the number of children able to be accommodated. To give me a total figure does not tell me anything about what we are doing in day-nurseries in Ontario.

It does not tell me whether we have any day nurseries around some of the industrialized centres of Ontario. It simply gives a lump sum which I present, Mr. Chairman, is not a realistic view.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me assure you and all hon. members of this House, that any working mother who cannot afford all or any part of day care for her child should turn to the municipal welfare officer. That is where the original service will be supplied and that is where we can get the original statistic.

Mr. Trotter: So many do nothing, that is not the answer.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the figures that the hon. member has asked for are as follows: Algoma, one all day, two half-day. Brant, three all day, seven half-day. Carleton, one public all day, six private all day. No, I will start over again, Mr. Chairman. I will give four figures. The first two figures are public all day, half day, private all day, half day. Algoma, blank, blank, one, two; Brant, blank, one, three, seven; Carleton, one, blank, six, 27; Cochrane, blank, one, blank, one; Dufferin, blank, blank, blank, one; Durham, blank, blank, blank, three.

Mr. Nixon: Careful now, watch your language there.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Elgin—no, I think this will take too long. Elgin: private, one all day; private one half day. Essex: private two; private, half day, 12. Frontenac: private all day, one; private, half day, 13. Grey: private, half day—

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if I may say, this is confusing. The question, Mr. Chairman, let us take the one question then. What facilities are there in each county, just the facilities for day nurseries? Then isolate the ones that are subsidized. I am sure there probably is not a subsidized nursery in Algoma and so on. To give us a realistic view, Mr. Chairman, if I may say, of how many nurseries there are and how many of those are subsidized by the province?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if I cannot table this, perhaps I could make the question the hon. member asks as an order for return and then it will be given. Now, it will not be broken down into the figures of subsidized and not subsidized, because presently, under the new regulations, if it is municipally operated they are subsidized. The municipalities can enter into agreements under the new regulations with the private nurseries for a purchase service. It will be some time before we will have those new figures of the municipalities that have entered into agreements to provide these subsidized day care services.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I was interested in what the hon. Minister said that if the working mother is not able to afford day care, then she should apply to the department of welfare; that is true enough. But if the department of welfare says to her, "But where are you going to put your child?" and there are no day care centres within reach of that working mother, then the problem is compounded. This is not an answer.

I think this is the point that my hon. colleague has been making—we just do not have enough day care centres. She read a quotation from *Sweden, The Middle Way*. I have seen some of those nurseries there. Then one of the new day nurseries I saw in Copenhagen a couple of years ago impressed me profoundly. In an apartment complex on the ground floor, a beautifully designed and well equipped area with play space outside, children of working mothers, from three years to kindergarten—were looked after with one attendant for every ten children, one qualified person. The women brought their children there to be looked after.

On the next floor, just above this, was where the children from three weeks to three years were looked after, one attendant for every four. And on the next floor above that were the workshops, the hobby areas, where the children came before, if necessary, and after school, until the working mothers came to pick up and take them to their own apartment.

Now, this was integrated, well run, well designed, and the working mothers paid something toward the cost if they were above a certain level of income. Below that level they paid nothing; it was picked up by the various levels of government.

I think this is the kind of thing that the hon. member for Scarborough Centre is getting at, that we just do not have this kind of systematic planning for our day care centres in the province of Ontario. To say that we have not yet planned them or that we cannot afford it, is just begging the question.

When countries not as wealthy as we are can see to it that this kind of planning is done to look after the children of working mothers, then I think we ought to face up to our responsibilities. Certainly I think the hon. Minister or certain members of his staff have seen the way these things work and we ought to be facing up to our responsibility here and making definite plans so that this need, this fundamental need for the women who work in our society—today—more and more of them are being forced to work through economic necessity, and their children should be looked after adequately. I think this is the thing that the Minister ought to face and ought to really go into.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned that if a parent wanted day care for a child, all they had to do was phone the local area in which they live, be it the township or the borough. Now, this simply is not good enough.

I give you a practical example. I have a handful of cases here before me and I do not intend to start and read a lot of individual cases, but certainly you can learn a lot from them. A woman with two small children lives in Don Mills and she goes to work. She phoned to the municipality for help, but in the area in which she lives, certainly nine months ago, there just was not that help. So what do they do? They move down to the city of Toronto proper, down in the Beaches area, because there is some kind of programme in the city of Toronto. That is, if you can find the facility available, they have a programme, but they certainly do not have enough day care centres.

This particular case of the woman from Don Mills, although she lived in the Beaches area, her child went to the day care centre

at Bathurst and Adelaide Streets, so she gets up at seven in the morning, takes the children to the day care centre and then she goes to work. You can see what kind of family life that particular family would have with those hours, simply because there were not the facilities available.

There are so many cases, and by the figures as quoted by the Minister he must know that they do not nearly meet the demand that is required. What are these people to do? These parents, or in most cases they are women alone, bring up their families, and on the odd occasion it is the father. Well, what are they to do? Quit work and go on welfare and increase the taxes that have to be paid out on a matter like this?

The thing to do is simply provide the facilities and keep people at work. In some instances the children at these day care centres get far more opportunity to learn than they would at home, because, as is well known to many of us, where the mother of a household does not go to work, we still like to send the younger children to kindergarten before they go to school. Those of us who can afford it make a point of doing this, because it is good for the child.

I know the predecessor of the present Minister was really opposed to day care centres. He told one distinguished group from the city of Toronto that women should not be working. And I would never fault the present Minister having such outmoded Victorian ideas, because whether a woman wants to work today or not, a good many thousands of them have to work. It is not a question of choice. We simply have to face up to the fact that our economy has changed in a very tremendous way and unfortunately, our policies on day care centres are extremely Victorian.

Last summer—I think it was some time in August or September, I just forget the date—the new regulations having to do with these day care centres were finally issued by this department. They were an awfully long time in coming and, in part, the long delay in bringing out those regulations is partly responsible for the delay of what work has been in Metropolitan Toronto. It may well be that the Metropolitan Toronto authorities used, as an excuse, the slow issuing of the regulations.

But I made a point, for a while, of phoning every week to see when the regulations were going to be issued. I think I started in June and maybe I made a nuisance of myself and finally, they said, "well, we will call you," and eventually I got a call. I was particularly interested in two day care centres that still are not opened in my own area and I know how desperately they are needed.

It is true that some of the new day care centres that we hope will eventually come into use are installed in churches. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister and to his department, to keep this in mind; some people both in Metropolitan Toronto social services agencies and in your own department think "well, a lot of these churches are after these day care centres because the churches are old and rundown and they need the money."

There are not too many churches that are wealthy, but in my own experience and in my own opinion, wherever I have seen churches try to establish day-care centres and seek grants from government, it is not so much that they are run down but that they are in areas that desperately need day-care centres. The clergymen who are involved see it every day and have seen it day in, day out for a number of years. Tragic family situations, simply because there is a tremendous dearth of day-care centres. And I think that the government should be grateful that such individuals as are involved around some of the churches, are taking the interest that they are taking, because there are many who are strictly volunteers—or if they are paid in their work they are putting far more hours than the usual nine-to-five, five-day week that many put in.

This issue is going to be brought up time and time again over the next number of years. I am frankly disappointed with the Minister in that he seems to lack an interest in this problem and seems to lack a grasp of the facts. I do not expect him to have an analysis of the situation—a complete analysis—because I know that for years this government has almost completely neglected this problem. But I want to give the Minister one bit of advice. You are never going to solve the day-care centre problem if you leave it to the local municipalities. A lot of them simply do not have the money even to make the partial grant that they must make. And a great many of them simply do not have a sufficient number of trained personnel.

This is one tremendous advantage that the Minister of Social and Family Services has in Ontario, in that he has probably got the best trained civil service staff in this field in the country and can certainly compete with most of the states in the United States. No municipality can begin to match the personnel that you have in training. Surely there are

some well trained people in the city of Toronto. I am not saying that, but in comparison to the facilities that this Minister has—there is no comparison and there are only two possible places that you are ever going to get money for this cause and for most other causes in this country: from the provincial Treasury and from the federal Treasury. To look to the municipalities at the present property tax rates is almost a hopeless situation.

This argument can be repeated for the day care centres. It can be repeated for almost any social facility that is required in this province today, and the Minister is simply going to have to take a far more vigorous stand in this situation than he has to date. I tell the Minister this for his own sake, that he has a tremendous opportunity to do a lot of good. A lot of people in this field would give their eye teeth to have the power that the present Minister has actually to do something. But I do hope that you show far more vigour and energy and interest in the future than you have shown to date because this department has had very lacklustre political leadership and it is still not too good.

The Minister has not been in office too long and I am going to prejudge him. But if I were to judge the Minister by the answers that he has given the hon. member for Scarborough Centre, I would say that he has no interest at all in the day-care centres. You certainly do not need a detailed analysis on day-care centres at this point because I could lead the Minister by the hand in my own area, and introduce him to people who can give him very informative answers to his questions. I can show him areas and people who are just desperate for help to clear up this situation that can be solved by day care centres; and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that from the research of this very department, that was done a few years ago on the rehabilitation of families on welfare, one of the things that was needed was day care centres.

What is the point of spending time and money and doing research, finding the answers or finding what is needed and then just doing literally nothing about it? Even under your estimates as they ended March 31, 1967, out of this—for day nurseries for maintenance and for grants, over $67,000 was unexpended.

There may be some good reason for it. I doubt it. They are crying for money for day-care centres and yet, back in the days when we voted only $591,000, you still had a good portion of that unexpended, more than 10 per cent. Now, because of the new legislation the estimate is up over $1 million. You are going to need more and I am not asking this government to throw money away, but I feel that in this particular estimate, where you spend a dollar you can spend it in keeping families off welfare, and I repeat, from your own research you can rehabilitate families and get them off the welfare rolls.

I do not believe in just giving people money to live and do nothing. I think that what is so important in this department is that we have far more emphasis on prevention, on rehabilitation. This is one of the estimates that is so singularly important in this area. Assuming you have got some of those Tory-Victorian ideas out of your head as your predecessor had about "women should stay at home"—I assume that this Minister will take a deeper and more thoughtful look at this estimate. But at this point he has not, and I know from the numerous phone calls, just wondering how the regulations were coming, how tortuously slow it was, and knowing how many people were waiting—and I know for two years of two day care centres—well, we are going to get under way some time; there are still no children being taken care of but, true, they are going to be. It is finally under way, but in the meantime the population has grown. Maybe the Minister can heave a sigh of relief that some of the children who would have been taken care of will not need to go into a day care centre; they are too old now. Maybe some of them are in reform schools; maybe some of them now that would have had a possibility of learning something in school are going to end up as the first of your drop-outs. As always happens, they are always the first on the welfare rolls.

Our patchwork view of social welfare, our whole thinking behind this is completely outdated, and I say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister has probably got the greatest opportunity of anyone in this province in doing something for the people of this province, and for pioneering and for making a tremendous amount of progress, both socially, politically, and for the economic stability of this province. Heaven knows, when you look at what goes on in the world today, we need economic stability. But you are not going to have it as long as you have a hard core of depressed people which we have in these large urban centres.

We can talk about the affluent society until we are blue in the face but there is a hard core of people who are depressed and it has been going on now in some cases for three generations. This is one way of striking at

it—there is no one answer, there is no complete answer—but day care centres are at least a part of the answer. So I urge the Minister: For heaven's sake, get busy and give some leadership on this important estimate.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Dufferin-Simcoe.

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Chairman, we are always glad to welcome visitors to the House and through you, I would like to extend to a group from my own riding a very hearty welcome this afternoon. They are representing the women's institute of the Collingwood area, the ski capital of Ontario, and we welcome them here.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Earlier this afternoon I brought up the problem of the day-care centre in my own community. I would like to pursue it a bit and point out to the Minister figures actually from his own department concerning the real emergency as far as day-care centres are concerned.

The Department of Social and Family Services reported that, from their case load, 100 women presently receiving mothers' allowance would likely avail themselves of day-care services in order to be retrained and self supporting. And of the 248 mothers who are on city welfare, we could rightly assume that a good percentage of these likewise would avail themselves of the services of a day-care centre.

Mr. Minister, maybe you can look upon the whole problem this summer from an experimental point of view. Why not try to take advantage of the large number of high school and university girls that cannot find employment and see if they could not be used in an experiment to take care of some of these children of mothers who would like to work? You see, we are fortunate in the city of Windsor that we have a large metropolis like the city of Detroit across from us and our women do not have difficulty in obtaining employment in either the sales field or the office field in the city of Detroit.

However, they are prevented from taking this employment because of the family at home and wishing to bring their families up in the proper fashion. Now, you could conduct some type of experiment in the community using the large numbers of either high school girls or university girls who cannot find employment, and see if they could not fit into a programme that would alleviate the day-care centre shortage.

Likewise, Mr. Chairman, the church organizations would go into the programme. However, as soon as they go to set up, regulations seem to be so stringent that they become discouraged very easily. I know it was not too long ago that I had an Italian church wishing to set up and use the religious sisters to conduct a programme. But because they were required to have X number of washroom facilities, they were precluded from carrying on the programme at that time.

I think greater use could be made of religious organizations in providing some type of assistance in the day-care field. It is not too long before the province is going to assume the total cost of welfare. The member for London South (Mr. White) made mention of it and we assume that he is the government spokesman, so that before the next election you will probably be using this as an election gimmick. You might as well start preparing for the take-over of the total cost of welfare. Why not try taking over the total cost of day-care services?

Set these up throughout parts of Ontario, areas that you know need facilities. You either provide the day care services today or The Department of Reform Institutions, newly named, will have these people as charges on their budget. So it is much better for you to get into the field completely today to prevent a situation from deteriorating very greatly in the not-too-distant future. I certainly would like to see if the hon. Minister can work out some programme so that we can provide employment for our many girls who cannot obtain employment and who could maybe be useful in the day-care field.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): I should like to endorse the suggestion of the member for Windsor-Walkerville and include in his suggestion the girls from the Alicia Mason school who have had special training in nursery care. Some of them have had three-year training in this respect.

I have one question for the Minister. I was out of the House, it may have been answered. Have negotiations for the Windsor day-school nursery begun yet?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I understand that the city council has passed the resolution.

Mr. Burr: But you have not begun negotiating yet?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No. They have just passed the resolution and they go on from there.

Mr. Burr: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few words to this matter of day-nursery care and ask the Minister a few questions. First I think we all are agreed that the mothers of many thousands of pre-school children are working because of necessity. It is no longer a matter of status to have one's children go to the day nursery. Included in these groups of mothers who must find places for their children are, of course, widowed and divorced mothers, single mothers, deserted mothers. It is this group that is finding it most difficult.

There are two reasons why they are finding difficulty—lack of facilities and the cost involved in placing their children in day nurseries under day-nursery care. Having been somewhat involved in a church nursery, I would like to point out a few facts and then ask a few questions.

It is the elimination of the possibility for leaving children in neglected circumstances during the day that makes it imperative that these working mothers find places for their children. Now, when a municipality subsidizes the care of this child in a private nursery, I understand it is to 80 per cent of the cost. This, I believe, is a shared programme, Mr. Chairman, and if that is correct what portion of that cost is shared federally?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The municipality pays 20 per cent and is reimbursed, that is, the province picks up 80 per cent and we share that with the federal government under the Canada assistance plan.

Mr. Good: To what extent, sir?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Fifty-fifty.

Mr. Good: Fifty-fifty. That is what I want.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say that Waterloo has just entered into an agreement for the purchase of such services.

Mr. Good: Yes, that is what I have been given to understand. Now, can the municipality pay for care of children in both private and municipally-operated nurseries? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, we subsidize 80 per cent.

Mr. Good: Now, what help—in capital costs and equipment grants—is there for municipalities organizing a day nursery? What percentage?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We will share 80 per cent of the renovations.

Mr. Good: Is there any help for the establishment of private day nurseries on the capital costs or equipment point of view?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, there is none.

Mr. Good: There is none. This brings me to the final point and that is the matter under which—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Excuse me, it is pointed out to me that, in some circumstances, the depreciation might be included in the daily rate.

Mr. Good: In a private nursery? Now, for those who need help—and I understand, Mr. Chairman, there are a great many who need help—the only way a working mother can get financial help to have her child in a day nursery school, is to apply to the municipal welfare office. This is where the rub comes in.

This has been described by many people as a complicated ordeal which causes the resentment of a great many applicants. Operators of nurseries tell me that mothers would rather struggle along as best they can and probably put their child in a nursery under proper care rather than make that trek down to the municipal welfare office.

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if we should not be concerting this system. I think all are agreed with studies showing that this is a very important matter in the life of pre-school children—that they be looked after properly. We should not be considering this as an extension of our educational system. Get the needs test away from the welfare officer; get it into subsidies for the day care nurseries, so that there would not be this stigma attached to placing one's child in a day care nursery and having to get the assistance through the welfare department of a municipality.

We have a very fine programme here and my sentiments are those of the others that

this needs to be extended. I think the one thing holding it back is the fact that subsidies have to come through the welfare department to the working mother.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add my word to those of the last speaker, that the needs test applied to children for day nurseries should be judged according to the needs of the child rather than whether the parents can or will pay. These are children of working parents, by and large, and at the present time they are going out to other forms of day care which are not necessarily safe—not necessarily any sort of a learning programme for the children.

I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, of the Minister, how many new day nurseries we have built in the province in the last fiscal year up to the end of March?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I thought I answered the hon. member. The growth is at the rate of about 10 per cent.

Mrs. M. Renwick: How many nurseries?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We are dealing with 400-some odd. We are growing at the rate of about 40 to 50 nurseries per year. Mind you, I am hopeful that this coming year, because of the provisions we have been making —raising it from 50 to 80 per cent—that this will be a stimulus, and that has been a stimulus as evidenced by Windsor, Waterloo, Metro Toronto and other places.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I believe there was a programme, Mr. Chairman, of eight or ten day nurseries to be built, three of which were built. I believe it was in the 1965 estimates.

I would like to know exactly how many we acquired in the last year. How many new subsidized day care centres did we acquire?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will take that question as notice, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. M. Renwick: May I ask, Mr. Chairman, the number of day care centres, subsidized day care centres, that are in the area of Scarborough?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As I pointed out to the hon. member, we do not have statistics as to subsidized and non-subsidized day nurseries; all municipal nurseries are subsidized. The municipalities, in turn, can enter into agreements with private day nurseries for the purchase of services and we will subsidize these in relationship to mothers in need.

Those statistics, because the programme is so new, are not available at the present time, but will be available in the future.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Okay, Mr. Chairman, all right. Could I ask then, please, how many day nurseries we have in Scarborough? Of any kind?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The day nurseries are not broken down into municipalities in the Metropolitan area because it is a Metro responsibility, so we deal with it at a Metro level. One of the finest moves we ever made in welfare in the province of Ontario was to make it Metro-wide.

I am advised that in Scarborough there are no municipal operated nurseries; all are private.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I would like to ask how many nurseries there are in the area of Etobicoke?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That would also be one of the Metro ones and I understand that there is another one in the offing.

Mr. Trotter: Does the answer not embarrass the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, the answer does not embarrass me.

In the county of York, which includes all the statistics we keep, there are, public all-day nurseries, 15; public half-day nurseries, five; private all-day nurseries, 54; private half-day nurseries, 101. That is the county of York and that is the statistics we have been keeping on a county basis.

Mr. M. Renwick: May I ask what the future plans of this department are? Are there any pilot projects going to emerge in other hospitals, such as the one in Riverdale? Is there any thought in the future of day nurseries automatically being designed and incorporated into Ontario housing units?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I answered the hon. member earlier with respect to the Riverdale hospital one, but so far as I know there is no other hospital contemplating that programme, which I believe is a very successful programme.

I told the House earlier this session that the interdepartmental committee on day care has been re-established and we took these advances during the year 1967. They will be in position then, in the course of 1968, to evaluate the progress we have made and see what further, if anything – I always

assume there is always something to be done—should be done.

Mrs. M. Renwick: May I ask if the Minister would elaborate a little bit on that interdepartmental committee? That very significant improvement—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The interdepartmental committee is being reconstituted. It was formerly under The Department of Labour, but now it is going to be carried by The Department of Social and Family Services.

The chairman will be the director of our day nurseries branch—and I thank the hon. member for Parkdale for his kind words. There will be representatives from The Departments of Education, Health, Labour and Trade and Development, both from the economic council level and the housing corporation level.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I may say, that is the brightest spot I have seen this afternoon. Could I ask, Mr. Chairman—there was a joint effort, and this is why I follow up on what we were just speaking about by The Department of Education and The Department of Social and Family Services at Moosonee. Is there thought, Mr. Chairman, of the Minister, of any future joint efforts between The Department of Education and The Department of Social and Family Services with regards to day nurseries; the learning time, when children in all likelihood, should be under The Department of Education rather than The Department of Social and Family Services, and the after-four centres. Is there any consideration being given to the pilot project that was carried out so well at the Duke of York school last year, for the aftercare centre for the children of working parents and for a hot lunch, which I understand the board of education is now doing some research to evaluate?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, Mr. Chairman, as you will note, there is representation on the interdepartmental committee of The Department of Education. One of the basic reasons for setting up this interdepartmental committee is, perhaps, the dealing with the universality of this kind of a service that should be provided because it has universal aspects.

Under the federal-provincial Canada assistance plan agreement, we are limited to the subsidy of needy parents. The Department of Education already provides services, or through the municipality can provide services, for children from three years and eight months which is in reality, a very young child. They are doing that in certain municipalities and one of the main items will be to see how this will be worked out.

In respect to the after-four care, of course, the care can be provided to a group during the whole period of the operation of the day nursery and we will share in the cost—up to the age of ten years, I believe it is.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, might I just ask of the Minister the correct term for these? Is "city day nurseries" the correct term for those which fall under your department? The one such as in Davisville public school, is that a city day nursery? If so, how many do we have and how many children are they accommodating?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Those are municipally operated. They are called "municipally operated day nurseries" as compared with private day nurseries. The Metro public nurseries—there are nine nurseries with 450 children. Davisville is one of the nine.

Mrs. M. Renwick: May I ask, Mr. Chairman, are any of those more recently acquired than others? I mean, in the last year have we acquired additional kinds of this kind of day care?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not know whether there have been any added in the past two years. I know that Metro Toronto is contemplating, right now, adding three or four. I think there are several of them—two of them at least are in West Toronto. The hon. member for Parkdale would be interested, and there is one in Etobicoke. Glenn Road was opened last fall and there will be one opening in June and three in September.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister gave this figure earlier, but if he did, I wonder if he would refresh my memory: The number of children who are able to be cared for in the province at this time under the day care?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are 21,000 children being looked after in day nurseries in the province.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I would like to ask the Minister if he is, at the present time, planning on incorporating family day care, making it eligible for a provincial subsidy as day nursery care is, setting up supervision licensing accountability—and the need is not just in Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the whole aspect will be reviewed by the inter-departmental committee.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Just a small question. What is the child-staff ratio under the municipal day nurseries at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: One staff per eight-to-ten children according to the age of the children.

Mrs. M. Renwick: May I ask, Mr. Chairman, if I rephrased my question—and I am not asking specifically for subsidized nurseries—can the Minister table in the House the number of day nurseries, regardless of whether they are even full-day or half-day, but simply the number that there are in each county?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. I have undertaken to table that.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2007?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The Minister said he would table it. I think that is indicative that he does not have it—

Mrs. M. Renwick: I am sorry—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do have it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has it?

Mrs. M. Renwick: What I would like to see in this record is the same thing that Mr. Cecile provided in his estimates so that we can see the rate of growth.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has turned the information over to the Clerk. It has been tabled and the member may inspect it at any time she wishes.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2007 carried?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just one question. I notice a small grant here to the nursery education association of Ontario which, at one time, provided crash courses for day nursery staff. Is that still in operation, I would like to ask the Minister, and if so, was there any request for more funds than $1,000?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, that is item 5. The work of the department has been very closely associated with the association in the training of these teachers and I think that we have had 249 pre-school teacher certificates issued. A good deal of this work has been and will continue to be done through the colleges of applied arts and technology that have developed courses. The association did ask for a substantial increase in the grant from $1,000 to $20,000. This came in after the estimates had been established and this is one of the matters we will be considering during the coming year—the relationship of the grant to the association in the light of the programme that is being developed in the colleges.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Why was it turned down, Mr. Chairman? I would like to know.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was not turned down, but a letter went out to the president on April 19.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Could I ask if a grant was requested, Mr. Chairman, by the Duke of York school in order to carry on the valuable after-four care that they have been providing for 20 to 25 children in the past year?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. Trotter: I have one question to ask, Mr. Chairman. I would like to get the Minister's opinion on this problem. It would help the day care centre situation to some extent and it is this: If a number of parents could have their children eat lunch at the schools—say it is a public school and down in the primary grades—it would be a very great help to many parents. A lot of public schools either do not allow children to have lunch at school, or discourage it, and I was wondering if there was anything the Minister could do through his connections, and I am sure with the goodwill of the Minister of Education, to encouarge schools to provide some type of supervision for children of families who want them to have their lunch at school.

Again, sir, you can see the problem. The parents may drop the children off in the morning, and the children may take care of themselves until about five o'clock. But in the noon hour, where does the child get his lunch? I know that people may have the facilities—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Are you referring to primary educational facilities?

Mr. Trotter: Sure, public schools. For example, I know that the schools in many cases discourage this. If you send a note—suppose you are a candidate in an election, as I am, and all the family is busy on election day, and you send a note that your child has to take a sandwich and have his lunch at school, it is discouraged. But in many areas that I know of in Toronto, they discourage it very much. Yet it would be a help to the working parent. The problem for the school is supervision by the teacher. Now with your department it would help solve some of the pressure on day-care centres if they would say to The Department of Education: "Provide the teacher on some type of schedule or we will supply lay-supervision." A middle-aged lady could go in during the hour-and-a-half lunchtime just to see to it that there is some supervision of the children.

It seems to me that this could be a practical solution in some cases. The reason why I suggest it is that a number of people who have found themselves in this situation have wondered why it could not be done. I wonder if the Minister has any opinion?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think that suggestion has a great deal of merit, on the surface, and I can only make the assumption that the committee will make a good review of the matter. In fact, I will see to it that they do.

Mr. Trotter: The main thing is that you do not make any assumptions. You are the Minister, I suggest that you zero in on it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I assume that there are merits. I have heard only the one side of the story, and on the hearing of the one side, there is a great deal of merit. Now, whether there are any valid reasons otherwise, is a matter which the committee will study. Myself, I think that it sounds like a good idea.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on this main topic, may I inform the Minister that the day-care committee of the social planning council in my own community made that as a specific recommendation, and it is that Windsor public and separate school boards consider developing supervised luncheon facilities for school-aged children of working mothers. So you can see that it is a fairly universal problem and it is a thing that your department has to look at very seriously.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick: From a survey of day care in East Toronto, dated April 1967, members of the East Toronto day care committee recommended that three more nursery and day care centres are needed on the basis of the social planning council report. This is in 1966—the city welfare committee. From the report—the survey of day care in East Toronto, April 1967, members of the East Toronto day care committee—came this information:

Of 23,000 children enrolled in 29 schools —23,323, actually, in the east end of Toronto in April, 1966—5,000 came from homes where both parents went out to work, and 1,500 one-parent families were also in that group of which a large proportion go to work. From the same sample of 12 junior schools in the east end of the city of Toronto, it is estimated that 800 children out of 17,000 in public schools, plus 900 in separate schools, were taking their lunches to their schools, having no planned supervision. I think maybe, Mr. Chairman, that that kind of information is worthy of the consideration of the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Was that elementary schools, or high schools?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Junior schools. Just a minute and I will read you, Mr. Chairman, their description of junior schools.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Very well. I will get the information later.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Junior schools, I believe, Mr. Chairman, stop at grade 6, but I would like to find out for sure.

Vote 2007 agreed to.

On vote 2008:

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, I made a few remarks with regard to homes for the aged when I opened the debate for our side. I made reference to the fact that it is a shame that the government, and the municipal administrators and nursery homeowners could not get together. If I recall correctly, I made some suggestion that part of the problem lay in the fact that grants should be scaled or varied according to costs in the particular area where the home is located.

I am in receipt of a letter from a Hugh McLean, the co-chairman of the negotiating committee on rates for the associated nursing homes incorporated, Ontario, and—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This does not come under this vote. This came up under vote 2003, municipal welfare administration.

Mr. Braithwaite: Are we not talking about homes for the aged?

Mr. Chairman: Homes for the aged branch, yes.

Mr. Braithwaite: I am talking about homes for the aged.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This is a different item, you are talking about nursing homes.

Mr. Braithwaite: Homes for the aged, are we not talking about the same thing?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, the associated nursing homes—

Mr. Braithwaite: Young or old, this does not matter. Let us not be technical. I am only trying to ask the Minister whether or not he has given any thought to some suggestions that I made. Whether or not his department has any plans for getting these two groups together, so that these people will not be moved when they do not want to be. I do not see how the Minister could say it should come under 2003; it is a very important question. I say, let us not get technical at this point. It is homes for the aged—I am talking about aged people.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is an important question, as are all items under discussion within this department, and they have been discussed, they have been talked about in the opening remarks, and they were touched upon in vote 2003, general welfare administration.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I am asking about old people. Even if they are in nursing homes, they are still in homes for the aged. I am asking the Minister if he has any views on this. I would like to know, just for the record, so that we may find out what the real problem is—I think that the Minister should give some sort of statement on this. If he does not want to, that is his prerogative.

Mr. Chairman: May I point out to the member that we are dealing with vote 2008, which is homes for the aged, and I think that it clearly means in this vote, the established homes for the aged. They are under The Rest Homes Act and the homes for the aged. General remarks on nursing homes, I would not think, would be proper here. If you can relate them to the homes for the aged—

Mr. Braithwaite: Well, I beg to differ with Mr. Chairman, and with the Minister. I do think that this is an appropriate place for this to come up. I can see nothing wrong with the Minister making statements. If he has a policy, this is the time to say so.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, if my friend, the member for Etobicoke, wanted to discuss the matter, whether it was homes for the aged, or nursing homes, could it come under the office of aging, because the hon. member for Etobicoke is right on recommendation 34, sir, of the recommendations of the select committee on aging, which was done under the auspices of this department, so surely he can discuss the situation. It is recommendation 34, under the next vote.

Mr. Chairman: The question that the member is trying to relate is a problem of aging persons in nursing homes. In that context, perhaps he is not too far off the vote.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the hon. Minister can take my question and comments as notice. Perhaps when we get to vote 2009, he would like to make a statement at that time.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the proper vote was 2003, and it was commented upon at that time. Now, surely, Mr. Chairman, this is not my ruling, it must be your ruling, that we deal with the votes as they come along. We have now progressed to homes for the aged with the various items that come under that jurisdiction.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister is trying to hide behind a technicality.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, we have a problem here and I think the hon. Minister ought to face up to it. It is his responsibility.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, talking to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Parkdale—the associated nursing homes cater to all age groups. They are nursing homes providing that special type of personal care that can be provided only in nursing homes and need not particularly have any direct relationship to the aged. They look after aged people, but by the same token they look after younger people and therefore are not within the terms of this vote at all.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order, as you yourself pointed out very properly, the hon. member is trying to associate the problems of the aged in asso-

ciation with the nursing homes and the other provisions that are there for them and I think, sir, that the ruling you were about to make indicated that he would be in order in one of these votes to raise the subject in a general way, and it was a very acceptable one.

Mr. Chairman: I must point out that the Chairman has not yet made a ruling. He is trying to determine just whether or not—

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, can I just underscore what I have said? This problem between nursing homes and homes for the aged has come up time and time again in the committee on aging insofar as it dealt with the problems on aging. Whether we discussed it under homes for the aged branch or under office on aging, it certainly is connected. In dealing with the problems of aging this item is extremely important, which the member for Etobicoke mentioned, and it is only part of it. I, for one, would be happy to say office on aging, but it is most certainly on this subject. In fact, it is one of the main items.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, within this department we do not have groupings as to age. For example, we were talking about young people—we discussed the various items under vote 2004, the family services branch; 2006, the child welfare branch, which deals with children; 2007, that deals with day nurseries branch—they are not lumped under a vote called "children." We in this House have developed the order.

The nursing home situation comes under vote—so far as this department is concerned—under vote 2003, the municipal welfare administration and comments were made at that time. We have gone past that vote and we are now getting into the homes for the aged branch.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, if there are senior citizens living in homes and if there are problems then it is, to my way of thinking, quite pertinent that they come up either under homes for the aged or office of aging—in spite of what the hon. Minister might say. I cannot see why he is trying to hide behind a technicality.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to hide, I am trying to get some order, to assist you and this House in having an orderly procession of the estimates. I may point out to the hon. member that senior citizens' housing now comes under The Department of Trade and Development and that is where you will discuss senior citizens' housing.

Mr. Braithwaite: I did not say housing.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Senior citizens' housing will come under Trade and Development.

Mr. Chairman: I think perhaps the member has in mind the problem relating to elderly persons who presently are in nursing homes, or the possibility of those people becoming eligible for, or included in, the overall programme of homes for the aged. However, I do not think that in vote 2008 we could introduce any such suggestion; perhaps under vote 2009. As the Minister has pointed out, we have covered under vote 2003 and other votes nursing services. I think under 2008 we should restrict the debate to the homes for the aged branch in the proper—

Mr. Braithwaite: Does that mean we can raise this matter under vote 2009?

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman will listen to the comments under 2009 to properly determine whether they should come under the office on aging.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, my comments are going to be the same as they have already been. I will not take the trouble to repeat them. I do not see why the Chairman cannot make a ruling.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman is not going to make a ruling at this time, except that it cannot be discussed under vote 2008, but possibly under 2009.

The member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask how many homes for the aged have been established? Has each municipality established at least one?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: During the fiscal year of 1967-1968 there were seven new homes and six additions made to existing homes, with an additional 1,180 beds. There are 68 municipal homes in existence and I think that every county and district has a home; at least one.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, according to the Act, item 2, except as otherwise provided in subsection 2, in section 5, "every municipality not in a territorial district shall establish and maintain a home for the aged." Is there one, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, in every municipality?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, of course there is provision made for joint homes, whereby the municipalities get together and operate a joint home. I understand that every county with the exception of one has a home and that is in the process of planning one.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am asking about municipalities. Is that the same as the county? I understand that they can have joint homes according to No. 5 and according to subsection 2, "but in lieu of separate homes the councils may, with the approval of writing the Minister, have a joint home." I would like to know, are we protected in every municipality in the province with either a home for the aged or a joint home in every municipality?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Every municipality in the province either operates or is a participant in a joint home, with the exception of Lennox and Addington, where there is one in the process of planning. There is one district that has no district home.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have received some correspondence that leaves me a little concerned about the calibre of supervision in at least one of the nursing homes and it could quite possibly apply to many others.

The Minister will recall, I am sure, that I inquired as to some accidents that had occurred in the Wentworth Lodge in Dundas, Ontario, just outside Hamilton, in regard to a lady who had twice fallen within the last six months and twice broken her hip. This lady was over 90 years of age.

I received a fully comprehensive report from the Minister and I sent a copy of it to the family of this elderly lady and they have some comments to make that I feel perhaps ought to be put on the record at this time.

The lady apparently fell out of bed in December and again in April, both times breaking the same hip. The report indicates that the family were annoyed because the home was trying to keep her in her room and they indicated that she was a very determined old lady—which she no doubt was—and she wanted to take part in the crafts and the various activities that go on within the hospital or the home.

In answer to this particular part of the report, the family indicated they at no time suggested that she should not take part. What they did suggest was that in December she had had illnesses which required bed care—I am reading from the report—for short periods of time, and the family were summoned to the lodge at those times and told of the extreme frailty of her heart.

The head nurse also warned the family to be prepared for a sudden passing, and from this time on she had several falls due to this extreme weakness. Many times she was assisted by other residents in the home, who told of her attempts to get to the dining room and the sewing room.

At that point her son spoke to the superintendent of the home and requested extra care for his mother, since she appeared too frail to decide for herself. She had many bruises on her body, she had a cut on her arm and, on Christmas day, she was, what could be interpreted, I suppose, as incoherent. She was not able to understand what was going on around about her, and she could not be taken out. They visited her at the lodge and had to ask a nurse to dress a bad cut on her arm that had become infected.

On top of this, they informed me that on a number of occasions—it says "many", and I do not know how many "many" might be—but on many occasions her two daughters-in-law had changed her and taken home her badly-soiled clothing.

I think this condition ought to be looked into. I can be sure of the validity of it, I have no reason to doubt that what they have said is true. I do not know how often this might have occurred. If it has occurred more than once, then it is deplorable.

They have asked that the mother be supported at all times because obviously, at age 92, she is unable to take care of herself. And yet, upon entering the home they found her slumped over a chair and they had to help her to get back into bed. Now, they are not asking for retribution of any kind, they are not asking that the home be chastised. They are asking for an investigation in order that the other people who are going to live there—and perhaps other people in other homes—do not have to be subjected to this kind of treatment.

It is not the fault of the nurses, I am sure. It is probably just the fault of trying to do too much with too few people. The inability to perform the function is apt to be because there are not enough people looking after the number of patients in the home.

The other complaint they have, of course, is that the first injury happened in the middle of the night and they were not informed until the middle of the following afternoon. This is not a very good relationship to have. They certainly should have been informed previous to that, I am sure members would agree.

The other part that concerns me is this—and I would ask that this be looked at. At the time she was admitted to the hospital—not the home, but taken from the home to the hospital after the accident—the hospital informed the relatives that she was badly dehydrated. I would be very interested in knowing how this condition came about. It may be a common condition among the elderly. I do not know, I am not a doctor, but I would very much doubt if someone was receiving proper care they would be in this condition.

I do not want to leave the feeling that I am criticizing the nurses. I think they probably do the best they can, but I do feel that we should make sure that each and every home in Ontario is adequately staffed in order that they can properly look after the people in their care. And I would ask the Minister if he would undertake to do this and to attempt to inform me—if not today at least some time in the future—of the kind of staffing arrangements in the homes for the aged and whether, in relation to other facilities available throughout the province, the staffing arrangement at this particular home is adequate.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will do that, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of fact, I am familiar with the case because of the member's representations. If he were to send me a copy of the statement of the family *vis-à-vis* the reply that I obtained for him, why, we will be in a better position perhaps to assess both sides and see what further investigation is warranted.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I have a resolution here that deals with item 4, and that is The Rest Homes Act. This resolution was passed by the council of my own community just as recently as April 29 and I would like to bring it to the attention of the Minister in case he has not received a copy of it. The resolution reads:

> Where the province of Ontario contributes 50 per cent of the capital cost of rest homes constructed by a municipality; and whereas the senior governments contribute approximately two-thirds of the capital cost of hospital construction; and whereas rest homes relieve the shortage of hospital beds; and whereas rest homes provide proper facilities specifically oriented to those whose condition falls in the grey area—

This is the area we were discussing earlier, Mr. Chairman—

> —between hospital care and other existing forms of institutional care, therefore be it resolved that the provincial Legislature be requested to arrange for an increase in the capital grants to municipalities for rest home construction from 50 per cent to an amount equivalent to the grants paid by senior governments for hospital construction.

Now, this resolution, Mr. Chairman, is only one month old. Seeing the tremendous advantage it could be in relieving another branch of the government's service of financial costs, it certainly deserves not only serious consideration but implementation if possible. Would the Minister have any comments on this?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all with respect to the operating costs, with respect to the answer there is just not the money available at the present time. However, I will bring to the hon. member's attention that we do pay 70 per cent. My own feeling is that as soon as we get the additional dollars, that should be raised to 80 per cent of the operating costs to put them on the same footing as private homes, the private organizations.

Mr. B. Newman: It would not be on a similar footing to hospital construction?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, it would not be on a hospital construction basis. Under the capital grants, presently it is 50 per cent, but we have not yet been able to work out with the federal government a complete sharing agreement in respect to capital costs. We intend to negotiate this in the coming year and that may lead to some further assistance in this regard.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, as long as the Minister is aware of the resolution from the city, and I know he will receive copies of it—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have not received it.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is being forwarded to the Ontario municipal association, the Ontario mayors and reeves association, the Ontario association of homes

for the aged, all local members of Parliament, all major Ontario municipalities for endorsation—so I would assume the Minister is going to get more than one copy of it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Now that the member mentions it, I am aware of the resolution in its overall context, yes.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in this rest-homes programme and I was very interested in what the member for Windsor-Walkerville just finished stating.

How many of these rest homes have been established in the province?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They are all in the planning stages, Mr. Chairman. There are six of them in the planning stages, for a total of 490 beds. Actually, the legislation is fairly recent and they are going right ahead with the plans.

Mr. J. P. Spence: (Kent): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister, in regard to the home for the aged across the province in different counties. Does The Department of Social and Family Services have inspectors who inspect these homes; how many; and how often do they inspect them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have, I think, in total 11—we have an establishment of 11 supervisors, are I think they are called. There are 11 inspectors, I am advised, and they inspect at least once a year and oftener, if anything arises, which indicates a further inspection or that more inspections are necessary.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. Trotter: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister in his opening remarks said that the home for the aged in this province were the jewel of this department. I do not often agree with the Minister on may subjects but it is true that, by and large, the province of Ontario, since World War II, has done a fairly excellent job compared with most jurisdictions, not just in Canada but throughout North America. This province has done a fairly good job.

There is one thing that has bothered me when I have had the opportunity to visit these homes and it is this: I always ask what is the waiting list. You know, in the old days people did not want to go into a home for the aged, they were called the houses for refuge and there was a social stigma about going there but today, once people see how well these homes are run and how they are getting away from being institutions, they are anxious to go. In fact, when we were discussing nursing homes and homes for special care under the estimates of The Department of Health, I had suggested that the government may have to move indirectly on some of these homes and the Minister of Health was afraid they would become just institutions.

But it has been shown by the way the homes for the aged have been operated that they have good buildings and they have good administrators in charge, and that they really are a home away from home. Nothing can replace one's own home but certainly, the homes for the aged have been and are, under the circumstances, a big help to many people, and it is true that in some circumstances there are some people who have been so poor that those who are now in the homes for the aged have never had it so good. This may be a minority of cases, but this is the truth.

But I used to ask two questions when I visited these homes and I have never had a proper answer, and I do not think there is one available. First of all, what is the waiting list? Sometimes they would have a particular number that the administrator could tell me. But neither the administrators nor the department nor the county, nor the municipality under whose control these homes are run, really know how many people require the services of a home for the aged. And this is what concerns me, Mr. Chairman, as I know of many people particularly in the large cities who live in rooms, who are sort of lost in the huge cities; they are living up in third-storey flats; they cannot find facilities in which to live, whether they be senior citizens' apartments or homes for the aged, because there just is not enough room.

The second question that these homes fail to answer—and it really has to do with the first part—is: What is going to be the demand for the future? No analysis of this has been done in recent times or at any time, unless it has been started at a very recent date and I do not know about it. I think this is vitally important. First, what is the waiting list now and what is going to be the demand for the future?

For a number of years, I think, the situation of our elderly people has been really a tragic thing; they have no place to go. In part, it has been solved. If you are in a home for the aged you are lucky but I do not think the government has really begun to cope with the demand that is really there. Not, Mr. Chairman, that I am urging that everyone who is getting on in years be rushed to a home for

the aged because one thing that I think government should do, and in part are doing, is to encourage people to stay on their own. When we get to the office on aging, I may discuss that very briefly because I think that may be perhaps more properly discussed under the office on aging.

But it is very hard, Mr. Chairman, sometimes to distinguish between what should be discussed under the homes for the aged and under the office on aging because both problems are very similar and the solutions are of the same type. But I did also mention it to the Minister the other day, in a question. I asked him what sort of a course they have for those people who were responsible for the administration of the homes for the aged. Now, I know that on the books we have a course that is referred to and the Minister told me he was going to look into it. But I tell you that next year on the order paper, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask what type of course we have for administrators. Maybe they have got the course, as the Minister indicates, but I will want to know how many people this coming year actually take the course.

As a result of my asking the Minister about the course for administrators for homes for the aged I received a letter from one individual informing me that there actually is a course for administrators at McMaster University. At the time I asked that question, I did not know there was such a course nor evidently did the Minister know there was a course, because I believe the legislation as drawn up under The Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act when it refers to a course, it means, a course run by the government.

I may be wrong on that but that was my assumption and if my assumption was correct, I do not think they have much of a course here. But in this you need improvement because when you have people in charge of homes for the aged who are properly trained, they can do such things, for example, as they do at the Jewish homes for the aged here in Toronto; they have out-patient activities, where people who are not staying permanently in a home for the aged, can come and take part in many of the activities that go on in the homes for the aged. This not only keeps an interest in the elderly people who live outside a home, it keeps up the interest of those who are the full-time residents. But it also lets people know, who may some day have to go to a home for the aged, that instead of going to a house of refuge, in most cases today, they are going to an institution that is well run and is a very pleasant place in which to live when one cannot live in one's own home.

So I do feel that more can be done in this field. It is those that are not taken care of whom I am concerned about and I think that the department has to do a great deal more in surveying the situation of what our needs are going to be in the future; and I would, in sitting down, Mr. Chairman, just like to ask the Minister this question: Is there any expectation in the near future that the government may carry out recommendation 10 of the committee of aging? That is where we recommended not only that there be a course for training administrators, but that a model home for the aged be established in Toronto where the administrators would be trained and it would really be not only a home for the aged but a teaching home as well. Is there any possibility of that coming to pass in the near future?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: First of all, Mr. Chairman, there is a course which is given within the department. After they have served their six months and before the appointment is made, they must come down to Toronto to take the course, take an examination. When they pass it, the appointment follows. Now, I have become aware, interestingly enough, of the McMaster course, myself recently, and I am going to see how it fits into the overall picture—but that is not the course that has to be passed.

With respect to the model home, without even being aware of the recommendations of the committee, I had begun to speak in terms of the model home. Quite a number of institutions already regard what they are operating as model homes, or suggest that they be taken into consideration. The idea and its implementation to the fullest will be getting a complete review in the very near future.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment for a minute, in connection with the old-age problems as regards both capital and maintenance costs. I would like to remind the Minister of a committee and delegation that was down here recently with respect to the recently-completed Centennial manor in Little Current, on the Manitoulin Island. It is a beautiful structure and, in fact has amounted to almost a landmark in that whole area now.

I almost feel on occasions though, because of the position that it has put those municipalities in, I almost feel like apologizing for my original effort in promoting this facility—except of course, that it has had complete acceptance. It is practically filled and it is just a matter of the municipalities' complete inability to carry the cost of this particular set of facilities.

Maybe I could point out what I am trying to say with respect to the comparison of the budget costs of senior citizens' homes and nearby municipalities, roughly amounting to something like 1 per cent of the total taxable revenue in municipalities. However, on Manitoulin this year's budget amounts to 15 per cent. Now I just simply have to try to persuade the Minister that something has to be done in this regard. It has come to my attention over the weekend that one municipality with a mill rate of something in the area of $103 million last year, will have a mill rate of $206 because of this one item alone.

Now I know that the Minister remembers that the arguments of two or three weeks ago were put to him very forcefully. In fact, I noticed that in this paper I received this morning—a local paper—the hon. Minister of Social and Family Services expressed great concern and surprise over the revelations of the delegation and stated that he would request the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), to conduct an inquiry into the financial position of the Manitoulin. It is hoped that such a study will result in a revision of a cost-sharing formula for the Centennial manor. Now, I wonder if such action has been taken and—whether it has or whether it has not—if the Minister can comment with respect to the possibility of such action being taken in this area?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I am very sympathetic to the unique, but very difficult position that the people with respect to Centennial manor find themselves. Following that meeting I wrote to the Minister of Municipal Affairs outlining the problems in a general way. As a matter of fact, I was pleased to receive a reply from him last week, I believe it was, in which he indicated that he will be undertaking this study. I, in turn, have replied to him thanking him. I add that it is going to right ahead. It is a situation which is somewhat unique, but really its uniqueness deserves a real good look at.

Mr. Farquhar: One more question here for the Minister. Does the Minister intend to, or has he already been in touch with the Manitoulin municipal association? They are the people who are spearheading and who are most vitally concerned with this matter, especially at this time of striking mill rates. I realize that the Minister did suggest that nothing could take place this year—nothing could happen that would affect the mill rates this year, or the budget this year possibly. But I would feel that it is very important—especially with respect to the volume of mail I am getting from that area—that he be in touch with the committee in this respect.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We will be following up—both the Minister of Municipal Affairs and myself. And as the hon. member concerned is aware, we did take some unusual steps last year. Whether it will be enough for all, remains to be seen.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2008. The member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to follow up the comments of the member for Parkdale. I would like to ask the Minister: What are we doing for the numbers of people who are desirous of this type of accommodation and are not able to find a place for themselves? Have you got any idea of how many there are of these people who are really, I suppose on the waiting lists for homes for the aged and rest homes.

Have we any future programme to assist them while they are still in their own homes? As the member said, it would be nice if they could stay there. Has any thought ever been given to the meals-on-wheels programme so that aged people might at least have balanced nutrition in an easy way, if they are not in a home for the aged where meals are provided for them?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: At present, Mr. Chairman, the number of beds are as follows: public homes and private homes total just under 20,000 beds and we are in the process of adding just under 5,000, so that we will have, we hope, when these additions have been made, 25,000 beds available.

Mr. Trotter: These are homes for the aged?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: These are homes for the aged. The problem of providing residential care for our senior people is an overall picture. We try to keep them in the home—if possible within the community—by the provision of adequate maintenance allowances,

by the provision of housing accommodation through the overall housing programme, plus the senior citizens' housing, which is now under the jurisdiction of The Department of Trade and Development. This is becoming an ever increasingly popular thing, especially with respect to married couples, but even with single people who want the particular type of accommodation being provided.

With respect to meals-on-wheels, this might come under the next vote, but I can answer it now. It is part of our overall picture in the future that, when developments are made for the care of the elderly, there be complexes—a united home for the aged and senior citizens' housing within the community so that there may be shared facilities, amongst which would be meals-on-wheels or the equivalent thereof.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): I stand before you to boast a bit. The county home in Welland, which the hon. Minister is acquainted with since he comes from that area—the Welland poorhouse as we referred to it many years ago—was no credit to any municipality, especially the county of Welland.

They decided to subdivide their home farm, as the Minister would no doubt remember. I was on the committee that sold off the lots at that time and we made $155,000 net on that particular farm. The government paid dollar for dollar with it, so we had $310,000 over to add the first addition to the poor house at Welland, as we would refer to it at that time.

Since that time, we hired a new man by the name of Doug Rapplegy, who is administrator of that unit. They have added another big section to it, and I would say it is a model home in the province of Ontario.

The home in Welland is, in my opinion, better than anything that I have ever seen with that type of accommodation. They have a beauty parlour for the elderly women. They have a barber shop for the men. They have a little coffee shop where they can buy a cup of coffee and some cigarettes if they want them. And they have many programmes for the people there. I think that is good.

But to wait for the government to provide quotas of that type for the citizens of this province, and provide them quickly, I think we will find that there will always be a backlog of work that should be brought up to date, because there are many people who are waiting to get into institutions of that type.

I think if I were in the fortunate or unfortunate position to be committed to one of these homes, I would like much better, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, to live in the area where I have lived for some 40 or 50 years like many older people have. It would be nice for this government to consider and consider well, the possibility of buying some of the older estates in cities and towns, and having the people who have to go into such quarters, live within a few blocks of where they have been accustomed to living for many years. And I know that there is some part of your programme working along that line.

There are private homes in small towns such as the village where I live—Chippawa—who again through private enterprise are doing a good job. But I believe there are many, many fine old brick homes that can be quickly converted into the type of units that I am thinking about, where an individual when he comes to the time in life where he is retired and has to have that type of service, that type of treatment, then he could have it in the community in which he has lived—whether it be Toronto, Hamilton, Niagara Falls, or any place else.

I wonder if the Minister's programme is ambitious enough with the amount of money that you have here to consider that type of construction, because I think there is some of that kind of work being done. I know too, that some of the private homes do not meet the requirements of the government, because the rooms are not big enough, or they have insufficient fireplaces. In many cases a private individual does not have enough money to put these additions on. They find themselves in the position where they are a home providing certain quarters that are not good enough for the people in this day.

I would wonder if the Minister would consider taking over homes of that type and running them by the government, the same as county homes are run. I think one county administrator who is doing a good job, could be the administrator of many small units. If that—I know we are pursuing that in Welland county—if that were followed up, if they would continue to work along these lines, I think we could get many homes for people very, very quickly.

I know not whether your department has looked into this matter. I would like your comments on that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In the past, the problem has been converting this type of accommodation to the standards required by the department, together with the availability of the kind of services that make a home for the aged more than just a place for shelter and care. So far, these conversions have proved uneconomic, but it is something that we will review continuously.

Mr. Bukator: Then if the old home that I speak of could not be readily converted, Mr. Chairman, would it be possible—I will have to give you an illustration. When the Bell Telephone Company in the States builds a Bell telephone office in a residential area, it looks identical to the homes of that area—yet it is a Bell telephone outlet. Maybe the government could consider building that type of home for the aged in the cities and towns where the people who are accustomed to living there could have this accommodation and not be too far from home.

They would live a few more years, I think, because they are closer to the subject. Is there a possibility that your folks—I see you are being briefed a little bit—is there a possibility that your people have looked at that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They could be coming under our rest home programme. I think the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville or the Windsor area has an outstanding example of the accommodation for senior citizens that just looks like good row housing. Excellent.

Mr. Bukator: Well, then if that worked in Windsor, I hate to pursue this, but—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Senior citizens' housing, that is—not a home for the aged. The home for the aged is sort of a motel type of accommodation. Very large.

Mr. Bukator: I was going to say it was a very, very fine line between the two groups, is it not? A very fine line.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The whole intention is to provide accommodation within the community that the people are accustomed to. Sometimes circumstances will not permit it.

Mr. Bukator: This answer was the one that I was looking for. If you intend to do that and keep them within the community where they are accustomed to living, this answers my question. If you are pursuing that and do it quickly, then I am quite content.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2008?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I want to raise one matter. I do so at the risk of being parochial. However, I have a constituent who is presently in the Ontario Hospital in Goderich. The daughter, the only member of the family, informs me that she went to the assistant clerk in the county seeking information in regard to having an application taken for admission to the home for the aged.

It was her impression, after that meeting, that insofar as the costs were concerned, the gentleman in question could not have any assets to speak of. As I indicated, there is only one surviving child in the family. The father had willed the house and the property —25 acres I believe—to that daughter, and it was indicated to her that that would have to be sold and be applied towards his keep in the home for the aged in Clinton.

Now I wonder what the guidelines are here? In other words, what liquid assets does one have to have in order to qualify? In other words, if you have over $1,000, is that money applied towards your keep in one of these institutions? Is there a limit? There must be some sort of guidelines in this connection. I would be interested in hearing about them.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are not limits set down by legislation or regulations. This is a matter for the local municipalities to decide.

Mr. Gaunt: What you are saying then—Mr. Chairman, if I may through you, to the Minister—what you are saying is that the regulations, if I may put it that way, are left to the individual counties. Is that so?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The answer is "yes."

Mr. Trotter: I have a question, and then I would like to add just a few remarks. What is the rate of grant for construction costs paid to a municipality when they put up a home for the aged. Is it 50 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Fifty per cent, yes.

Mr. Trotter: Well now, we on this committee on aging, urged under recommendation 28a that it be raised to 75 per cent. This would be a municipality, or for a charitable institution for this reason. We knew because of the costs of construction that it was becoming increasingly difficult for private charities to raise funds. And because of the same rising of costs in almost every walk of life, it is very difficult for the municipality to pull down the tax rating.

It is just not that easy to get their hands on the necessary 50 per cent to put up a home for the aged. And although, Mr. Chairman, there are no detailed statistics as to what the need really is now for homes for the aged, for what it is going to be in the future, we know it is going to increase because people live longer than ever before—at least more people live longer than ever before. This demand is going to increase. And it was the unanimous decision of the committee at that time, regardless of party, that the grants for capital construction be increased to 75 per cent in order to encourage the building of homes for the aged. Can the Minister give the committee of supply any indication that there is any hope of these grants being increased, as the committee on aging asked?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As I indicated, Mr. Chairman, it is the question of the moneys that are available. There will be no additional moneys available in this year's estimates for that type of provision, but we are in the process of negotiation, I hope, with the federal government for more participation in capital expenditure. They share in the operating expenditures, but not to the same degree, to a very minor degree in capital costs, and we are hopeful that something satisfactory comes out of this negotiation that we may sometime in the future be able to participate more.

Mr. Trotter: I have one more question—it is a small matter—Mr. Chairman, on this vote, and yet sometimes in the quality of living, to an older person it might be very important. I grant you these homes are well run, for the most part, that I have seen, and each one is a home away from home. But I think we can be a bit puritanical in some of our views. I do not know who is responsible for laying down the ground rules, whether it is local administration, for if it is, I was wondering if the province, in discussing this problem with various administrators, could keep this in mind.

I have talked to many an old fellow who had gone into the home for the aged because his wife had died. For the most part he would be happy, but I often suspected when he was talking to me he had a tear in his eyes when he said, "It is impossible to get a cold beer." And I know in institutions they may hear me say this just should not be allowed. Some of the more liberally minded ones manage to do it through the doctor. They get a prescription for the hard liquor. That is possible, but they use the old medical excuse. But I was wondering when we think of the number of older men—probably it has been their custom all their lives before dinner to have a cold beer. I am not asking him to go and live it up all the time, but these facilities are not available, and I hope that none would be so puritanical as to say, "Well, these old fellows are just living on their old-age pension. They cannot afford it. They should not be spending their money on such an item." But to many of these men, the vast majority of them are working men, and that was one of the few pleasures they had in life, their evening cold beer. One or two of these men mentioned this to me, so I made a point on different occasions of asking them. Of course, some could not care less, but a lot of them did, and said of course, "That cannot be done around here."

There may be one or two local administrations that wink at the problem and have a way of getting around it. But I think that we could be more liberal in our views—and using the word "liberal" in a non-political sense, to encourage if we could, or make it possible to have facilities and a common room where the men smoke, to get the occasional beer. Because this has been, in our past, a bit of a puritanical outlook. I think that we have grown up enough to say that this maybe is a bit of a luxury that some of these old men are entitled to.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kent.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister with regards to citizens in our homes for the aged. A good many of them are receiving the pension. Of course, they deduct, those patients that are in these homes, maybe $71 for their keep in the home and leave $4 for pocket money. Now, does this department make that decision? How much money is taken away for their keep in these homes for the aged? Of course some of the homes have hospitals and they leave only $1. Is it The Department of Social and Family Services which makes these decisions? How much money will be deducted from these pensioners in these homes for the aged?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, actually the situation is that it is the pensioner who is paying what he can towards the upkeep. It is not a question of deducting or taking away. He pays towards his upkeep and the $71 is just a small portion of the upkeep within a home. But he is permitted to keep $15 under the regulations, to provide for these items.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister, is that decision made by your department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The $15, yes, that is under our regulations.

Mr. Spence. If a patient in one of these homes receives a $75 pension, then he has the right to keep back $15? He keeps $15? Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. He has it to keep.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a word to the comments of the member for Parkdale, at the risk of making him look a little partisan in the double standard in his views. But I would like to point out also that many of the older women whom I have spoken to, before they go into rest homes and homes for the aged, have expressed the view that they do in fact travel possibly prior to the dinner hour for a bottle of stout or a bottle of ale at their local pub; I have run into this several times. After all, the word we used here is "home," and surely anything we can do in these homes which would make it seem more like home is worthy of consideration. I think it is worthy of consideration that the elderly persons could purchase a bottle of beer or a bottle of stout, whichever they prefer, prior to their meal.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, there is no restriction or regulation. Perhaps the gentleman who has his $15 can buy a few cold beers with that. There is no restriction on what the home would serve.

Mr. Trotter: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I am just saying that there is no restriction, and provision is being made. In some cases I have read that a glass of sherry is just as good as a sleeping pill any day of the week.

Mr. Braithwaite: If I might interject at this time, perhaps this might be an apt time for the saying that "Guinness is good for you" to come in—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I brought this case to the attention of the Minister quite some time ago, and I would like to repeat the case, hoping that the department might change regulations to enable individuals to be placed in homes for the aged in the vicinity in which they live. I happen to have a case of a lady who had moved from the county into the city of Windsor to live with residents some six or seven years ago. Because she had not been in the area long enough—and this lady, by the way, was 82 years of age—she could not be placed in Huron lodge in the city, but was required to be sent to the home in Leamington. She has no friends, no relatives in the Leamington area.

You have taken an 82-year-old woman, taken her away from her friends in the city of Windsor, and you have come along and rehoused her in a community so that absolutely no one can come to visit her. All her friends are aged. They would be within travelling distance of her by visiting her at Huron lodge. The Minister's department should have been able to do something to have kept her in Huron lodge in the city of Windsor, rather than have sent her out into the county. If it requires a change in the regulations then a change should be implemented in the regulations. What he has done to this elderly lady, this 82-year-old lady, was heartless. It was cruel, it was uncalled for.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: First, Mr. Chairman, we did not do any of those things. And I bring to the attention of the House that this is a local matter. I will refresh the member's memory that the introduction of amendments to The Homes for the Aged Act removed any statement relating to residence; that is no longer within our statutory regulations. With respect to that particular woman, that lady you referred to, I understand that the city was going to look after her as soon as a bed was available.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope what you say is so because the people that have approached me—the religious orders that have approached me—certainly presented an extremely good case for having her kept in the city of Windsor rather than having her sent to the county home. It certainly was not fair, and whether I am blaming you needlessly or not, someone deserves some blame for the way this 82-year-old lady has been treated.

Vote 2008 agreed to.

On vote 2009:

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to repeat all the comments I made at the start of vote 2008 but I am asking the Minister if he would at this time like to make some statement with reference to nursing homes and our senior citizens—our aged people. I think that this might be an appropriate place since we are talking about the office on aging; we are talking about negotiations in Metro in particular and we are talking about his staff—people being moved. As I said, I am not going to go into detail. However, I thought perhaps the Minister might, at this time, want to make some comments. I know that he wants everybody to know all the details that are involved. When you have headlines such as you had in the Toronto *Daily Star* of Thursday, May 18, where is says "Metro Nursing Homes Hit Bully Welfare" and this sort of thing—I think it is time for the Minister to make some sort of statement as to what his department is going to do to clarify the whole matter.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I bring to your attention again that this matter that the hon. member raises in contravention of the rules should have been brought up under vote 2003 but just to conclude the matter, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health is also interested in the homes for the aged. He is going to undertake a review of the rates by a group from the government's point of view, and then this department will have the benefit of the review of rates, as made by a survey to be initiated by the Minister of Health. At that time we will be in a position to still further review the propositions which have been placed.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, if I might just follow then, through you, Mr. Chairman. Is the Minister then prepared to give this House an undertaking that those presently in nursing homes will not have to suffer the apprehension of being moved, even though the moves have been stopped temporarily? Will he undertake that there will be no further moves until this—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member was out of order when he asked me the first question. I did him the courtesy of replying to him. That matter is at the local level, Mr. Chairman, and I would suggest to you that any further discussion on this matter is out of order.

Mr. Braithwaite: If I may disagree, Mr. Chairman, you made no ruling that I was out of order. The Minister suggested the same, but you did not so rule. This is the office of the aging and I see no reason why the Minister should try to hide behind a façade and say that I am out of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order! The member has made those statements before, but it seems to me that references should not be made, as I said before, to nursing home activities. If the member wants to bring in any suggestions as to those elderly people who are in nursing homes, or any plans or arrangements in connection with them, which have been studied by the office on aging or which would be a desirable programme, I think it could be brought in. But as the Minister has said, there has been complete debate on nursing homes as such.

The member, I think, must realize that it came under vote 2003, but if he wants to bring in any area of dealing with the elderly people and what might be done for them, I think this would be in order.

Mr. Braithwaite: Then following your comments, Mr. Chairman, what I had in mind by asking for the Minister's undertaking was specifically that. I wanted him to remove any apprehension these senior citizens might have about being moved—I am not saying from where, but we see in the paper where moving has been halted temporarily. I think it behooves the Minister at this time to say, "all right, I am going to give an order to Metropolitan Toronto not to make any more moves until our survey is over."

I can see nothing wrong with asking that, at this time. Mr. Chairman, it is not out of order. A survey is being made by the Minister of Health. It involves the office of aging and I cannot see why the Minister cannot make that undertaking now.

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister intend to make any further comments in connection with this?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have already explained, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the member for Etobicoke is in on this vote and deserves a better answer.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I might mention that when the committee on aging was set up, in their interim report they recommended there be an office on aging. Of course, this is again strictly dealing with aging

and if it has anything to do with nursing homes—true, it relates to aging, because this is a very major problem in the province.

Even dealing with the report of the Minister of Health, Mr. Chairman, under item 5, under the office of aging, there is the interdepartmental advisory committee on aging. I wish that we had some knowledge from the Minister, Mr. Chairman, as to what has taken place between The Department of Health and The Department of Social and Family Services in regard to this. For example, the question I have on this—again, if there is any argument about it you could decide whether I am out of order as well—is this. The committee of aging made a recommendation—34, it is a short recommendation and I will read it, and it had to do strictly with aging:

> —that the province take immediate steps to increase its share of the costs to municipalities for—

I am sorry, I will begin at the beginning:

> —that municipalities and non-profit organizations be encouraged to avail themselves of government support to develop a complex of service including both hospital based and community based home care programmes, visiting nurses' and visiting homemakers' services—

and then it goes on.

The problem is this, Mr. Chairman—and I would like to get an answer from the Minister—that many people are sometimes in nursing homes, many elderly people, or in mental hospitals, that could be in homes for the aged. I have met many people in both and I often wonder why the person should stay in a mental hospital and not in a home for the aged. The reason usually is that there has been no background developed, or they are in a home for the aged and are just lucky there happened to be space available.

I would ask the Minister—and this would include having to do with the elderly citizens in our nursing homes—what has been done by the government in the last 12 months in encouraging non-profit organizations and municipalities in establishing hospital based and community based complexes. Has anything been done?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Of course, Mr. Chairman, that activity comes properly under The Department of Health and they have taken steps in that regard. Mr. Chairman, we are now dealing with the office of aging.

I refer to the hon. member through you, Mr. Chairman—there is a report of the select committee on youth which covers at least ten departments, I think. Now does that mean that every time you talk about a young person you can talk on any subject? No, you talk within the scope of the particular vote at the time. In this relationship, the problems of the elderly sick, that type of thing, comes under the department of the Minister of Health, although the geriatric committee comes under our jurisdiction, through the office of aging, because they make the studies, in this particular instance the one in the Western hospital, through the geriatric centre.

Mr. Trotter: Could you tell me if the interdepartmental advisory committee on aging, and that would include, in part, your department, has it come up with any policies dealing with this matter of establishing a complex, both hospital based and community based?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The interdepartmental committee has come up with their first recommendation. I am pleased that I had the opportunity of passing that recommendation to the Minister of Labour and that it has already been implemented. They considered it to be perhaps the first and foremost—the one on the age discrimination advertising—that was their first and only recommendation so far. That has been implemented and we are waiting for their studies on it.

Mr. Trotter: How often does that interdepartmental committee meet; who is on the committee; and who is its chairman?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is no set rule on the number of times that they meet. They can meet from time to time. Dr. Priddle is chairman, and I take this opportunity of placing on the record the outstanding contribution he is making to the geriatric field, not only on behalf of the citizens of the Metropolitan area, but on behalf of the citizens of an—

Mr. Trotter: He is a good man, I will not argue that—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He is tops.

Mr. Trotter: I will not argue that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Then we have from The Department of Agriculture and Food, Miss H. McKercher, the director of the home economics branch. From Trade and Development, Mr. H. Suters, vice chairman, and managing director of the Ontario housing corporation. Education and University Affairs, Dr. E. Dutton, special advisor to the community programme division. Health, Dr. J. Allison, director, chronic care and medical

rehabilitation. Labour, Mr. Daniel Hill, director of the Ontario human rights commission. And, from our own department, the Deputy Minister, who has been substituted by the acting deputy; from Municipal Affairs, Mr. G. Hewsen of the organization and administration branch. The office of the Prime Minister, through Mr. R. A. Farrell, the executive officer. The Treasury, Mrs. H. Salisbury—she is with the economic planning branch of the finance and economics department.

This is an unusual committee in that it also has members at large. Mrs. J. J. McHale, Jr., who is a board member of the Ontario housing corporation and former chairman of the section on aging, Ontario welfare council. Rev. Sister St. Michael, she is also a Ph.D. of the departments of philosophy and psychology, Brescia College, London, Ontario—I believe she was very recently honoured in respect of her work in this regard. Mr. R. J. Lamoureux, who is a retired official of the united steelworkers of America and the united senior citizens of Ontario, incorporated, and of course, Dr. W. W. Priddle. So we have more than a well balanced interdepartmental committee in this aspect to review the recommendations, to give them their thoughts and place them before us.

Mr. Trotter: There is no question that the personnel you have on the committee is excellent. I do not know how many times they have met, but they are having a strenuous time; the only recommendation that has come up is the age discrimination.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Certainly not, Mr. Chairman, that would be unfair to the committee. They have had four meetings. I know because I met with them. Their agenda covered a very broad range of matters and then they happend to formalize this particular recommendation, in order to have it proceeded with and we accepted it.

Mr. Trotter: I would assume that they would come up with a lot more ideas than that. Maybe it is the only one you have seen fit to bring before this House in the form of legislation, because—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear that they have met, they have discussed this particular matter and they made a formal recommendation. It was passed on by me to the Minister of Labour under whose jurisdiction this particular matter came. It has been implemented and no doubt there will be other formalized recommendations coming forward.

Mr. Trotter: I cannot understand why you move so slowly. When your committee on aging, a select committee of this Legislature made 48 recommendations we had for advisors some of those very same people whom you mentioned, so I have had an opportunity to hear them and I know that they are highly informed. But what seems so wasteful of their time, of my time, and of the government's money is that we have committees that sit around in discussion. We bring in recommendations like this 48th recommendation I have here and it just seems like a colossal waste of time and money.

Now, something has been done but a lot of it has been window dressing, and a lot of it, I think, is embarrassing in some respect. They use good names, dedicated people and extremely learned people and certainly their abilities or advice cannot be put into practice. You know, we are so timid in this province that we had recommendation 42, having to do with senior citizens in this committee, and the hon. member for Durham, the chairman of our committee, last year brought in a resolution wanting this House to adopt recommendation 42—that we set aside each year, commencing with the third week of June of each year, a senior citizens week, in order that we could give publicity to, and advertise, the problems of senior citizens. But, of course, that was talked out and nothing ever comes of it. It is a simple thing, a publicity gimmick, if you wish to call it that, to help the cause of senior citizens, but we cannot even squeeze that out of the government.

And when I see the extent of this problem and see, for example, under this vote on aging, $17,000 for surveys, expensive surveys, conferences, investigations, I realize that we really are not making the effort that we could make. Of course, if governments vote the money, what in the world can we expect our trained people to do? This is, I think, an urgent matter because we really do not know in this province the need of our people who are either in the homes for the aged, or whether those who are in the homes for the aged could get along better if they were on their own, if they had a little bit of help with meals-on-wheels and the other helps that can be provided.

We do not know, we have no idea and yet it is true you are literally investing millions of dollars on homes for the aged and my guess is this is not nearly enough. But this is the department, this is the estimate that is supposed to find these things out. Dr. Priddle got all kinds of credit for the work that was

carried out at Western hospital on the geriatrics study. The average person does not know it is going on, and I rather question that The Department of Health even liked what he was doing.

They may do now, but they certainly had a rough time trying to pioneer it, and I hope that under your interdepartmental study there is far more co-operation than there has been in the past, because if the past is any evidence of what is going on now, it is pretty grim. This is why I am asking what is being done, and I am quite certain that these people on the committee that you mentioned could do more. But just to give you an example, you mentioned two people, Mrs. J. J. McHale and Mr. H. Suters. Both of them in their field are quite capable. Undoubtedly, Mrs. McHale has done a tremendous amount of work for senior citizens. Yet with all the dedication she has, when that particular group from the Ontario housing corporation was before the committee on aging, they could give us no indication whatsoever of what the requirements for housing of our senior citizens.

I do not think they know yet. Maybe they have not been given the opportunity, they may not be given the personnel. I am sure that one of the reasons why the Ontario housing corporation was having difficulty in dealing with the senior citizens' problems was simply over salaries, because the civil service commission would not allow them to employ certain people. But those very people were before this committee and I feel that particularly, Mrs. McHale was most anxious to help the senior citizens on housing. And yet when they cannot give you the answers you just wonder what government is really doing. So these committees become buried in small print in the estimates despite the fact that we spent 2.5 years traipsing across this province and this country bringing up recommendations, the vast majority of which are worthwhile, the vast majority of which are not really expensive and the vast majority of which are preventive. They seek to rehabilitate people; they seek to keep them going; in the long run they save the taxpayer a lot of money. And yet you bring forth almost nil on this estimate of what is needed or what is done. I would say to this Minister, Mr. Chairman, that he has a marvellous advantage. He can say, "I am new at this game, there has been a lot of neglect, it is not my fault, but I want to do something. I can do this, I can do that," but he sat like a bump on a log and simply used the names of a lot of good people and put them to work or gave them the opportunity. I do not doubt for a minute that they could do a tremendous amount and I must register through you, Mr. Chairman, to this Minister and this entire House that I am pretty disgusted with the work that the Minister has not permitted to go on.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2009? The member for Scarborough Centre:

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister when the report for the select committee on aging will be published.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It has been published for some time. What is the date of it, I ask the hon. member for Parkdale, the date of the select committee?

Mr. Trotter: This one is dated February, 1967. What the member for Scarborough Centre is referring to, is this: It says the complete text of our select committee's report was not available for inclusion with these final recommendations which we wish to present to the House early in the session.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): This was the pre-election bait.

Mr. Trotter: And it is under the name of Alex Carruthers, MPP, chairman, February 1967, while the rest of it never did come out. That is it, and I do not know if we ran out of money, if there was an election or what happened, but at least the recommendations are there. I would like to have seen the rest of the report but at least the recommendations are there. Maybe you can answer the question when the rest of it is going to be printed.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2009.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, might I ask then, if the Minister is going to answer and if not, could it be tabled in the House some time in the near future, when this report will be published?

Mr. Chairman: I do not think this comes under the—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am sorry, the matter of publication of the full committee's report does not really come under my jurisdiction at this time. When the House was dissolved that finished that committee.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister about seven points

of recommendations from that committee. What has been done about the recommendations? It was recommended that programmes for the elderly be co-ordinated through the office on aging established in 1966. Has this been done?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, we are now providing subsidies for programmes and I believe that statement in this regard has been made. It is in the process of being dealt with.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if we will be co-ordinating all programmes for the elderly under the office on aging?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The interdepartmental committee, Mr. Chairman, will be dealing with the full co-ordination of all the programmes.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the Ontario institute on aging proposed to do research and planning in the field of services for the elderly. Has there been anything set up or any provision made yet for this research?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Sorry, I did not hear that last part, there is no Ontario institute.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, repeating for the Minister—the Ontario institute on aging proposed to do research on planning in the field of services to the elderly. Has any arrangement been made or any provision been made yet to set this up for research purposes?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Insofar as I am aware, there is no Ontario institute on aging as yet.

Mr. Trotter: Nothing happens.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Another recommendation, Mr. Chairman, from the select committee on aging was that the province survey manpower needs in the field and institute accelerated training programmes, since there is a great shortage of trained personnel to serve the aged. Has anything been done to accelerate the training programme?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Of course, that is part of our overall programme of stimulating the classification of social worker and all those other personnel necessary to serve, not only this particular field, but all of the field within the social services. Remember that they are active in a programme that provides the kind of services the member for Niagara Falls was referring to; this is made possible through the provision of the services adjutants.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman: another recommendation was increased grants to the Ontario welfare council in regional county and local jurisdictions to permit the establishment of community councils on aging and permit better planning and co-ordination. Since there was no significant increase under the municipal welfare administration branch in the 68-69 estimates, I would like to ask if there is any intention that this particular recommendation be carried out in the future.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That matter will be getting complete review during the coming year.

Mr. Trotter: How often does it have to be reviewed?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It will receive consideration.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Another recommendation from the select committee on aging that was tabled on the Legislature February 23, 1967 —all of these recommendations were tabled at that time—was a need for an income study. Both the Senate committee on aging and Ontario committee recommended a technical body to discuss income needs and keep assistance grants up to date and adequate. Has anything been done?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Of course, Mr. Chairman. Under our Family Benefits Act, all of those allowances were increased considerably and that is an action that has been taken.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if a network of geriatric centres has been, or will be, established sometime in the near future?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am not quite clear as to the way the hon. member placed the question. There is no network of geriatric centres planned.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, are there any geriatric centres in our province as recommended by this committee?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is one at the Toronto Western hospital and I understand that others are interested.

Mr. Trotter: That was established some time ago.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Trotter: But nothing since then. That was established when this report was written. This report recommended that more be established but none have been established since this report came out and there is only one. That was that pilot project, correct?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Lastly, Mr. Chairman, another recommendation was that the grants under The Elderly Persons Centres Act be increased both operating and capital. The increase was $79,500. Does the Minister consider that this is a sufficient increase to deal with the problem?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, we think that this will meet our immediate requirements. Of course, this is a continuing programme and one that I expect to see increase annually as more and more municipalities take an interest.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2009 carried?

Mr. B. Newman: I want to ask the Minister if he considered the programme of meals-on-wheels a worthwhile programme?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I followed with interest, the discussions on that and as I indicated earlier, I think our direction in the future will be to the development of complexes—homes for the aged and senior citizens' housing, with central facilities to be made available to all of those.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, that is all right after you develop that complex. But in the meantime, what do we do? I think this meals-on-wheels programme is one that merits serious consideration and assistance from your department. I think that here is a programme in which you can take advantage of the large number of high school girls and college girls who find difficulty in obtaining summer employment. You could use it as a pilot project in communities throughout the length and breadth of Ontario. You could expand the programme and be of that much greater assistance to the aged.

I know the one in my own community has proven so successful that they are continuing the programme. However, they only take care of 25 hot dinners once a week, so you can see the tremendous room for expansion on this. Twenty-five in one week; multiply that by seven days and you would have seven times the personnel involved. Multiply that by the number of different institutions or individuals that require this type of assistance. You have an opportunity here to take advantage of these large numbers of young people in our communities who would like to get themselves active, and become interested in social betterment of the aged. Here is an opportunity by which you can come along and make them productive.

It being 6:00 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 95

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, May 27, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, May 27, 1968

Estimates, Department of Social and Family Services, Mr. Yaremko, continued 3427

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 3456

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND FAMILY SERVICES
(Continued)

Vote 2009 agreed to.

On vote 2010:

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if any grants have been paid under The Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act, 1966, to workshops, and if any have been turned down?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Sir, in 1966, 1967 and 1968 the branch will have provided an estimated expenditure of $535,000 for operating grants and $80,000 for capital grants. It is estimated in this coming year that the cost of the operating grants will be $840,000 and the cost of capital grants will be $131,000. There are no grants which are payable under the legislation which have been turned down. There are situations where some workshops have wanted additional sums of money. That of course is a matter for further decision.

Mrs. M. Renwick: How many counsellors are available for counselling guidance under the Act, solely for this purpose?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There was a complement of 95 last year, and a complement of 97 this year. There are 11 rehabilitation counsellors, and then there are 45 in other categories which are related to the counselling field.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I would like to ask—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: One hundred and fifty-three counsellors in all.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you. Who are the members of the board of review, and has the director had to suspend or cancel service provided, and for what reason? Which service and for what reasons?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The board of review is the same board of review under The Family Benefits Act, and we had a discussion on that, Mr. Chairman. You will recall that the appointments have not yet been made.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Has the director had to suspend or cancel service, Mr. Chairman, and which service, and for what reason?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are suspensions made where those receiving training skip the school or fail in their training. Apart from these, there are no classifications of suspension.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, under the regulations, item 1 (b), approved workshops, is listed as schedule 2. I had trouble locating schedule 2. I wonder, are they too many for the Minister to enumerate or would he tell me where I missed schedule 2, to decide what is an approved workshop?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Schedule 2, which I have before me, commences immediately after schedule 1, and there are 81 insitutions listed.

Vote 2010 agreed to.

On vote 2011:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, this is the only place in the estimates of the government when it is fully in order, I suppose, to discuss matters pertaining to the Indians of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think that the leader of the Opposition is correct. I have spoken to the leader of the House and the Chairman. I think that this is the one place where perhaps the strict rules of the committee for procedures might be set aside, and this will be the time to discuss the matter of Indians, regardless of in what particular department any aspect may directly fall. Any additional time that we take up this evening will of course be made up later on where the discussion of the relevant departments is concerned.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Does the hon. leader of the Opposition agree that this is an appropriate place for the major debate?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairman, this is the point in the estimate where we are called upon to vote $1.5 million for the support of the efforts of the province of Ontario in assisting in the conditions of the Indian population of the province. You know that the constituency that I represent has the most populous Indian reserve in Canada, that of the Six Nations band. But I want particularly to draw your attention, sir, to some of the problems in two other areas of the province which have very significant Indian populations, which I believe are not being adequately served, either by this government or by the government of Canada. I would say first that—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): It is a federal responsibility!

Mr. Nixon: There are a good many members present who remember our visit, in 1965 I believe, to northwestern Ontario, when we had an opportunity to visit the Indians in the Patricia district and Kenora district.

Unfortunately the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) is not present, because I wanted to specifically refer to some of the problems in his area. We all know that the two representatives of the bands in the Patricia area and the Kenora area are present in the House from time to time, in the person of two of our young page boys whom we have come to know in the last two or three weeks—I do not see them here this evening, but I think many of us have had a chance to chat with them informally since they have arrived here in Toronto.

I think that we can remember particularly the situation of contentment and some degree of prosperity that the Indian bands exhibited up in the Trout Lake area, halfway between Kenora and Hudson Bay, where a large group of us as members of the Legislature landed on the lake and were treated to the Indian hospitality. I well remember the ladies of the band cleaning the fish that had been caught that afternoon for the members by the Indians in the local community, and they served the most marvelous dinner. There was good feeling and enthusiasm following dinner. In the long twilight of the farther north regions of the province we took part in sort of an extemporaneous field meet in which the Indians showed that they could outrace us in everything, I suppose, but elections.

But there was certainly an attitude there of great friendliness. I felt that the provisions that had been made for those Indians in that part of the northern part of the province were such that their medical requirements were being met. They had built there a large freezer so they could take advantage of the fishing and they had the proper facilities to market this catch in a manner that was to their advantage.

It really was not until you got down to the southern part of northwestern Ontario, around Kenora, that we saw some of the real problems involving the Indian population. It was in that area where a change in the economy, and an economy that is growing quite rapidly, had left the Indians behind and had really brought about some of the serious difficulties that have been growing rapidly in that part of northern Ontario.

As the economy changed, as the forest products were depleted, as the advantages of having traplines and fishing rights receded with the growth of some of the industry there, the Indians found that they were not in a position—because of racial prejudice to some extent and through poor educational facilities probably to a greater extent—to take advantage of some of these advances that were taking place in northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, I know you are aware of the serious difficulties associated with unemployment. The problems of an urbanizing community close to where the Indian reserves had been established in years gone by, and the fact that large numbers of these Indian people would drift into the towns without anything to occupy their attention, without adequate employment, and with a liquor problem that was larger in that part of the community than in the general community, are apparent. Those of us who have visited Kenora on that occasion and since have been struck by the numbers of Indian people that we can meet on the streets and talk to, ask about their problems—about which they seem to be completely disheartened—about their cultural backgrounds which have stood them in such good stead for many years, and their opportunity for taking part in the new community that is developing with the expansion of the economy of the north.

The government has tried to give some assistance in this regard. Representatives of the alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation are in the process of making special studies there, trying to give assistance to the Indian community that has experienced so much difficulty in this regard. This, of course, is just a symptom of the much deeper

difficulty, associated in my view, with a more progressive approach that this government has not been able to take—even though they have apparently signed an agreement with the government of Canada, which is giving them a much larger share of responsibility than they have had in years gone by.

We are aware of the problem there. Many of us have met these Indian people on the streets of Kenora and some of us in our tours of the north have gone out into the reserves to meet the chiefs, to discuss with them the problems they have in leading their people into a better way of life—one in which they have the advantages of modern educational opportunities, and more than that, an opportunity to develop in their own reserves with the support of the taxing community in the broader sense, the support of their own initiatives which I believe is the answer that we must look for.

The second group of Indians I would like to bring to your attention, Mr. Chairman, is one that is described, I think, in a very excellent piece of reporting in the St. Catharines *Standard* of October 26, 1967. This is a rather extensive article that some of you may have had an opportunity to look at earlier. It describes the conditions on an Indian reserve that probably many more of us have visited whether we realize it or not, because it straddles Highway 17 where it passes through the constituency of my colleague, the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar). I refer to the Serpent River Indian reserve.

In this area, there is a group of about 200 people living in conditions which are much more closely associated with the developing areas of Ontario than the groups that I have mentioned to you already, Mr. Chairman. These people are not living in any remote area of the province. One of the main highways—the Trans-Canada Highway—bisects the reserve, and yet we find that they are living in some special difficulties beginning first with the roads that serve the reserve itself. They are dirt roads, impassable in many seasons of the year, and even in the summer they are just dusty, dry, rutted roads which make low-gear transportation the only possible way of getting into the distant parts of the reserve and visiting the 200 residents.

The buildings are all of frame construction and while many of them are described as adequate by the two reporters for the St. Catharines *Standard*—whom I should name as this point: Mr. Eric Colwell and Mr. John Pearson, who undertook to make some research in this regard—many others are simply unfit for habitation by even the broadest sense of fitness and the most expansive judgment that could be possibly applied. These two gentlemen had a considerable tour through this particular reserve with the chief, whose name is Meawasige—I follow the example set by my hon. friend from Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), who gives *Hansard* some assistance with some of these more difficult names. This gentleman is the chief of the Indian band and is endeavouring to get the assistance that is needed to support his own initiatives in developing this reserve and giving the people an opportunity to come into some of the advantages of modern living.

Some of the matters associated with this have to do with the fact that in this reserve of 200 people—right on the Trans-Canada Highway, close to Elliot Lake, not too far from Sudbury—there are only five homes equipped with running water. Because the buildings are mostly all frame and most are heated by ordinary stoves there is a very serious fire hazard, since there is no water piped into the area except in the five individual cases that I have previously referred to. The nearest fire protection is 20 miles away at Blind River and that is provided by The Department of Lands and Forests. When they have a call to come to the community they provide what assistance they can, but under normal circumstances they arrive with too little and much too late.

As far as recreation for the citizens of this particular reserve is concerned there is only a dilapidated hall which was formerly a bunkhouse and was moved by a team of horses by the Indians themselves from a site where it had been left by a paving company. This is the only community facility that is available, not only for the meetings of the band council but for the other activities on the Indian reserve.

It is interesting that the lack of funds is something that is often stressed, because there is a general impression among the population of Ontario and elsewhere that the Indians are on the receiving end of an almost unlimited source of public funds in the form of federal handouts. But as the Minister no doubt knows, Mr. Chairman, the Indians receive the ordinary income, particularly the elderly Indians, of $105 a month, and many of those of working age do not have available even those funds. The band funds—which normally are available to supplement these cases—amount, we are told in this

article, to something like $7 a year each for the members of this particular band.

The Minister knows that some of the bands are much more fortunate than others. We are aware of the fact that those in the Sarnia area have a pool of funds available from the sale of lands that have appreciated in value over the years, and are in a condition where they can finance many of their own projects. In my own reserve in Brant county, the most inconsiderable band funds that were based on the sale of real estate more than a century ago were largely wasted by the decision taken by the government of Canada of the day, with no recourse for return when the advice, and, as a matter of fact, the directives for the investment of those funds, led the Indians to lose them entirely over the years.

There is a serious difficulty here, if they were to be repaid with anything like interest from the time the funds were lost in that particular case. It might double the national debt in order to meet the requirements that the Six Nations Indians feel that they legitimately have on the government of Canada to meet their continuing obligations.

There is no doubt that the problem of the elderly people on the reserve is a very serious one. It was raised previously in the estimates of The Department of Social and Family Services in the provision of facilities for the older people, and we know that there was an amendment to The Homes for the Aged Act this year that would provide the responsibility for the government of Ontario to have the right to make funds available for some of these homes for elderly citizens on Indian reserves.

This is a continuing problem, because up until now, as the Minister well knows, the elderly citizens, if they had access to a home for the aged at all, normally had to leave the reserve to go to a home in a nearby white community and found themselves in circumstances very strange to them. Normally they were very anxious to return home a few days after they had arrived at the home for an elderly person in a nearby community.

It is obvious that these facilities will have to be provided on the reserve itself, and in order to provide for some sort of dignity and happiness for the elderly citizens we are going to have to share in this, I presume with the government of Canada and without the involvement of band funds at all. I believe it can be worked out so that the government of Canada would pay the share that normally is the responsibility of the municipality in the communities that have these programmes at this time.

But there is one specific case here that I would like to bring to your attention—of an Indian 75 years old, a former lumberman, now retired and who has for the past 20 years lived in a crumbling one-room tarpaper shack on the Serpent River reserve. He apparently showed the two visiting reporters through his home, which they felt was quite inadequate. The ceiling was made of rotted timbers stuffed with paper and rags for crude insulation, and in his own words he said even in his best efforts the roof still leaked a bit. Inside the unfurnished and bare walls of his solitary dwelling, there was a wood stove—and the elderly Indian had to chop and store fuel—a chair, a table, an ancient iron bed, which were the only creature comforts available. Almost incongruously, a cut-out picture of Queen Elizabeth II smiled down on the place where this Indian lived in some considerable danger. Red-hot pipes of his stove poked through the hazard of the papers and rags in the ceiling, and these reporters were much struck by the inadequacies of the facilities, particularly for elderly Indians.

As a pensioner, he is nearing 80 years of age—he is older than 75 anyway—he receives $105 per month, and this with his treaty money is his only income. To dispel any thought that treaty Indians receive largesse in abundance, the Indian, who spoke with his band members only in Ojibway, advised that the band funds amounted in his case to the sum of $7 annually. So it appears that there are many problems associated with the Serpent River band, which is another specific case of a community that has been bypassed by this government and to a great extent the government of Canada.

I did want to mention to the Minister and the members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that there is a third group of Indians—the ones with whom I am most familiar, whose problems are quite different from those either in the far northwest, or in more developed areas of the north—and I refer to the Six Nations band in the county of Brant.

Their problem is considerably different in that they do not choose to accept for themselves, the responsibility of a municipality in the sense that we understand it, because they believe that this carries with it the release of the government of Canada from the commitment that that government entered into over the years when they were backing the Indians

off their hereditary lands on to the reserve properties. The Indians feel, with much justification, that the responsibility undertaken by the government of Canada years ago for the provision of health services, welfare services and education and the sort of support that would keep the Indian community in some sort of touch with the modern community outside the reserve is still there and they are not prepared to let any government relinquish that responsibility.

This, more than any other reason, in my view, is why the Indian reserves, even those fairly prosperous ones, are not anxious to have themselves established as municipalities in the sense that we in this House understand it. They are prepared to set themselves up with an elected council, which has already been done on several southern Ontario reserves and a few in the north. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the quality of the deliberations of these council meetings, the democracy of their elections and the involvement of the Indian people themselves, is of first-order quality, and that they are quite prepared to deal with their own problems.

It is their initiatives that we must support. I believe that we in this House, and the Minister of Social and Family Services, who has the responsibility as chairman of the Cabinet committee, are prepared to support them in these initiatives as long as they are properly identified.

The day when we in this House, or the members of the Parliament of Canada, would decide what was best for the Indian community must be long gone, and there should be no Legislature or Parliament which is prepared, without the full co-operation and leadership of the Indian community, to decide what should be done for them.

In my opening remarks—and the member for London South, of course, made a lot of this—I was quick to say that no level of government is without guilt in this, the government of Canada included.

Mr. White: I want to make it clear that this is a federal responsibility.

Mr. Nixon: But in this particular case, Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote two or three items—

Mr. White: Speak to your friends in Ottawa.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The member for London South is off again. There he goes. Tell us about Big Chief Stanfield.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to quote two or three items from a report that was commissioned by the government of Canada, and it is sometimes referred to as the Hawthorne/Tremblay report. I think the Minister may be familiar with it. It is now published in two volumes. There are two or three quotes from it that I think have some application here, and the first one is the following:

> There are strong moral and ethical grounds for asserting the provincial governments should contribute far larger amounts of money and trained personnel for coping with the problems of depressed Indian communities. Provincial governments have the jurisdiction over resources, the allocation of jobs, and the types of development that take place in using these resources.
>
> The provincial governments should assume prior responsibility for the social and economic costs that are a direct by-product of development, such as depletion or spoilage of resources on which Indians depend for their livelihood, technological changes that render various types of employment obsolescent, new resource development projects, and the influxes of population that cause social disorganization.

And then there is a gap, and the Minister can fill in if he chooses:

> Hitherto, provincial administrations tended to sanction various types of revenue associated with this, while dumping the problems they generate in the laps of other authorities.

That is the end of the quote from the report.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, the provincial governments were justified in doing this, since The Indian Act gives full responsibility for Indians and their lands to the senior level of government. But we now know that under the urgings of reports such as the Hawthorne-Tremblay report, the government of Canada has seen fit to enter into far-reaching agreements with provincial governments, and we have signed such an agreement here. And this is the only one, the Minister tells us, that has been accomplished. But I would say this, that simply because we had entered into this agreement in Ontario, there has been little or no evidence of a more progressive attitude towards meeting the problems that I have attempted to describe to the House this evening.

We know that we have under construction at Moosonee, a centre for education that is

going to be directed chiefly towards the Indians. Yet we are told that the Indians themselves had little or no involvement with the planning and development of that centre, that Indians on the staff are very few. Actually the facilities for the teaching staff there are far and above the general level of the community, so that the teachers are once again going to be parachuted into the community—that is a phrase that has some particular meaning these days. They are going to be parachuted into the community with all of the condescension usually associated with that sort of an undertaking. Unless the Indians are intimately involved in the co-operative development of these training procedures I fear that once again we are spending funds—public funds, federal and provincial—in an effort which is not going to meet the general acceptance of the community that is most concerned.

I have visited the centre for continuing education at Elliot Lake, in which a good many Indians are involved in an upgrading of their abilities, so that they can take part in the industry and economy of the north. I have talked to quite a few of them in their classes, and there has been the expression of some disappointment at the involvement of both levels of government.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that these education centres are going to be interesting to observe. Certainly the one in Moosonee is going to involve a large amount of capital in its use. But one thing that has always bothered me is that when we estabilsh these training centres, there is a tendency to withdraw the younger Indians in particular from their normal family environment and bring them by boat and aircraft for many miles, accustoming them to a different way of life and expectations that are associated more with life in a large urban centre, without the follow-through that will permit them to make a decision if they choose to leave the reserve, the Indian community, and make a life for themselves in the larger centres of the north, or even to come down to Toronto or Hamilton as so many of them do.

Unless we are prepared to follow through on these forms of education and see that these Indians have the spirit, the background, the education and the general understanding of the new sort of life that they are facing, we are doing them no service. We give them a bit of a leg up to coming down to Toronto and joining the many hundreds of Indians who have come here expecting to fit into a community and get a job and to perhaps integrate with the larger metropolitan community, only to find themselves, sometimes because of their own personality difficulties, cast out entirely and living in what is becoming a larger and larger ghetto of Indians in Toronto.

I know that many of you have had an opportunity to talk with many of the Indians in Toronto and other major centres, and you find that they are very unhappy indeed. This government's efforts to establish social centres so that Indians can be with people of similar backgrounds in an effort to build up the kind of confidence that will assist them in making the transition are very laudable. Yet we know that it is grossly inadequate and that there is no intermediate step, whereby these Indians who do choose to leave the reserve and their hereditary situation, can have the training and assistance that will permit them to fit into the other parts of society, and in the broader sense.

There is no doubt in my mind that where the reserves are well established, and intend to remain that way, it is our responsibility to see that the educational facilities are on the reserve for the people. I believe that we are misguided if we believe that these young Indian children should be uprooted from this sort of situation, so that the intermediate step is some kind of a white school where they are going to be forced to adapt to the white man's ways. My experience is that while a few of them do accomplish this adaptation and transformation, many of them continue to withdraw inside themselves. While they may be excellent athletes and students, they do not appreciate this uprooting at an early age. I believe that it is the biggest part of our problem to see that these facilities are put on the reserves for them and that the transference from the reserve, if that is what the Indians wish to undertake as individuals, entails a special sort of programme that would give them this sort of assistance.

Mr. Chairman, there are many items associated with this in the broader sense. The House leader has indicated that he wants the bulk of views of the members of the House on Indian affairs expressed at this time, and because of this I would say that it is incumbent on this Minister, who has the job of co-ordinating the Cabinet approach to Indian affairs in the province, to see to it that the federal participation is going to be extended to the development of roads in the reserves, and the building of bridges. I raised this matter in connection with my own Indian reserve just a few days ago with the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme). The Minister, at that

time, said that the province is prepared to shoulder its share of the cost as long as the Indians finance their share, either as a municipality or with the assistance of the government of Canada.

I believe that if the responsibility for supporting Indian initiative is going to be transferred more and more on to the provincial government, it is this Minister's responsibility to go out of his way to provide these Indian bands and the Indian leaders with a clear knowledge of the alternatives open to them. It is a good thing when this government says, "We are prepared to pay our share; the government of Canada or the band funds can pay their share."

I think that this Minister has to undertake to go out to those reserves, or have someone on his staff who is prepared to do this, and sit down with the band councils and work out the alternatives. You should get in touch with the government of Canada, write the bands and say: "Here is a proposal that they may support, and if not, we are prepared to undertake these negotiations on your behalf." This is the kind of assistance that will bear fruit.

I know many of the Indians personally, and I have a high regard for their ability as councillors and as individuals. But they have a tendency to be shy and retiring when they get into a position where they are meeting the representatives of other levels of government. Any assistance that we can give them in this regard is, I believe, much appreciated—as long as we are not trying to impose our views of what the Indians should do, on these people themselves. I believe that they have a clear view of what they want to do in their own situation, and as I have tried to point out, this situation varies from one Indian community to another.

I am glad to see that in vote 2011, we are appropriating $1 million for community development projects, and this is something that can bear real fruit, as long as we are prepared to support Indian initiative, and if we are prepared to provide the staff of trained people who are aware of the ramifications of The Indian Act of Canada and the difficulties that have been associated with it over the years, and are prepared to work with federal people and not simply criticize them. They have undertaken a broad responsibility for many years, and I believe that their attitudes are very similar to those expressed in this House. They want to do a good job, and I believe that they are prepared to enter into the kind of co-operation that is necessary in this regard.

But too often, the programmes of this government have been custodial, in the presentation of subsistence programmes and relief measures. We see the responsibility for health care, education, transportation, community development, and economic development gradually moving to the government of Ontario with the financial support of the federal government, and a whole new vista of heavy responsibility opening up headed by the Minister of Social and Family Services. There is none other in the Cabinet to take the responsibility but he, the way that it has been organized in Ontario.

He is the Minister for Indian affairs, if you wish to call him that, and his responsibilities are growing rapidly. I hope that he can describe to us tonight an implementation of a federal-provincial agreement that is going to be meaningful, and which will come to grips with the problem that has created suffering in the province of Ontario, surrounded by plenty and a growing economy. The Indians have been bypassed by every level of government and they continue to be bypassed by this government. This is a project that the Minister of Social and Family Services can take on as something that could be his most important responsibility as a member of the Cabinet, of his political career. We on this side, Mr. Chairman, are prepared to support him to the hilt as long as he is progressive, and is prepared to go out into the field and give the assistance that is needed in this important matter.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the Minister would prefer to wait until all members have spoken?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That would be preferable, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Before I recognize the member for Thunder Bay, I am sure that the committee would permit me a few moments to introduce the special guests that we have in the east gallery. We have with us tonight the ladies from the Liberal ladies association of Wellington South, and I am sure that we welcome these special guests.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Great-looking bunch of women, even though they are Liberals.

Mr. Chairman: I was going to say that, but I must remain impartial.

Mr. Stokes: Well I said it for you, Mr. Chairman.

I am rising to speak to vote 2011, the Indian development branch, where we see the expenditure of $1,428,000 out of a total budget of $228 million. It is our view that the amount that has been appropriated is totally inadequate. One of the most tragic consequences of federal-provincial buck-passing is the negelect of our Canadian Indians.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): And Eskimos!

Mr. Stokes: Because Indian affairs is a federal responsibility, the government of Ontario has completely washed its hands of the problem. It turns its back on the thousands of Indians living in the province and has chosen to ignore the plight of these people in the estimates of each department. It explains its no-action by pointing to Ottawa and, saying "Let them do it." We are aware that Indian affairs is a federal responsibility but we do question the wisdom of allowing this to blind the Minister of Social and Family Services to the need for an extension of services under the Indian development branch.

In trying to get some information on the Indian development branch I phoned the offices and asked if they had any publications that might enlighten me as to what was going on within the branch. I was told that they did not have any information available and anything that is pertinent to the department would come up during the estimates.

I found out later in an offhand way that they do produce, under the Indian development branch of The Ontario Department of Social and Family Services, a publication called *Widjitwin,* a social, educational and economic publication. This is all I could see in the way of print from The Department of Social and Family Services with regard to this particular branch. Out of estimates of $227,990,000 for total expenditure for his department, the Minister has set aside $1,-428,000 for a branch charged—and here are the Minister's own words—"with the responsibility of finding and implementing the means whereby Indian people may achieve the maximum social, economic and cultural development of their communities."

Placed beside these high-sounding goals, this figure is not just unrealistic, not just misleading, it is an insult. It is not just an insult, it is an indication of the degree of awareness of the Indian problem on the part of the Minister—a complete denial of the gravity of the situation. We are told that the Indian development branch of The Department of Social and Family Services acts as a liaison between the federal government and the Indian people of Ontario. This in itself is a good idea, but the government of Ontario must expand this service in order to meet a growing need, must explain why there is no legislation covering this branch and therefore no clear definition of purpose or responsibility.

The Conservative government has lost an important opportunity to lead the way in this difficult area to show the federal government that it is willing to accept some of the responsibilities attached to having people live within its boundaries. The Indians in Ontario allow the provincial government to capitalize on their presence and culture in the development of certain branches of other departments of government. Is it not then reasonable to expect the government to provide more services for these Indians?

I do not want just to deal with a bunch of vague generalities and make a lot of accusations against this particular Minister and this particular branch of his department. But having some 22 Indian reservations and Indian settlements in the riding of Thunder Bay that I happen to represent, I have a pretty well documented case of neglect of our Indian people in almost every sphere of their daily living. With regard to making adequate levels of employment available to them, equality of educational opportunity, proper housing, proper medical care and welfare where it is needed, and in the absence of positive action to help the Indians in all of these aspects of their daily lives, I think it is incumbent upon this government and in particular this department to step in and fill the void that has been left by the federal department of Indian affairs.

To be more specific I would like to draw your attention to a letter that I received from one of the Indian leaders in Armstrong. Among many other things this letter said, and I quote from it:

> The next thing I want to write about is a tragedy that struck one of the members of our association. Last Tuesday the home of Dennis Shapwaaygesic was completely destroyed by fire and his 11-month-old daughter Denise was fatally burned. Dennis was out of town on a survey job, the first employment he had had for some time. He quit his job near Iron Bridge on learning of the tragedy. They lost everything they owned; the other young children even lost their shoes. Some local

friends have tried to supply some of the necessities. However, as was evident to you on your visit here, the people on the back streets of this town have little to spare. Any source of assistance that you could direct to us, would be appreciated.

I immediately contacted the Minister's department and I was put in touch with a Mr. Beaudreau, I think it was, in Port Arthur and he said that he would look into it immediately. He suggested at the same time that I contact the department of Indian affairs in Ottawa, which I did. In due course, I got a reply from Mr. Borczak, the acting Deputy Minister. He said:

Further to our letter of February 26, I now have a report from our representative who called on you. He reports that you have located temporary housing and that the department of Indian affairs has provided you with financial assistance to help with expenses following the tragic loss of your daughter. I understand that every consideration is being given. I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Stokes to inform him of the present circumstances.

As an addendum he says:

As this family are treaty Indians, and residents of the unorganized territories, the responsibility for assistance and rehabilitation remains with Indian affairs. We have been assured that everything possible is being done for Mr. and Mrs. Shapawaaygesic.

They have been issued emergency assistance and obtained temporary housing, and when I asked what the nature of the temporary, or emergency assistance was, they said that they were alerting the Red Cross in the Lakehead and they would attempt to provide emergency assistance through that body, but the responsibility lay with the department of Indian affairs.

This, as I see it, is the problem as regards assistance to our Indian people. There does not seem to be any effective liaison betwen the different agencies at the provincial and federal levels. There does not seem to be any co-ordination at all. It seems to me that you cannot go to a provincial agency without being directed to a federal agency for assistance or vice versa. I do not know how we are going to ever resolve the Indian problem if we are going to be passing the buck from one department to another or from one level of government to another.

Just to show you, here is another letter I received from Gull Bay. This person is blind and if you were to see the letter, you would understand and realize that she is blind. Among other things she says:

I am totally blind now they have took one of my eyes out. I tried to get an increase in my pension but they said I was not eligible to get it. But I am absolutely helpless now. My husband has to lead me around and look after me. He is quite old himself. I got to pay for my wood and washing, and the Hudson's Bay prices is very high in this neck of the woods and I don't have no money left when I pay up my bills at the end of the month. I am 64 years old.

I brought this to the attention of the department of Indian affairs. This letter from Mrs. Mary Michelle was written on November 8. On January 17, I got this letter from the hon. L. S. Marchand, special assistant to Mr. Laing:

I am informed that there are monthly visits to this reserve by members of the Port Arthur agency staff. A welfare committee appointed by the band council administers assistance on the reserve. So far as I have been able to ascertain, Mrs. Mary Anne Michelle has not brought her circumstances to the attention of either the welfare committee or the Indian agency staff. However, Mr. L. A. Morrison, superintendent, Port Arthur Indian agency, will investigate Mrs. Michelle's circumstances and ensure that the necessary assistance is provided. She may be eligible for the blind person's allowance. On behalf of the Minister, I wish to thank you for bringing this matter to my attention.

Here it is, two months after I received a letter from this lady, who had made several applications to different government agencies and brought it to the attention of anybody that would listen to her, the federal agency says it knows nothing of her circumstances or the situation that she finds herself in at all.

Here again is just another indication of—I do not think it is a callous neglect. I do not think that they really know what is going on, or take the trouble to find out what is going on—what the conditions are in the reserves and on the reserves. And a good many of our treaty Indians who do not happen to find themselves living in the confines of a reserve, they move off of the reserve because there is nothing there at which they can be gainfully employed.

Most of the reserves are located in areas where the trapping has died out, and the hunting and fishing is no longer up to par that will allow them to maintain themselves. There is no mining industry close to them. There are no Department of Lands and Forests projects going on. There is no work in the forest products industry, so naturally, they have to move down and they become located on the fringes of small northern communities where they are indeed our rural poor. The economy of these municipalities that they move to in many cases, is an unorganized territory where the people in the community just have not got the industrial base to integrate these people and they become a burden, not only on the community, but they become a burden to levels of government.

They start to live in shack towns and if I may quote for a minute from the "Human Relations Bulletin," published by the Ontario human rights commission, it says:

> Over 200,000 Canadian Indians, descendants of our original inhabitants now live outside the mainstream of their native country. They are deprived of the social justice, human dignity and the equality of opportunity which other twentieth century Canadians claim as their heritage.

Now it says here:

> Among the shocking statistics cited by a Miss Jeanine Loche, are the following:
>
> Indian infant mortality is tragically higher than the national total; out of every 1,000 live births, 74.7 against 27.2 for the whole of Canada will not survive. More than half of all Indian families occupy substandard homes or shacks of three rooms or less without electricity. Where close to 90 per cent of white homes have sewage, indoor toilet and baths, a minority of Indians—about one in nine—enjoys such ordinary aids to health and self-esteem. In Moosonee, only one in four Indian children reach grade 8, the end of local education. The majority drop out at grade 6 and it is not unusual for the Moosonee Indian at 16 to advance no further than grade 3.

Now if we are going to do anything in a positive and meaningful way to assist our Indian people within the province, I think that we could take a good long look of what has been accomplished at Quetico centre. I had the privilege of being present when it was opened; I believe my friend from Rainy River (Mr. P. T. Reid) was there on that occasion and it is a wonderful facility where I think both levels of government have expended some $800,000 on a cultural, arts and adult retraining centre.

I can remember one of the first chores I had shortly after I was elected, when I received a letter from the director of that centre, Mr. Cliff MacIntosh, was to assist in getting some kind of co-operation and co-ordination and some kind of dialogue set up between the provincial Department of Education and the federal Department of Manpower and Immigration.

After the federal Department of Manpower and Immigration scrapped programme 5, they in effect threw the baby out with the bath water, where they said that you must have a grade 8 level of education in order to enroll in the adult retraining facilities throughout the province and throughout the whole of Canada, and of course, this was the problem that Quetico centre faced. But after having made a special trip over to Ottawa and discussing it with the Deputy Minister of Manpower and Immigration, we were able to explain the situation to him and show him that the Indian people, whom this particular programme was designed to help, would never be in a position to avail themselves of these adult retraining courses—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to clear up the record for the House and for my friend from Thunder Bay. I believe he stated, or at least the impression he has given this House, is that he alone was responsible for the events that happened in that Quetico centre so that it was allowed to accept these Indian trainees. I would like to point out to my hon. friend that John Reid, MP for Kenora-Rainy River was also very active in this and although he did not get the publicity, he certainly had talks with the Minister and all those concerned and was very involved in this particular matter.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What Minister?

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I am not really concerned about getting any of the credit for this. The fact is I could show the hon. member correspondence that I brought substantiating what I have said, and it was not my intention to relate—

Mr. T. P. Reid: I am disagreeing with—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): He should have done it without the pressure.

Mr. Stokes: It was not my intention to relate specifically what my part was in it. I can prove what my part was, and I am quite proud of it, but it was not my intention to take credit. All I am trying to do, is to impress upon the Minister that the facility that is operating now in Quetico is the kind of thing that can get the Indian population back into the mainstream of society.

I received a letter from the director of Quetico centre a short while ago, and in it he enclosed a copy of a letter that he had received from one of the trainees who was unemployable until he had taken a retraining course in the operation of heavy equipment. It would have brought tears to your eyes to read it, when he expressed the gratitude that he had for the centre and the facilities that had been made available to him and made him employable. I doubt very much if this particular chap, or anybody who enrolled in that course, will ever be on welfare again.

It is money very, very well spent, and I just want to point out to the Minister that this is the kind of plan, the kind of programme, that is going to bring our Indian people into the mainstream of economic and social life in Canada.

Another area that I want to explore is the youth friendship centres. There is one set up in Port Arthur where the director finds it necessary to spend money out of his own pocket to do the kind of work that he is expected and called upon to do by the native population in the north who come to his centre for assistance. The money that is available for him to spend to make this service available to the youth of the Lakehead is completely inadequate.

I think that the grant that was given by the provincial government for this youth centre at the Lakehead was something in the neighbourhood of $4,000. It was completely inadequate. I am sure that the Minister knows the good work that Mr. Xavier Michon, who is the director of that friendship centre, does. He has been speaking with various levels of government, both here in Toronto and in Ottawa, and to various Ministers within this government, and I think that the kind of work that he is doing up there is very worthwhile. I happen to have a copy of the annual report for that centre and I can assure you that if you are aware of the kind of service that he is performing for the Indian people in that area, you would have no difficulty justifying to your colleagues quite a substantial increase in a grant that is being awarded.

I remember quite vividly some three or four months ago he was down here pleading with the Ontario housing corporation for the establishment of what they call half-way centres, to help overcome the shortage of housing, and because, as the hon. leader of the Opposition has stated, they do have a problem in integrating completely into the mainstream of our social and cultural habits. A good many of the Indians in my riding have never seen an automobile. They do not know what a television set looks like. And it is essential, I think, that we allow them to integrate at their own pace and at their own speed. I think it is absolutely wrong to say, "Well you can no longer survive on a reservation setting and you must, of necessity, be completely integrated with the white society."

Now if we had some of these sort of half-way centres where they could come down and live in decent housing with decent plumbing and decent living facilities, I think that, in a very, very short time, they would be able and willing and ready to become completely integrated. But when you bring them out of a very primitive setting that they are exposed to on the reserve, and all at once say, "you are going to progress and be in the mainstream of Canadian economic society and our industrial activity," the overnight change is much too great for them, and they usually end up back on the reserve again, worse off than theye were before. So that if we had one of these half-way places, where they could slowly learn our way of living and become more accustomed to what is going on in the more urbanized centres, I think that a half-way house has a great deal of merit.

Now—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): You are getting carried away!

Mr. Stokes: I did not ask a question.

Mr. MacDonald: What kind of an interjection is that?

Mr. Stokes: I think he just woke up.

The final point that I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, is I had occasion just a short while ago to assist the students of Bathurst Heights secondary school in the city, here in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Singer: North York, Downsview.

Mr. Stokes: Very good! And they must be a very fine bunch of people indeed.

They did take it upon themselves to sort of adopt the people on an Indian reservation.

They asked me for the name of a reservation that was in particular need and in dire circumstances, and wondered if they could help. So through this gentleman that I spoke of earlier, Mr. Xavier Michon, who is the spokesman for a good many of the Indians in northwestern Ontario, we were able to impress upon this group of students from Bathurst Heights that it would be a very worthwhile project if they would make—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Everybody is in Downsview riding.

Mr. Stokes: —if they would make good used clothing available to these Indian people at Osnaburg House, which is about half-way between the Lakehead and Hudson Bay. I happened to visit them last fall and I noticed that they were in dire financial circumstances. These young people went out and gathered a ton of clothing. I was able to get Mr. Harvey Smith, from a transportation company, to move all this clothing free of charge up to this Indian reservation, and you have no idea the kind of good will that a gesture like this will create between the white community and the Indian people in the north. And I think it would be a very worthwhile exercise if the Minister and his department would in some fashion try to have a student exchange, say between a secondary school in Metropolitan Toronto, with some of the children of a like age, say away up in Osnaburg House, or a good many of these reservations in the far north, to give them an opportunity to communicate.

I can very well remember the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier), when he brought down the two young page boys and they were just completely aghast at the size of the buildings, the number of motor cars, the very fact that it was possible to see a television programme, something that was unheard of on some reserves. And you can well imagine the kind of stories that these two young lads are going to be able to tell when they go home to their people on the reserves. And I think that an exchange such as this, would have a very useful effect on the people on the reserve who have no idea, no conception whatsoever, of what life is like in the outside world. The world that they are never exposed to. And the only answer is that we bring representatives from those reserves down to view first hand what life is like, and go back and tell their people. They will become more inquisitive; they will yearn for the kind of thing that we have; and I think that the Minister could do nothing better than to educate these people into the kind of thing that is available to them, and give them an opportunity to become integrated into the kind of society that they are very deserving of. And I think that we have an obligation to make them a part of it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, this can and should be one of the most important debates that we will have in this Legislature during this session. But quite frankly, I think it is bogging down.

The proposition of all of us in the Opposition delivering lengthy speeches and the Minister, with greatest difficulty, continuing listening to these speeches and then at the end answering all that we have said—and particularly the points that may be buried in the course of our general remarks—is simply not going to come to grips with the problem that we must sort out, in my view, this year.

I think we have reached the crossroads in terms of our relationship with the Indians. If we do not face up to the problems and do something about a situation which is a national scandal, then we are going to have trouble. Indeed, that we have not had trouble up until now is both a credit and a debit to a group in our society who have been neglected for far too long.

I am not going to repeat, and I do not know to what extent I am going to get into difficulties, Mr. Chairman, with the kind of pattern that the Minister suggested, I am not going to repeat a lengthy speech. First, because I agree with what the leader of the Opposition and my colleague from Thunder Bay have said. Second, I have already made a lengthy speech in general terms on Indian policy. What I want to do is perhaps elaborate briefly on the remarks that they have made; to set a background to specific questions which I want to put to the Minister; to explore what is government policy at the moment and what is contemplated to be government policy in a completely new and different approach to coping with Indian affairs.

The first point of which I think we should be very much aware, Mr. Chairman, is this: If the Minister or anybody else for one moment tries to lull the public into the belief that we are making progress let us disabuse ourselves of that idea. There is a very worthwhile document produced by E. R. McEwan, the executive secretary of the Indian-Eskimo association, which is perhaps the most authoritative and effective body in terms of liaison

between the white community and the Indian and Eskimo community in Canada, a publication that came out no more than three or four months ago on "community development services for Canadian Indian and Métis communities." Just to nail down this point that I am making, by way of a premise for looking at this subject, I quote Mr. McEwan from page 27:

> It should be clearly noted that at this point in time the lot of the native people is getting relatively worse, not better.

Let not the Minister get up with his bland outpouring to the effect that, "We are doing better than we have ever done before; we are doing well enough to cope with the situation." The fact of the matter is we have a situation which is a national scandal and it is getting worse. Let us start from that premise.

The next point that I want to deal with, in general terms before I get to some specific questions to the Minister, is that we have been kidding ourselves for the last two or three years that we were really coming to grips with this problem because we came up with what we thought was a new approach, a new apparatus, a new machinery, for enlisting the co-operation of the Indians—namely the community development programme, and we have been putting community development officers into these various Indian communities.

What produced this document by the Indian-Eskimo association is the fact that the community development programme, in the view of those who were involved—when they are given an opportunity to speak privately and not in the presence of their masters at Queen's Park, or in the Indian affairs department at Ottawa—in their view the programme has bogged down completely.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Why?

Mr. MacDonald: For a variety of reasons. Let me give you two. The first one—and I am going to use this source for quotation rather frequently although he is not here tonight—is the hon. member for Kenora who delivered a very good speech in this House on Indian affairs during the Throne debate. I have reason to believe that it is a reflection of the views of those who are working in a number of these community organizations in co-operation with the Indians. I am not suggesting that they are not his views, in fact I am going to take it for granted that they are his views, and I want to put on record two views, one his, and one another citizen from the Kenora area with regard to the community development programme.

"Why is it bogging down?" my friend from Rainy River asked. On page 996 of *Hansard* in the Throne debate, the hon. member for Kenora—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Page 995.

Mr. MacDonald: I am about to quote from page 996; the hon. member is just a little too precise in the fine points that he wants to make in a debate and sometimes misses the main point. On page 996 the hon. member for Kenora said this, and he was referring to the reaction of one of his Indians whom he called Nitchi. He said:

> To give you a typical example, in the course of the same week Nitchi may have separate visits from the federal community development officer, the provincial community development officer, the representatives of the company of young Canadians, and the federal economic development officer—

This is your friend FRED, may I say to the leader of the Opposition.

> —the four of them exclusively interested in community development with different approaches and aspects of community development. In between, Nitchi may have to meet another half dozen or so of community officials, either federal or provincial.
>
> Mr. Speaker, Nitchi is a man of responsibility on his reserve and once in a while he hears vaguely that the white people in Ottawa voted more millions of dollars to help him and the other Indians. Nitchi looks around his shack, lacking what the white people call the barest necessities of life. He is unable to obtain employment which would give him pride and confidence in being able to find himself, and conscious only of the multitude of forms he has signed, and the promises made by the various government agencies, he wonders what it is all about. Is it not another trick on the part of the white man on the pretext of creating more jobs for the white people?

Then the hon. member goes on to say that Nitchi is having a problem with drink—and after all of this confusion who can blame him? To rescue himself from the confusion of a situation he goes and has another drink.

There is one answer, and it is from one of your own backbenchers, who is familiar with the Indian situation. It is a confusion beyond description—of provincial government, federal government, two or three agencies from each, so that the Indian does not know where he is going and what all the white men are attempting to do, and he gets a bit suspicious, Mr. Chairman, that once again the white man is voting millions of dollars to build a bureaucracy to provide jobs for white men who are presumably helping the Indian.

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): What would you do?

Mr. MacDonald: Sit and listen for a moment and perhaps you may get an inkling. A second comment that I want to put with regard to the community development programme is a comment that was presented to the Kenora mayor's committee by Harry Shankowsky, who happens to be one of the white committee—I do not know what they call it exactly—who were working with the Indians in Kenora ever since that outbreak of concern and involvement of the Indians a year or so ago. In his brief to the mayor's committee Mr. Shankowsky said this:

> Community development in most cases is just a couple of over-used words. Community development officers have no specific job to do and no authority. If community development is to be real, then it must be the development of the community. It must involve the Indian people in very aspect of their life as equal members of the community in which they live.

A little later in his brief:

> The white society, having recognized some of the needs of the Indians, has made honest attempts, though very limited, to meet some of the material needs of these people. However, we have, somewhere, lost the essence of the community development. We have not involved the Indian people in the community development process. We have done the development and not they. Our focus on, and pre-occupation with, the material has somehow bypassed the human element and we wonder why our plans and our efforts at rebuilding the communities are meeting with marginal success, if not outright failure and hostility from the very people we want to help.
>
> We must continue to assist the Indian community to satisfy their material needs but we must also introduce programmes which will give the Indian person the opportunity and the possibility of self growth, of developing himself as a human being in the Canadian context. We must create a situation in which the Indian person feels that he has the power within himself to plan and to direct his life in his own way and that he can find personal success through his own effort.

My friend from Rainy River interjected and asked "why". I have given two views of people who are fairly close to the scene—as to why the community development has bogged down—one, the hon. member for Kenora, and the other, a member of the white committee in Kenora. Let me add a third one briefly. Mr. Chairman, I think we are attempting the impossible to merge within the old paternalistic, bureaucratic framework of the Indian superintendent's operations, a community development officer who is seeking a completely different objective.

The superintendent is attempting to maintain tranquility and stability in the old pattern. What he wants is peace and order and obedience. The community development officer is a person who goes in and deliberately provokes unrest, or concern, on the part of the Indians as to what is the nature of their problems and what is the possibility of a solution. If he is doing his job he is going to create, in the minds of the Indians, questions, queries, demands and this is precisely what the Indian superintendent does not want.

So the Indian superintendent, very quickly, comes to the conclusion that the community development officer is a trouble-maker. Mr. Chairman, if there ever was a case of where you cannot "pour new wine into old bottles," the community development programme within the framework of the old bureaucratic paternalism of the Indian affairs branch in Ottawa, in my view, is attempting the impossible. It is not just my view that we have reached the end of the road, in terms of its potential; it is the view of the Indian-Eskimo association; it is the view of the Ontario union of Indians, which is the advisory group of this government. So against that background, in terms of elaboration on what the hon. leader of the Opposition has said and what my friend from Thunder Bay has said, I want now to put a number of specific questions to the Minister.

The first question that I want to put to the Minister is that if we are going to bring order out of this infinite chaos of two or three levels of government, with sometimes two or three agencies from each level of government being involved, we have got to co-ordinate our approach so that we are all focusing whatever resources we have—and indeed, adding to those resources, to solve the problems. This government recognized this as a problem two or three years ago—or was it four or five years ago — in setting up the interdepartmental committee which is chaired by the hon. Minister whose estimates are now before the House. This was an attempt to bring some co-ordination into the various departments who are dealing with Indian affairs.

I was interested, Mr. Chairman, during the Throne debate when the leader of the Op-

position interjected in the course of the Prime Minister's (Mr. Robarts') remarks and made some rather critical comments with regard to the interdepartmental Cabinet committee on Indian affairs, asking what it was doing—and the Prime Minister refused to get drawn off into the details because he said then was not the time to do it. Later we would have an opportunity, and it is now. But he clearly indicated that this committee has not been able to achieve its objectives. Let me put it to you in his words:

> We think that we have done a very great deal in this area and perhaps it will be necessary to point out where the difficulties have arisen and why we have been blocked in doing what we set out to do and what we want to do.

"Why we have been blocked in doing what we set out to and what we want to do"—the Prime Minister's words, in reference to this committee. And later, he said:

> I will agree with the leader of the Opposition that not nearly as much has been accomplished as we would have wished.

My first question to the Minister is: What is wrong with the interdepartmental committee? Why was it blocked? Who blocked it? What did you set out to do? Where did you fail in achieving your objectives?

I think that if we are going to have any meaningful debate at all on getting a better and more effective policy we have got to start with this—and I warn you, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of other questions that will follow it when I get some idea of what the Minister's answer is to the bogging down of the interdepartmental committee.

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister wish to answer now or is he going to stick to his—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think, Mr. Chairman, that really the leader of the NDP has taken one position with respect to how the debate should go. I still think that there is a good deal to be said for having everybody express their opinion and to give me the opportunity of summing up.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh no!

Mr. Nixon: There would be no objection to asking questions following that, would there?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not at all. I think that the leader of the Opposition has made a very full statement and I may say to him that, almost without exception, everything that he said is very sound and very wise and I will make a comment upon it. I will also comment on what the member for Thunder Bay has said and I am quite willing to comment on what the hon. leader has said, both previously and at the present time. I am not going to wind up the debate, necessarily. I will just try to remember all the points and I have been making notes.

Mr. MacDonald: I trust you will make notes. My first question is: What has happened "to block the achievement of the objectives of the interdepartmental committee"—and those are the words of the Prime Minister, not mine.

Let me proceed, if the Minister wants to adopt this pattern. Let me proceed with the second and I think a very basic and key point. The leader of the Opposition, in the course of his remarks, said that the basic responsibility for Indian affairs rests with the federal government in The Indian Affairs Act. Mr. Chairman, let me pause and deal with this.

This is a myth we have lived with for too long. Once again do not accept my word for it. But in the Hawthorne-Tremblay study—which is a very, detailed and voluminous study, only one volume of which is yet available, on the question of Indian affairs; it was prescribed or authorized by the federal government—they make a point dealt with by Mr. McEwen on page 31 of his pamphlet which I referred to earlier, and I am quoting:

> The general acceptance of the thesis that the federal government are solely responsible for Indian affairs has been challenged cogently in the Hawthorne-Tremblay study.

It is too bad the hon. member for London South is not here because he says it is a federal responsibility. Here is the myth being exploded. It is not an exclusive federal responsibility. The authors argue that "the absence of provincial activity is more a matter of policy than a question of the constitution."

These, Mr. Chairman, are experts—an expert committee appointed by the federal government who have finally thrown into the waste-paper basket, the proposition that the responsibility for Indian affairs is exclusively a federal responsibility. It is not. In their own words, the authors argue that "the absence of provincial activity is more a matter of policy than the question of constitution."

So my second question to the Minister is: Since it is a matter of policy, why has this government, as a matter of policy, refused to accept its obligations with regard to coping with Indian problems? It is not just a federal responsibility, it is your responsibility.

Let me move to the third area, which is an important one. In the old context of believing that it was a federal responsibility, and

that some of it would have to be shared by the province, we started to enter into agreements some two years ago—if I recall correctly—in 1966. The Hawthorne committee had some rather caustic comments with regard to this process. Their comments are focussed on the proposition that this is a piecemeal approach agreement that deals with this aspect of the problem and that aspect of the problem but never comes to grips with the totality of the problem. The piecemeal approach is going so slowly that it will be an eternity before this government has come to grips with the problem. Let me quote, as commented on again by Mr. McEwen on page 31 of his pamphlet:

> While it is true that the present policy calls for the transfer of a significant number of Indian affairs branch functions to the government by a system of agreements, the fact is that there is very little being transferred at the present pace and method, and it would take decades to effect a substantial transfer. The Hawthorne-Tremblay report states: "The increased funds the provinces will require in assuming the growing responsibility for providing services to Indians should be provided as quickly as agreement can be reached within the general federal-provincial fiscal arrangement rather than by an infinity of specific agreements dealing with particular functions."

In other words, the Hawthorne-Tremblay report is suggesting that we cut out this business of piecemeal agreements which will take an eternity of achievement, and that within the general fiscal agreements which the province signs with the federal government, come to an agreement with regard to federal moneys being made available for the province to tackle the totality of Indian problems. That is the third question that I want to put to the Minister: In this connection, what is happening?

In case, Mr. Chairman, the Minister should think that this is not a view that is shared by others, let me quote the hon. member for Kenora in this connection, to be found on this occasion on page 995—we are back now on the same page as the hon. member for Rainy River wanted me to be last time. I quote from page 995, from the hon. member for Kenora's remarks:

> Under the existing agreements, very little authority has been transferred from the federal to the provincial government. The transition is difficult. But one may question if there is enough effort being made at the provincial level to speed up the process.

I wish the hon. member for London South were here, since he had a few general comments to make—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: —because he in effect was saying that it was the federal government. It is not the federal government's responsibility. It is the provincial government's responsibility and it is by "policy decision" that they are not accepting it. Secondly, one of your own members familiar with the scene said: "But one may question if there is enough effort being made at the provincial level to speed up the process."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It still does not contradict the hon. member's argument.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not going to argue with the hon. gentleman. He is just missing the point. It is a contradiction, therefore I am not going to pursue it any further.

Let me move to a third point. Against the background of what is happening to the interdepartmental committee, which is the overall co-ordinating body, I come to another question. I put it, once again, in the context of the suggestion that was made by the hon. member for Kenora, when he was speaking—expressing I think the views of persons in the Indian-Eskimo association elsewhere, to be found this time again on page 996, of *Hansard* when he said:

> As a suggestion, since the provincial government has instituted the Indian development branch, why not use this vehicle, more extensively, and centralize the maze of all government services through one agency.

There is an opportunity for empire building. I put it to the Minister. He may have to fight with others who have got a share of the empire at the moment, but for the Minister who has on occasion a propensity for empire building, there is an open invitation. Use this branch of your department to co-ordinate all of the approach.

I want to come back to that in another context in a minute, but let me put another comment of the hon. member for Kenora on record, to be found on page 998 of *Hansard*.

> How can a start be made to correct some of these shortcomings? I would say, transfer the obligations of looking after the Indian people from the federal to the provincial governments.

Is the enormity of that statement come home, Mr. Chairman—"to transfer the obligation of looking after the Indian people from the federal government to the provincial governments"—a total transfer. Every aspect of

responsibility for the Indians. Completely get rid of that myth that the federal government has exclusive responsibility for Indians. Let me complete his quotations:

> There have been some transfers already, Mr. Speaker, in the field of education and welfare, but a complete transfer of all obligations and of course federal moneys should be made to the province.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with that. Not only do I agree with it, but this is the basic proposal of the Indian-Eskimo association supported by the Ontario union of Indians. Apart from treaty and land matters, which could be left with the federal department of Indian affairs, there should be a complete transfer of obligations of the federal government for Indians to the provincial government. We should take it all over.

What is the basic rationale for that proposal? The basic rationale, Mr. Chairman, is that most of the things needed to cope with the problems of the Indians are to be found at the provincial level today. Education, for example, is provincial, and the Hawthorne-Tremblay report says it is time that we got Indian education out of the control of the churches; all of the churches; completely. Bring the Indian into the general educational programme. Bring the Indian community into the welfare programme of the province.

When we come to face up to the economic aspect of Indian community development let us face the fact that virtually everything that is needed for our economic development is now a provincial responsibility, whether it be Lands and Forests, whether it be fishing rights, whether it be timber. All of it is now a provincial responsibility, and therefore the proposal of the Indian-Eskimo association, increasingly supported by the Indians—if they can have some assurances in areas which in light of past experience they are apprehensive. It is supported by one of your own backbenchers, who comes from a community with a lot of Indians—to completely decentralize all responsibilities for Indians from the federal government to the provincial government, with the exception of lands and treaties—

Mr. Nixon: Are you aware that the Indians have some misgivings?

Mr. MacDonald: They have some misgivings. I said that a moment ago, and I think they are right in the statement that there should be steps taken to assure the Indians on this area of misgivings which are part and parcel of their whole relationship to the white people over the last 100 years.

My final area of questions that I want to put to the Minister: When I raised this whole new proposal, which I said was in effect a new day and a new approach, completely cutting ourselves off from the past with its ineffective approach which has failed for 150 years—when I raised it during the Throne debate, the Minister in his inimitable fashion said: "I have a copy of the document on my lap, right here!" Well, that was two months or ten weeks ago. As a final question to the Minister, I want to ask: What is the government's thinking with regard to this whole proposal. Particularly, what is the government's thinking with regard to the various agencies that are suggested in the Indian-Eskimo association proposal. Their proposal is that you should have at the federal government level, a native Canadian development institute, which will be representative of the white community, of the federal government of Indians, which will be like the planning body for ARDA. It will map out the programmes with regard to meeting Indian problems. The actual fulfilment of those programmes will be through the establishment of corporations on a regional level—not unlike the one for which the department has put out the annual report, the Widjiitiwin corporation, in the area near MacIntosh. Now the interesting thing, Mr. Chairman, is I may draw your attention to the subtitle, it is a social educational and economic corporation—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Is that by Tchirkey?

Mr. Stokes: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, it is not just an economic development. It is a full development of the community. In a way that puzzled me, the government has apparently been involved in this kind of development. When my friend for Kenora was speaking on the Indian problem, some time ago, he pointed out that up in his area, they have what is known as the Amik association. It is an association that was chartered by the federal government in 1964. It is an association, which, in his words, was organized to help and guide Indians into the world of the white man, and "into the activities of the free enterprise system". I was rather intrigued by that description, Mr. Chairman, because the whole corporation is a co-op, non-profit, shared-capital approach. This is to lead them "into the free enterprise system," but I suppose one can forgive that as a Tory bias in the presentation of it. The fact of the matter is that it is a completely co-operative approach. I suppose the co-operatives are a

part of a free enterprise system today—so maybe I am quibbling. However, Amik is a federally chartered organization, and it acts as a sort of an overseer—an intermediary to assist the Indians in developing these corporations. There has developed in northwestern Ontario, two or three corporations, the Widjiitiwin corporation, the Pawitik corporation and the Sabaskong corporation.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Sabaskong Corporation!

Mr. MacDonald: Not only in French classes, but in Indian classes, I find myself being corrected by the hon. member for Rainy River.

These, Mr. Chairman, are described by the hon. member for Kenora as subsidiaries of Amik. Now, I think that it is time that the Minister were to explain just what is going on. Is this the government's implementation of the kind of thing that the Indian-Eskimo association has proposed? Because the government is involved in a very real way. I draw attention to the notation of the hon. member for Kenora on page 997 of *Hansard*, when he said that in the case of the Indian corporations, Pawitik and Sabaskong, and their parent body, the Amik association, the provincial government has seen fit to provide a grant to cover the expenses of the Amik association business manager. So, you are deeply involved.

Since the Indian-Eskimo association has proposed that at the federal level, we should have what they describe as a native Canadian development institute to plan this kind of development for the whole country. But they just plan it. The implementation of it will take place under the provincial jurisdiction. My question, tied in with the earlier question to the Minister, is what is the coordinating body at the provincial level. Are you going to follow the pattern of the Indian-Eskimo association proposal of having a province wide corporation to sort of act as the holding agency, like Amik, on a province wide basis for these local and regional corporations that develop across the province? Or is your Indian development branch going to be the coordinating agency? The important thing, Mr. Chairman, is that all the monies that are now available from any one of the various provincial government departments, and all of the monies that are now available from the federal government department, plus more moneys that will have to be poured in, should be co-ordinated through this one agency, so that you do not have competing officials, trying to come up with programmes that have inadequate finances and which are not co-ordinated. They should all be put through this one development corporation, which as the Widjiitiwin corporation indicates, is a social, educational and economic corporation, which deals with the total Indian life in that particular community.

My question to the Minister is, what is happening in Ontario? Are you agreeable to the complete decentralization of responsibility from Ottawa? Are you willing to negotiate with Ottawa as the Hawthorne-Trembley committee said, not on a piece-meal basis with agreements, but through dominion-provincial fiscal agreement of total decentralization, with a total availability of federal moneys along with provincial monies to be channeled into these development corporations on a regional basis? Have you given any thought to it, and what is the government's proposal for the future? Because my final comment, before I sit down and listen to some of the Minister's comments, is that we have reached the stage where the past approach to coping with Indian problems has been proven completely bankrupt.

The Indians are getting relatively worse off. Their distrust of the white man has been recorded by those who have studied the rights of the Indian before the law—that they regard the white man in the Indian affairs branch as their enemy, not their friend. You simply cannot continue to pour new wine into the old bottle. We have got to have a completely new approach which, in theory, is the kind of approach that we had in the community programme but this programme was not effective because it was a new and democratic and modern system that we were trying to implement within the bureaucratic paternalism of the department of Indian affairs. That simply could not succeed. It has failed. It has bogged down. What is the department thinking with regard to the new day, the new approach for the Indian?

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask just two or three questions, and make one or two suggestions. I will expect to ask these questions without making any speeches, or even reading anybody else's speeches.

My questions flow from remarks by the leader of the opposition, and have to do mostly with the legislation recently introduced with respect to authority to establish senior citizens' homes on Indian reserves. Now on three or four occasions I have sat in meetings with members of the national Indian health

services, people from various branches of this government and Indian chiefs who have examined for things like, for instance, the report of the select committee on aging, which proposed this very type of legislation quite some time ago. Nothing has as yet happened on that.

Discussions have developed that related to the actual type of buildings which would be supplied for these purposes, rather than the type of building which is presently being supplied for ordinary, regular senior citizens' homes. The reserve people who seem to know what they want, the Indians, say that they would prefer a long, low motel unit type of building. They have tried to suggest and get a start made by this department, a pilot project which would establish a few of these units and which could be added to later, which would prove the need and test the market for the Indians who were in need and were prepared to participate and use these services, and so on. We have listened to complaints that proved to us that the type of communal living that resulted from their participations in the regular senior citizens system just simply would not work. They are not happy there, and they do not stay there. I would just like to ask the Minister what atcions have already been taken? And if no more has taken place than I think has taken place, what plans are proposed to use this legislation; where, and information along that line? I would also like to mention one other specific.

Now, it did not take The Department of Agriculture and Food very long to decide that there was something specific that they could do on Indian reserves. A community pasture, your announcement last week for an Indian reserve, points up the kind of thing that can be done. I am going to make the suggestion to this Minister. Mention was made of the Elliot Lake centre for continuing education, and the project, the trial effort that was made there to introduce Indians into that area. Now, this has not been completely successful, and lots of pot shots have been taken at it because the whole 20 families did not stay there, but several very interesting things were proven.

These families were moved into various parts of the town. The wage earner was taken into the centre and given a course which went as long as they were prepared to accept the course and continue to learn. The children went to school in the regular system in the town. The people in the community made the mothers welcome. As I say, some of them went back to their own towns. But do you know what happened when they did go back? The children who went back want to know when they are going back to Elliot Lake—so it did work. It was a pilot project that was successful to a point and more of the same thing can be done. The facilities are perfect, there. The teachers are there, the training courses are set up for them, the houses are available and there should be more done because in terms of an overall success, that is exactly what it was; and I wonder if the Minister is prepared to comment on that also?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise to speak on the Indian development branch, and I will be very brief, Mr. Chairman. We have heard a number of what I would say are excellent speeches here tonight on the Indian situation in Ontario. I would like, before I make my few remarks to mention to the Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, one aspect of his department that I think is somewhat picayune, and should be cleared up; and this is the practise, I understand, that when Indians receive their treaty money while they are also receiving welfare, they apparently are docked—for want of a better word—43 cents on their treaty money, because you can only earn so much money.

This is a small point, perhaps we can clear that up later. As I said, Mr. Chairman, we have heard many excellent speeches tonight on the Indian situation. I have in front of me two files that go back a number of years on the Indian situation in Ontario and I do not intend, tonight, to use the articles and the statements in these files to flagellate this government any further for their treatment of the Indians in the past years.

Certainly, I think this department has been wanting in their treatment of the Indians of Ontario, but I feel that this department alone is not responsible. I think the members of this chamber, the people of Ontario, and Canadians generally have a responsibility in this matter that they have not lived up to in the past. This is a situation that has existed for over 100 years and I think it is time that something was done about it and I would suggest that this is a problem that should not be allowed to fall into petty partisan politics. This is a problem that concerns all the people of Ontario, and that should be on the consciences of all the people of Ontario.

I intended to say a great many things that have already been said here tonight, Mr. Chairman, but one thing that bothers me is that in most of the literature that I have read, indeed, in a great many of the speeches that I have heard here tonight, the fact that the Indian himself, his culture and his philosophy have, to a great extent, been ignored. An Indian is not a white man. His philosophy, his culture, his sociological background, are different. I would quote from an article I have in front of me.

> The average white Canadian is caught up in a whirlwind of materialism. You are judged not by what you are but by what you have. Indian society has its roots in a communal way of life with instincts of sharing, not acquiring. Materialism, the gathering of more and better goods for their own sakes rather than usefulness, is a foreign concept for the Indian.

I would like to take a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, to dwell on this idea tonight. The Indian lives in a different world than the white man and as I said tonight there seems to me to be a strain, a thread, running through a great many of the suggestions made and, indeed, in some of the government's policies, that we are going to make the Indian into a white man, and we are going to do this mainly by economic development, by instilling into the Indians the desire for accumulation, for material goods, that he earn his own living, that he pay his own way, that he, in effect, adopt the Protestant ethic of hard work and the good life flowing from that.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that these have been the thoughts that have been running through a great deal of the discussion concerning the Indians and it bothers me and it frightens me. I rose to speak on this particular issue with some trepidation because I dislike at best of times tampering with other people's lives, and it bothers me especially that I should rise and make suggestions for changing the whole way of life of another people so that they may come to accept my philosophy of life, and what I think is good for them. This is a frightening concept, Mr. Chairman, and I say to this House that I think that we should all bear in mind just what we are dealing with when we talk about Indians.

Let us not lose sight of the main problem, the Indian himself and what he is. What he is, not what we would make of him. So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this thought be paramount in our minds and in the minds of those speakers who will follow me that we remember what the Indian is and what he wants to be, not what we shall make of him.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, in the early part of the session I went with the hon. member for Port Arthur and Xavier Michon, whom the member for Thunder Bay referred to earlier, to see about housing for the Indians in the Thunder Bay area. We were advised on that trip by the Ontario housing corporation that there were two surveys being done for housing for the Indians. I am wondering if the Minister has any information on those two surveys.

Mr. Chairman: I would advise the member that the Minister will answer all questions after there are no more speakers.

Mrs. M. Renwick: The other small question, Mr. Chairman is under item 5, friendship centres. I am wondering how many there are and where they are. And under item 4, just exactly what has been provided under item 4?

Also a small comment, Mr. Chairman, on Xavier Michon's visit to Toronto in search of housing for his fellow people in the Port Arthur area. He specifically outlined, and I think the Minister might like to know this, that the transition from the reserve into the cities is sometimes a disastrous one for the Indians. In his own experience and his own view, he prefers housing of a halfway nature —not completely in the city, nor left too far out, but a part-way housing development where the Indian could make a transition into the trials and the fascinations of the new city life.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I rise to support the earlier remarks of the leader of our party, the leader of the Opposition, and then latterly the remarks of the hon. member, my colleague from Rainy River. I have lived in northwestern Ontario for nine years now and have taken a very specific interest in Indian people in various ways and I feel very confident in saying now that our Indian people have lost their pride. I think it is the saddest thing in the world to see a man who is ashamed of his own nationality and ashamed of what he is, and that is the truth of the matter. Too many of them can no longer hold their heads up high.

I can remember very naively six years ago having seen the Winnebego Indians from Wisconsin come to the Lakehead and put on

a pow-wow dance in the Prince Arthur hotel. They were extremely proud Indians, terribly proud of what they were, and the way they dressed, the way they danced, the way they held their heads, the way they mixed with the non-Indian people and walked around, extremely proud to be exactly what they were. Being an editor at the time on radio I went back on the air and asked, "What is wrong with the Ojibway? Why do they not have the same pride in what they are? Why do they not start up the pow-wows again, just so as to regenerate, put the fires of pride under their people again?" Because on the other side I had watched most Indian people up there—so many Indian people, I should put it that way—parading through the courts usually on drunken charges or assaults, or something like that. There seemed to be such a great contrast, and the longer I stayed at the Lakehead the longer I came to realize that the Canadian Indian probably has the greatest inferiority complex of any other nationality in this country.

I think that any programme that helps the Indian to regain his pride is one that should be supported by this department. I cannot agree entirely with the leader of the New Democratic Party in the remarks he made earlier, which seem in a general way to pan and condemn the community development programme that has been conducted by this department. As liaison member between the Fort William city council and the Ojibway—the Fort William Indian mission band council—two years ago, I had the opportunity to attend many of their community development meetings. I was very pleasantly surprised to find that the Indian on that particular reserve had suddenly become organized. Perhaps the white man had given the leadership but it was the Indian leaders who were leading.

I do not think there is anything wrong with that system; what is perhaps wrong is the people who are conducting this system. If you have the right people in the right place in such a system as the one that is operated under this community development programme, I think it will work. The Fort William mission was fortunate to have a little man with an awful lot of energy as director in Father Maurice, and he made it click there, and believe you me, when this programme clicks it does an awful lot of good.

Six years ago, shortly after I saw the Winnebego's dance, I called up Chief Frank Pelletier of the Indian reserve and asked him if I could come out and talk to the people at a meeting. I went out and in no uncertain words I told them that I was kind of ashamed that I had not seen any Indian people involved in any real activities in the community in the city of Fort William and the surrounding area. They seemed to be left out of everything; not so much left out as they did not seem to want to include themselves in it. I was rather forceful at the time and they sat there with blank expressions on their faces and when we walked out of the meeting I said to Chief Pelletier, "Well, I guess I have really done it, eh? I suppose this has pretty well turned the Indians against me for being so frank." He said, "I do not know." Well, I said, "When will I know their reaction?" He said, "Well, possibly in about four months from now."

So that was the situation then. But last year when I went back to the same mission and attended, not a meeting of the band council this time, but a meeting of the community development association within this reserve, it was completely different; everything was organized into committees. There was a committee for the community centre, a committee to control the water supply or the watersheds where the water for the city of Fort William is derived, a committee to handle the tourist lookout attraction site on Mount McKay, another committee to handle recreation; everything was set up into committees and it was all Indian people running those committees. Everything was completely organized.

I remember going back to the Fort William city council and saying, "Now, gentlemen, you are no longer dealing with the same kind of people at the Indian mission reserve. It is very obvious to me that we had better pave that road through the reserve because it is indicated in the water contract, in the treaty with the Indian people, that if we do not keep up this road through the Indian reserve they can block us from taking water from Loch Lomond" and I said, "They are getting organized now, they are re-reading that agreement and I think we are going to have trouble with them before long if we do not do something about it."

Sure enough, currently the Indian people have banded together, they have engaged an attorney, and where the city of Fort William was paying $1,500 a year for the use of that water, the Indian people are now asking for $30,000 a year.

So the Indians, who four or five years previously were just satisfied to be sort of pushed around, *comme-ci, comme-ça,* these people who did not get involved in anything,

or get organized, are suddenly organized. They are demanding their rights; they have some pride, and it is not a case of white bureaucracy, it is a case of using the better aspects of white bureaucracy and applying them in a very practical way to an Indian community. And I think this department should investigate what has been accomplished at the Fort William Indian reserve. Possibly more important than anything else is that the people seem to have more joy of life, more pride.

If I could leave that for a moment, I would go back to the Port Arthur Indian youth friendship centre, which was referred to by two hon. members of the New Democratic Party. Here again you have the same situation only this time under the leadership of Xavier Michon. Under his leadership Indian youth this time has been organized into committees to help themselves. This is very closely related to welfare, I say to the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, because I remember when Xavier first contemplated this centre as director of the news department of the local television station up there.

We had many long chats, and he told me at that time how he used to drive along sort of the slum area of Port Arthur between 10 p.m. and 1 o'clock in the morning, looking for these young Indians, because he had grown up in Port Arthur and he had seen how young Indians had been—for want of a better word—contaminated, by older Indians—"rubbydubs", you know, people who are pretty well over the hill.

Naturally the young Indians coming in from the reserves to study in the Lakehead, not knowing where else to go, would find their way down and find Indian people on Pearl Street and Cumberland Street and areas like that. So Michon would go along in his car and he would spot one and he would jump out of the car and would go and get him and bring him back to the car and take several of them back to their foster home or their boarding house, wherever they were living, one after another.

But he said, "Ron, I am sick and tired of patrolling the streets at night for these youngsters. I want to give them an alternative, I want to give them a place where they can band together and where we can give them some pride and get them to develop their talents and give them real social life while they are away from their families." And that is how the youth friendship centre came about. He was fortunate in convincing not only me but many other leading people in the community in the city of Port Arthur to help him out.

I noticed today that the federal government has just approved another $5,000 annual grant to the youth centre. The federal member for Port Arthur, in making the announcement, said he felt sure that the provincial grant would again be forthcoming this year. And I would like to say that this is the kind of thing the department can do very well, to support someone like Xavier Michon who I always refer to as the missing link. That is what he is. He can speak to white people and he can speak to the Indians. He is accepted both ways and he is very effective in his position. But I would hope that the department would consider increasing its grant from last year, matching the federal government dollar for dollar if necessary.

Then there is this housing programme that Xavier has in mind. He has seen whole Indian families leave the reserve and come into the city of Port Arthur and not know where to go so they just automatically wind their way down the beaten path—right down into the slum area and find whatever shack or whatever little hole in the wall that they could climb into and join their fellow Indians on the welfare lists of the city of Port Arthur.

Now Xavier has been close to the situation. He says: Wait a minute, let us stomp them before they get to the slums. Let us build a little housing development. Let us get an area just on the outskirts of the city, have them come there first, have a talk with them, find out what they need and what they want and then try to place them in the city, in a proper place. Not in a slum area alongside of other people who will contaminate them, who will just make them wards of society—humiliated people, degraded people. Let us have a half-way house, I think that is the expression that Xavier used when I last spoke to him. And the last word I had from the Ontario housing corporation was that they were already trying two experiments along these lines, on Manitoulin Island and Moosonee, and they just did not have room for any more such experiments.

I think Fort William and Port Arthur are the clearing house of the northwest. The Indians who come down out of the northwest, come into the Lakehead, naturally. We are talking about some 200,000 square miles up in that area, and I think we should not delay in acting on Xavier Michon's suggestion, because he is very close to the problem. A lot

of us speak from books and we quote from speeches and things when we are talking about the Indians, but Xavier does not; when he goes out to the reserve he lives with the people. Whatever bed is good enough for them is good enough for Mich. He feels for them. And I think his suggestion of a half-way house at the Lakehead should be given far more consideration and I would certainly hope that it would be acted upon.

By all means, whatever we can do as non-Indian people, and as a department of government that has the power of spending money in this direction – to rebuild the Indians' pride–then I think that that is exactly what we should do. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any other members wishing to speak on the Indian development branch before the Minister replies?

The member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Just a few words, Mr. Chairman.

This vote comes to a total of $4,000,428, and of course none of us begrudge any of those dollars on this vote. But when you go back into the records of what this department has asked the House to vote and compare what has been spent, we well realize that we are giving the Indians anything but a total service.

For example, for the year ending March 31, 1967, this House voted $741,000 and despite the fact there was a Treasury board order for $5,200, we left unexpended $634,000. Now we voted $741,000 and when we add on the Treasury board order, the government really had available to it, $746,000. But we left unexpended, unused, $634,000. Now why this tremendous amount of money is left unused is hard to understand.

For example, for that year ending March 31, 1967, we voted for community and welfare projects for the Indians $480,000. We actually spent a little over $5,500. Now I wonder, when the Minister says, I am going to spend $1,428,000, I wonder if he really has any programme or what the intentions are. Because this is one obvious case where the government has made a show of what it is going to do before this House, through the committee of supply, and no doubt, when it makes its announcements it is good for a press announcement. We are going to increase what we do for the Indians and yet, when we come back, you have nearly close to 80 to 85 per cent of the moneys voted just not spent–that is, if I am to believe the public accounts. There may be something wrong there, but certainly on the face of it, we simply have not been using even the little money that has been made available for the Indians under this vote.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, just how desperately the Indians need the help of the white community. I think there are approximately 215,000 Indians in all of Canada. I do not know how many of that 215,000 are actually in the province of Ontario. A goodly proportion are in this province and 40 per cent are unemployed and receiving welfare. Could you imagine what a revolutionary state our society would be in if the white community was 40 per cent unemployed?

The health situation among the Indians is that eight times the number of pre-schoolers die in the Indian community compared to white people. Yet, contrary as it may seem, the Indian population in Canada is one of the fastest growing populations in the world. In 15 years it has increased 55 per cent. This is one of the great contradictions in our society–the fact that health-wise, their children are eight times worse off that we as white people, and yet they are growing at a rapid rate, 55 per cent in 15 years.

But you must realize the problem that we are going to face is this: We are duty bound to do everything we can for them health-wise, and although we have not done as much as we could and are obligated to do more, if on humanitarian grounds we are to live up to what we should, it means that the Indian population is going to continue to grow.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, anytime I have had the opportunity to be in Indian communities I do not know where in the world they are going to find work under present standards. I know there are great arguments as to whether they are going to become part of the white community or they are going to remain off by themselves. My own personal view is that they cannot possibly exist if they are going to live off by themselves. There just is not that much hunting and fishing to do in all of Canada, and the competition from the society that is pushing northward all the time is just too much for the Indian as he is today. We are simply going to have to revise, very greatly, the policies that we have had in the past.

The Earl of Elgin, over 114 years ago, said that we were not doing enough for the Indians and that the Indian had among its

peoples, so many able people that could contribute and help themselves. You know this is what the United Nations has been preaching; that we have to help people to help themselves, and the Earl of Elgin was telling us that 114 years ago. We are still dragging our feet on the Indian question—because there is no doubt about it, there is an increased dependence on welfare.

They have a very high incidence of conflict with the law. I see the Indians in my own riding. You may say, "Well how come you have got Indians in the city of Toronto, in Parkdale?" There are a number of Indians in the city of Toronto and I hardly ever meet an Indian unless he is in trouble. They come into our large urban societies and it seems such a large proportion come into conflict with the law.

I think that if any of us knows anything about human nature, no race is born particularly bad or born particularly good and we are going to have to ask ourselves why such a large proportion of the inmates of the Mercer institution are Indians. Is it the fault of the Indians or is it the fault of ourselves? I tell you quite frankly, sir, I believe it is the fault of ourselves.

In all of Canada, there are only 88 Indians who are receiving a university education. How are the Indians going to be able to help themselves if we are so unable to give them the leadership from their own people?

You know we, as Canadians, often think we are helping people in South America develop themselves. We are making contributions to India. We are making contributions to Mexico, and yet the United Nations looks upon a section of our country as very backward and they regard our treatment of the Indians and the condition of the Indians in the same way as we sometimes look at certain sections of Iran or Mexico. It is a strange paradox in the Canadian society that we have let this come to pass.

I would urge the Minister, in summing up, that you have got to do the same for the Indians what we try to do for ourselves, but even more so and that is, the cultivation and the restoration and the conservation of human resources. It is a sad sight, whenever you go into any Indian community, or the ones I have seen. I have seen a number in Manitoba, and I have seen a number, of course, with the members of this House on our trip to the north and the story is very much the same. It is a very tragic situation and we are going to have to do three things for them—the three things that the United Nations recommend whenever we go into any backward community.

You are going to have to involve the people, and so I again ask the members to read what the leader of the Opposition said and what the leader of the NDP said. They emphasized that you have simply got to involve the people and change the basic concept of how we have administered Indian affairs.

And you have to give them access to resources. They simply do not have the access to resources to a sufficient amount in a modern society. To have them fishing is not good enough, and to have them hunting is not good enough. You have simply got to give them the opportunity for far more education than we have in the past. It is inconceivable to be able to say, "Well, they are backward and only 88 of them, in all of Canada, can go to university." Any knowledge of humanity will defy that argument. So we have been sadly lacking in making the resources of our educational system available to the Indians.

Thirdly, this argument comes up almost every time in our own modern government and certainly in the development of backward areas, and that is, that you have to have regional government. You are going to have to treat these areas in certain regions and this, we have not done. The leader of the Opposition has said, and the hon. member for York South has said, there is absolute chaos among the Indians. Even the Indian bands hardly have any legal status. It is questionable today, at this time in our history, whether the Indian band has any legal status. When you have chaos in government how can you develop your resources, be they human or otherwise?

So I urge the Minister to do away with this miserable token effort that has marked this government. The Hawthorne-Tremblay report said, "It is not all the federal responsibility." That report put more of the responsibility on the provincial government but let us not use that as a political football.

Federally and provincially, Conservative or Liberal, we have all been at fault over the years in the treatment of the Indians, and the time has come to turn our backs on the past. We may learn from our mistakes but the time is to look to the future and I say to the Minister—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: You sound like Simonett. Surely you can do better than that.

Mr. Trotter: I say to this Minister—

Mr. White: This has been a federal responsibility—

Mr. Trotter: Well, there is the member for London South.

Mr. White: —for more than 100 years.

Mr. Trotter: You know the hon. Minister of Energy and Management Resources (Mr. Simonett) said that Indians like to live in wigwams—

Mr. Nixon: You have got to be kidding.

Mr. Trotter: —and maybe a lot of us have said this was typical Tory philosophy, like that of the member for London South. But I think it is time—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How could anybody hate the Tories that much?

Mr. Trotter: But I think it is time to look to the future and I am asking the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, to no longer just say vote the sums of money like we did two years ago—$741,000—and ending up spending only about 15 per cent of it. This is not good enough, so let us go to work and redress the wrongs of the past and show our Indian fellow countrymen that we have a sincere desire to treat them as a fellow human being.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

We have had a lengthy and a very good debate, some of which indicated that the responsibility for policy rests with this government and not constitutionally with the federal government. I object to the hon. member for London South going out and drinking coffee and ignoring the debate and coming in here and repeating the same sort of political, cheap statement—

An hon. member: All right!

Mr. MacDonald: After being—

Mr. White: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I was not out drinking coffee. I was out dictating 75 letters, many of them to poor citizens in my riding and I want to say that the—

Mr. Stokes: You admit you were out.

Mr. White: I want to say that the Indian situation in this country is a national disgrace—

Mr. Nixon: That is no point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. White: —and that the primary responsibility lies with the Indian branch in Ottawa—

Mr. MacDonald: If you had been here, you would find the exclusive responsibility does not rest with the federal government.

Mr. White: That the Indian branch in Ottawa has frustrated every effort made from Queen's Park to remedy the situation, and if these people—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. White: If these people are sincere they will attempt to get their federal colleagues to correct that disgrace.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. White: And you know it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, may I say a word or two before the Minister makes—

Mr. Chairman: On the point of order?

Mr. Spence: No.

Mr. Chairman: In connection with this vote?

Mr. Spence: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: All right.

Mr. Spence: I will not rehash what has been said, but I must say, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the Minister, that I have the honour to represent, through my riding, an Indian reservation known as the Moravian Indian reservation.

There has been a great deal said about the Indians in many aspects of their livelihood, but I want to say that the Indian reservation lacks—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Spence: The Indian reservation lacks drainage, there is no drainage on these Indian reservations and the Indian reservation is covered—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: Go out and have another cup of coffee or dictate another 75 letters.

Mr. Spence: The Indian reservation is covered with scrub timber. If there was a programme to clean up and drain the land on these Indian reservations this land would rent out and supplement the income of the Indian in our part of the province. I know in other parts of the province as well it would supplement their income, which would be a lot better than giving them welfare; and this would last not only for one year, this would last for many years. The land on some of these reservations is very rich land. A little programme in cleaning up, clearing the brush and giving drainage would do a tremendous lot for the Indians in many parts of the province of Ontario.

I will not rehash anything that has been said. There has been a great deal said, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the wisdom that lay behind your decision to permit all members of the Legislature to express their views and then for me to follow can be summed up by my telling you, and through you the House, that I am in complete agreement with a good deal of what has been said.

Mr. MacDonald: What are you doing about it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And it need not be repeated by me in this regard. With one or two exceptions and some clarification much of what *Hansard* will record, this could have been said by me had it not been said by others.

The leader of the Opposition follows a unique family tradition. I always remember one of the outstanding contributions his late father made was with regard to the problems related to Indians. He had an intimate and a very personal knowledge of it, combined with a warm affection for his particular band.

Mr. Nixon: And he did not pay $50 to become a chief.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say to the leader of the NDP, with much of what he has said, I, too, am in complete agreement. I would point out one or two places where I will clarify and perhaps set down in the record something that may bring him and the member for London South perhaps along the same point of view—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Much of it was critical of your department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: When it comes to the interpretation of responsibility and the full significance of the assumption of responsibility, I was pleased that he saw fit to read into the record, much of what the hon. member for Kenora has said in the past.

I have no doubt that the hon. member had the opportunity of being present tonight but he is away on constituency business, he informed me. He was going to make some remarks and I am pleased with what the hon. member for York South did see fit to read into the record, because with much of what he said, in fact with almost the total, I am in complete agreement.

Mr. MacDonald: What are you doing?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the whole thing can be summed up in four words —new attitudes and new approaches. Not so much as just the fact that these are new, but the adoption and putting into effect of approaches—of attitudes and approaches—which may have been kicking around for a while—

Mr. Trotter: Very long!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Kicking around for a while and have finally jelled.

I was very interested when the leader of the Opposition made reference to attitudes and the psychological and physiological approach to the Indian problem. The member for Rainy River touched upon this aspect of the attitude as to what separates and what can bring together the Indian and the non-Indian and the Indian with his ways and the non-Indian with his ways. That is the terminology that I have begun to use, not as to putting the Indian and the white man in opposite camps, but for the purpose of clarification of the two groups—the Indian and the non-Indian.

New attitudes—now these are not completely new attitudes because certain people, sir, have been expressing these for a goodly number of years. But right in the year 1968, following upon 1967, there is a much greater acceptance that attitudes of the past, generally, held by the public and people in responsibility, have not worked.

There must be new attitudes, and I need not expound those, but primarily, there is a recognition of the fact that the Indian is a

man who has a unique culture and background, and that he, with the assistance of the non-Indian, must find his way to the type of life which he wished for himself and his children.

The Indian—and I am using generalities—has come to recognize those things that others have pointed out—that there is no longer sufficient hunting or fishing or those things which were historically available to him, and that because he is living in the 20th century he must bring himself into the 20th century's stream.

Then of course, there is a change of attitude among his fellow citizens, that this concept—this idea of the kind of person the Indian is—is completely wrong. If the Indian is any different from the non-Indian, it is because he has not been given a chance. There is no passive person on the face of the globe that, given an opportunity, will not find his way to sharing a fuller life, and this I think is the basic need in this attitude.

I might say that I come with a completely fresh sheet, because the first time I ever came into contact with the Indians was as a boy scout on the banks of the Grand River where it was pointed out to me that on the other side, in the Caledonia area, there were a band of Indians. My concept of the Indian was a completely romantic one. A man of unusual ability, of unusual skill, and it was only comparatively recently that I recognized or saw the attitude of many of our citizens—that this picture of the Indian was not what was held.

They had a completely different image, and one of the things that we must achieve, I think as a basic principle, is that the public at large must change in their approach to the Indian. He is a romantic figure in our history and he has a rightful place in the development of our history, and he should be one of our most respected citizens. I am hopeful that one of the things that will be done, unrelated to development specifically—through our department, and through The Department of Education in particular—is that throughout the schools of Ontario our youth will have as complete an understanding of our Indian population they should have of all of the citizens of this province in their entire make up of so many cultures. It is the new attitude, the new approaches, and here again in the light of something that is just brand new, a new building or hatching of an egg. This may not be the complete answer perhaps, but it is new in that there is a complete adoption of a new attitude. This is where I want to dwell on this emergence within the government of Ontario, and the chief factor is the vehicles we are using.

I touched very briefly upon the Cabinet committee, and its counterpart in the civil service, the interdepartmental committee. The interdepartmental committee is becoming an accepted vehicle throughout the government in total for carrying out responsibilities where there are overlapping jurisdictions. It has been my conviction that no other departmental committee is as important in making effective our work as this one is in order to come to grips with the problem.

I am delighted to say that at the meeting of the subcommittee of Cabinet, and I think that I can say this without any breach of my oath of secrecy, that never have I attended a Cabinet committee meeting in which there was such out-and-out complete endorsation of the necessity for interdepartmental co-operation and enthusiasm. I point to my immediate colleagues here, the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), and the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), both of whom have responsibilities with regard to the Indian, and both of whom have an intimate knowledge of Indians, because they have contact with them. The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), who traditionally has had this over a period of years, had a great interest, and I am delighted to say that he is going to build upon his predecessor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I also should mention the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), in addition, Economics and Development, and the Ontario housing corporation. There are really two representatives in there—Municipal Affairs and Labour—in addition to those that I mentioned, with the chairmanship of myself, and my counterpart in the interdepartmental committee. I am delighted to say that the representation on the interdepartmental committee is made up of that level within the public service just below the deputy ministerial level. They are the people who are actually charged with the execution of matters within the department.

Putting Deputy Ministers on too many committees has its drawbacks because they become overloaded. We have designed this so that we could get as close to the Deputy Minister as possible, plus those who will execute the work. This is the secret of this interdepartmental committee. The leader of the

NDP group touched upon departmental jealousies. You know the type of thing. I may say that I have accepted as a fact that every Minister involved in this committee has, without reserve, indicated his full participation and that of his department under the leadership of The Department of Social and Family Services and the chairman. This is not to say that they will not continue with their own work.

For an example, let me take the Minister of Agriculture and Food, who has a great deal to do with ARDA. ARDA is a programme available to all of our citizens, and the Minister has made the announcement in the past where there are specific ARDA programmes to be made in respect of Indians. It is through this committee that we hope to channel all of the resources and know-how of the various departments to come to grips with either specific situations, like an ARDA situation, or to bring to bear all of the departments where there is a community development project. The efficacy of the approach is this. The province has the resources, the know-how, the experience, and we have an organization which—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have the know-how and the resources. Mr. Chairman, we set up our own organization, the Cabinet subcommittee and the interdepartmental committee, to be channeled through the newly established Indian development branch, to be channeled at the grass-roots level, to the Indian development officer, and this is one place where I disagree with the hon. member for York South. I believe that the Indian development officer has a great contribution to make because he is at the end of this "know-how", and resource.

We have set up, with this vehicle within the provincial sector another very basic principle of the involvement of the Indian himself, and this is—

Mr. MacDonald: Can we deal with this issue now?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Let me finish, let me complete the picture.

Mr. MacDonald: Before you move on, can we deal with it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York South will please do me the courtesy and fairness of permitting me at least one tenth of the time that has been taken up by all the members of the House.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. You can conduct the House in the way you want, but the Minister took two hours of speeches, and 15 different questions, and he is now beginning to comment on each of those questions. After he has commented on the 15, we are going to have to come back. At 10 o'clock tomorrow night, we are going to be back, going over the questions which he is moving through seriatim.

If the House leader wants to deal with it in this inefficient way, this is fine, but I am giving fair warning that the Minister is not going to "snow" us into silence before he meets important issues in this orgy of enthusiasm about his committee.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, that is no point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You made your speech and I have adopted most of it already for my remarks.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the—

Mr. Chairman: Order please. I think when the debate started, after we had about two speakers, I believe it was agreed that the Minister would answer the questions after all speakers had said what they intended to. There were eight, nine, or ten different speakers and it has taken some considerable time. I realize it is going to be difficult for the Minister to answer them all but I do not think he intends to just cut off debate, I think he is going to entertain questions afterwards. This is what he intimated in the first place.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Your summation is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: So I think if the members will please afford him the courtesy of speaking—he listened to nine or ten people very faithfully.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We have Indian involvement and this again involves a very basic principle that the Indian, individually and as a group, must be involved. We are fortunate that we have the continuation within the department of the Indian advisory committee, with whom I have met and with whom I have spoken very frankly. As I have spoken here. I have indicated to them much of what

has been said here tonight I have said to them I have adopted this approach myself as the responsible Minister in this regard.

If there has not been consultation in any one area, I do not know how it came about, because the very basic principle that this department is dedicated to is Indian development. Even in the Moosonee project that one of the hon. members touched upon, the board of Governors of that centre does have a representative in the Moosonee Indian community, and has a local advisory committee composed of residents both Indian and non-Indian. That is a basic thing that I have said and stressed to the department and to the head of the Indian development branch, that there will be a continuous consultation with the Indian advisory committee, with the Indian in the community, so that we may know that what we are doing is acceptable.

It must be acceptable or we will never have any success, because, as the member for Rainy River says, to impose, to thrust upon, is something that has been tried over a long period of time, and has been found wanting. The only problem that this presents is that consultation back and forth does create delay. I have reached an understanding with our Indian advisory committee that these channels of communication must be made as expeditious as possible in order to make sure that this worthy principle does not become an obstacle.

That is the vehicle within the government of the province of Ontario. We reached this point because far from what has been said, this government has indicated its willingness and its adoption of a new approach. We were the only province to sign the welfare services agreement—

Mr. Nixon: What was the date of that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was signed on May 19, 1966.

Mr. Nixon: May?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May. We were the only province to do that. We signed the Indian development agreement; we were the only province to do this.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Liberal provinces never did? The CCF in Saskatchewan never did?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: None of the provinces did. We went into the two agreements on a certain understanding, and that is what the money first began to be provided for in this department because we had an understanding of what was going to take place.

I am not going to get involved at this stage of the game in castigations or criticisms of the federal government, because one of the things that will be done immediately that there is a new government in Ottawa is that negotiations, which we were teeing up prior to June 25, will then come into being, because it is understood that there is going to be a new Indian Act. We are hopeful, and indications have been this, that prior to the putting into effect of the new Indian Act we will be consulted to the fullest, as will the Indians, I trust, be consulted to the fullest.

We talk about responsibility, which the hon. member for York South touched upon and the hon. member for London South touched upon. Responsibility can mean responsibility of someone who is charged with doing something. Presently I am charged with putting into effect the government's policy with relation to Indian matters, but the Treasurer of the province shares that responsibility with me as do the Treasury board because they must provide me with the funds, as they have. This is where the big misunderstanding has taken place between the provincial and the federal level. Who is going to provide the dollars?

This is the crux, and if you read the report that the hon. member names—the Hawthorne report—where they talk about responsibility and the shifting of functions and so on, always in the background is the one key factor and this is the provision of moneys to discharge the federal responsibility. As I say, to me it is so clear that it is the federal government which traditionally has had this responsibility. This has been accepted right across the nation, and the other provinces subscribe to it almost completely because they have not participated in the agreements. They say, "That is your responsibility." We have adopted this stand that we have the know-how, the resources; you provide us with the funds and we will do the job. Without taking a hard and fast position on that, we have gone further—we have provided $1 million in this department branch to look after these things where before we had assumed that the money for those things would be coming from Ottawa under an Indian development agreement.

I say to the hon. member for York South, whether it is under the total umbrella, or whether it is under specific agreements, I, as a Minister, need the dollars to carry out the job.

Mr. Nixon: Are there any federal moneys in this programme?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Very small.

Mr. Nixon: Like what?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The federal government has interpreted the agreement *vis-à-vis* the expenditure of the dollar, that they will share with us in the cost of our Indian development officers in the field, and some of the services that they do. In the budget, when you are talking about Indian development, that is a very minor portion.

When you are going to develop a community you need that kind of sharing, you need sharing in the capital costs through the provision of those physical things that are necessary in order that a community be developed. This is the major issue which has to be ironed out between this government and the Ottawa government. I say to the hon. member for York South, who asked the question as to the block: That is where the block is.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, having in mind the cut and thrust, I move that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has adopted certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with the estimates of this department.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 96



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, May 28, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 28, 1968

Questions to Mr. Simonett re the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, Mr. Nixon 3459

Questions to Mr. Davis re the information systems committee, Mr. Nixon 3459

Questions to Mr. Gomme re Highway 401, Mr. Nixon 3460

Question to Mr. Brunelle re the departmental takeover of private forest lands, Mr. Stokes 3460

Questions to Mr. Haskett re the driver examination centre at Sarnia, Mr. Bullbrook 3460

Questions to Mr. Robarts re the minutes of the Niagara parks commission, Mr. Shulman 3461

Question to Mr. Robarts re The Business Corporations Act and The Securities Act, Mr. Shulman 3462

Question to Mr. Robarts re a charge of brutality at Guelph reformatory, Mr. Shulman 3462

Questions to Mr. Davis re George Brown college of applied arts and technology, Mr. T. Reid 3463

Presenting report, Mr. Welch 3464

Question to Mr. Rowntree re the purchase and sale of rubber footwear, Mr. Martel 3464

Estimates, Department of Social and Family Services, Mr. Yaremko, concluded 3464

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman 3491

Recess, 6 o'clock 3500

Appendix 3501

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 28, 1968

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Once again today in our galleries we have students from a number of schools, with others to join us later in the afternoon. At the present time, in the east gallery we have students from Holy Cross school in Georgetown, and from Errol Road public school in Sarnia; and in the west gallery, from McKillop public school in Walton. Later this afternoon, we will be joined by pupils from Dublin public school hosting students from Riverview public school in Ottawa, and by students from St. Philip's school in Petrolia.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. It was made available to his office, I believe, yesterday.

Is the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario a shareholder of Canadian enterprise development corporation?

If so, is the Minister aware that CED is described, in their own brochure, as a, and I quote, "risk capital investor" and, therefore, how can he justify the involvement of public funds through Hydro?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the answer is "no". The Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario is not a shareholder of Canadian enterprise development corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain that the investment which has given rise to this question relates to the pension fund administered by the Ontario Hydro commission. The decision to have the pension fund invest in this corporation was documented in a memorandum to the commission dated October 30, 1962, and approved by the commission October 31, 1962, and basically followed the principle of diversifying portions of the pension fund into potential good earning situations.

It was not anticipated that the earnings from this corporation as a venture capital investment company would be immediate, but over the longer term, substantially higher returns would be forthcoming, compared with the blue-chip-type investments.

The original shareholders, together with the pension fund of the Ontario Hydro, were major Canadian institutions in both life insurance and pension funds. The pension fund holds 1,250 shares at a cost of $250,000. The value at December 31, 1967 was $290,000.

I table herewith, a list of shareholders of the Canadian enterprise development corporation, together with a statement of the corporation's objectives and a list of the officers.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask a supplementary question.

Is the Minister aware that in the brochure, under the heading "Institutional Shareholders of CED", along with the list that no doubt the Minister is tabling, there is included the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, not just its pension fund?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, in the list I have, it is the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario pension fund.

Mr. Nixon: Would it be possible for us to exchange these lists so that we could have a look at it? Right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education.

What is the purpose of the meeting of the Minister's information systems committee to be held at the Constellation hotel, Toronto, tomorrow through Friday?

Will the statistics on pupils, teachers, school plants, transportation and finance be made available to members of the Legislature in time to be considered in the debate on the estimates of The Department of Education?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question: The Minister's

information systems committee is perhaps a term not completely understood by all members opposite. This committee really emanated from the former Minister's committee of the CEA. It has now been transferred as a portion of the responsibility of the Minister's council, and really, it is a committee representative of all The Departments of Education in the country, not just relating to the province of Ontario.

They have been conducting studies and having meetings, Mr. Speaker—the last, I guess, two and a half to three months ago—to try to develop some common approach with respect to definition of the use of computers and computer technology for the statistical information that could be available from one provincial jurisdiction to another. In other words, all the provinces are endeavouring to get together to agree on common definitions, and as I recall it, the DBS people are also involved so that their, shall we say, definitions will be the same.

This meeting tomorrow through Friday, relates to work this committee has been carrying on in this on-going study, Mr. Speaker. I would be quite delighted to get a copy of their interim report from the meeting of the total Ministers' committees, I believe it was, in September in Regina. This will bring him up to date on what has gone on. But it is, as I say, a gathering to discuss further the desirability and the practicability of bringing in line definitions as they relate between provincial jurisdictions and DBS.

Mr. Nixon: I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would permit, whether the purpose is to compare the statistics from each of the jurisdictions—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The purpose is not one of comparison at all; it is a question of determining definitions for the information that is put into computers for the compiling of statistics. It is really an agreement on how we approach it, not to compare, shall we say, the number of pupils in grade 8 in Ontario with the number of pupils in grade 8 in some other jurisdiction, or the costs or anything else. It is a question of coming at some common means of definition so that we can get comprehensive statistics on a national basis.

Mr. Nixon: Having to do with the second question, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister will permit, the statistics that might have been forthcoming from this meeting would have been normally included in the annual report of the Minister, is that not so?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, they are not necessarily the same statistics at all. The Minister's report will contain those figures relevant to the province of Ontario. It will not include—nor do I envisage the Minister's report in this province including statistics from another provincial jurisdiction. I think over a period of years this would be compiled into a single document representative of all the provinces.

Mr. Nixon: I have questions, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Highways.

1. What is the contract completion date for the section of Highway 401 between Yonge Street and Bayview Avenue?

2. What penalties for late completion can be imposed by the contract?

3. Is there any reason why these penalties will not be imposed if the contract is not completed on time?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the answers are as follows:

1. The contract called for the work to be completed by November 15, 1967;

2. The liquidated damage clauses in this contract indicate that $500 per day can be imposed;

3. Yes, subject to the effect of the construction strikes of last year.

Mr. Nixon: Might I ask of the Minister, Mr. Speaker, if he will permit, is there a clause in the contract that exempts the contractor if there is a strike of sufficient importance, or is this just by agreement?

Mr. Speaker: There is no answer. The member for Thunder Bay has the floor.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Will the Minister implement the provisions of Bill 115 regarding the takeover by his department of private forest lands? If not, why not?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): In answer to the hon. member for Thunder Bay, the legislation of Bill 115 will be implemented.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sarnia.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I have five questions, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Transport.

1. Would the Minister confirm that the location of the driver examination centre at Sarnia has been established to be on a parcel

of land immediately adjacent to a building presently housing the Ontario Provincial Police and a brewers' retail store, and owned by a common owner?

2. Is the Minister aware that an application has been or is being made to the liquor licence board of Ontario to convert the said building to a licensed hotel premises?

3. Does the location of the driver examination centre next to a licensed premises cause any concern to the Minister?

4. Would the Minister advise which, if any, city of Sarnia officials or city of Sarnia police officials were consulted with respect to the location of the said driver examination centre?

5. Would the Minister specify the names of those officials who recommended the proposed location?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the member's five questions are, respectively:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. The establishment of a driver examination centre next to an existing liquor licensed premise would.

4. An official of my department discussed the location with Sarnia's director of planning to assure that it would comply with the city's bylaws and urban renewal plan and conform to the city's traffic study findings.

5. After advertising in the Sarnia paper for a suitable site, officials of The Department of Public Works and my department selected the present location.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would the Minister entertain a supplementary question?

Is he aware that it is the consensus of opinion in the city of Sarnia that The Department of Public Works and your department picked the worst possible site available?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The answer, sir, obviously is "no".

Mr. Bullbrook: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Highways.

Would the Minister advise what provincial financial participation there is with respect to the proposed bridge to be built between the mainland and Walpole Island?

Second, would the Minister advise why specifications in connection with the tender of the contract for the erection of such bridge was not received by the Sarnia construction association depository until one week prior to the opening of tenders, while such specifications were received by other communities from two to three weeks in advance?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, this question will take a little research and I will take it as notice.

Mr. Bullbrook: I have a question for the hon. Attorney General.

Could the Minister advise the reasons for the removal of the Sarnia detachment of the Ontario Provincial Police from Sarnia to Petrolia, particularly with a view to the following: (a) The volume of present traffic in the Sarnia area and especially the location of proposed Highway 402; (b) The population concentration of the area; (c) The history of Ontario Provincial Police activity in the Sarnia area?

Could the Minister advise as to whether Ontario Provincial Police officials were consulted in connection with the removal of the detachment to Petrolia and what their advice was in connection with such removal?

Would the Minister specify the officer or officers who recommended such removal?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I have considerable knowledge of this matter, but in view of the specific inquiries which are contained in the question I have asked the Ontario Provincial Police to give me a complete report. I will be able to answer very shortly.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have three questions for the Prime Minister.

First, when will I be allowed to examine the minutes of the Niagara parks commission as promised by the chairman of the Niagara parks commission in committee?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I am told by the chairman of the commission that he extended an invitation to the standing committee on government commissions to visit the Niagara parks system and that he would at that time make the minutes available to members of that committee. If the hon. member is a member of that committee, I assume that he will journey to Niagara when the time comes and will have an opportunity then of examining the minutes. I am also informed that the committee has not yet set a date for the visit, but this is a matter to be arranged by the chairman of the committee with the chairman of the commission.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That was not what happened—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I leave the functioning of the committee to the committee chairman. Certainly it is in able hands there. In any event, that is the arrangement as I understand it, as I am informed. I am not a member of that committee and I was not there, but when the committee visits the Niagara parks, then the minutes of the commission will be made available to the members.

Mr. Nixon: Is there any chance there will not be time for that?

Mr. Shulman: Will the Prime Minister accept a supplementary question?

An hon. member: Do not get too close to the Falls when you are there.

Mr. Speaker: The member has inquired if the Prime Minister will accept a supplementary question.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Prime Minister not feel that perhaps it might be easier for the minutes to travel to the committee rather than for the committee to travel to the minutes?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I make no comment, I simply say that I am informed that this is the arrangement that was made and I assume it was made with the consent of the members of the committee. Perhaps it might go back to the committee if there is some further arrangement.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): The Prime Minister was wrongly informed.

Mr Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Prime Minister has been wrongly informed. I was there and I say with authority, with positive authority, that the Prime Minister has been wrongly informed.

Mr. Shulman: And I will agree with that. However, I am sure the Prime Minister will look into it.

I have a second question for the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister make changes in The Business Corporations Act and/or The Ontario Securities Act to prevent advantage being taken by associates or relatives of insiders regardless of whether they are domiciled with the insiders?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I believe this question was examined quite carefully prior to the drafting of The Corporations Act and The Corporations Information Act which were introduced in this House on May 17. Those bills were put on the order paper in order that representation might be made if changes are considered to be required and necessary.

If representations are made to this effect, and if the modifications as suggested are deemed to be necessary, then that will be dealt with when the bill as revised comes back into this House.

As far as The Securities Act is concerned, I am not aware that any such changes are immediately contemplated. Once again, we rewrote The Securities Act relatively recently and it is under constant review in order that we may make modifications if they appear to be necessary. No doubt these questions are being considered there, and if the member would like to make representation to the Minister, I am certain that he would be quite prepared to give full consideration to any recommendations.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

Finally, will the Prime Minister set up an all-party committee to investigate the charge of brutality at Guelph reformatory, as detailed in today's Toronto *Daily Star*?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of setting up an all-party committee to look into this matter. I believe the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) dealt with this a week or so ago, and answered the member's question in the House. In view of the reports in the newspaper, I will ask him to review the situation, just to be certain that such things that are set out in that article did not, in fact, happen.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Prime Minister accept a supplementary question?

Is the Prime Minister aware that the answer as given by the Minister of Reform Institutions in the House last week was an absolute contradiction to the story as set out in today's paper?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, there are certain credibility gaps in certain things that appear in the newspapers, and I do not think that on the basis of a newspaper story we can set up an all-party committee of this House, in effect, to check on the report that the Minister, advised by his officials, made. I will ask him to not disregard this particular article in today's paper, but to be sure

that the report he gave to this House was, in fact, correct.

We have no desire, nor would we ever countenance this type of behaviour, but certainly because six inmates make certain allegations, I do not see that this is cause for a complete investigation into the administration of this particular institution, when the matter has already been looked at. I think we need to look at it again, to make sure that we are satisfied that these reports are not correct.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. It is about the George Brown college of applied arts and technology. It is in eight parts.

First, how many science and mathematics teachers are employed at the George Brown college of applied arts and technology? How many of these teachers hold a certificate for teaching from The Department of Education? How many, if any, non-certified teachers are university graduates? Of the remaining teachers, how many have grade 13?

Second, what are the standards and regulations of The Department of Education concerning the qualifications necessary for persons to be eligible to teach science and mathematics, at the college of applied arts and technology? Have these regulations been adhered to at the George Brown college of applied arts and technology?

Third, is it true that a person can be appointed a teaching master at George Brown college only if he has at the minimum, an honour degree or an ordinary degree plus trade qualifications? If the answer is yes, are there any masters at George Brown college who do not have these minimum qualifications?

Fourth, are there any chairmen who do not have university degrees? Specifically, does the chairman of the department of architectural technology have a university degree? If not, why not?

Fifth, what are the academic and/or professional qualifications of the assistant chairman of the department of architectural technology?

Sixth, did a person apply for the position of chairman, or assistant chairman, of the department of architectural technology who had a university degree in science?

Seventh, does the registrar have a university degree? If not, why not?

Eighth, whereas the principal of George Brown college has a university degree and his technical institute teaching certificate, in what technical field is his certificate?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this question to a degree follows the question asked by the hon. member, I believe last Friday. At that time I indicated to him that I was not in a position to answer the fourth part of his question, and I am really just a little concerned as to whether or not a question of this nature should not be directed elsewhere. I am sure the principal of the institution would be more than prepared to give the answer or to sit down and chat with the hon. member about it.

I am wondering if the hon. member were, for instance, to ask me to list all the faculty and their qualifications, say at York University for the sake of argument, is it appropriate for the Minister of University Affairs to undertake to do the necessary research and answer the hon. member?

Mind you, were I asked this question at York, I would immediately go to the hon. member for Scarborough East, because he would be in a position to get all this information for me very readily.

I really am concerned as to whether or not these institutions are separate and apart, and while the department obviously has an interest, whether the question would perhaps be better directed to the principal of the institution. I am sure he would be more than prepared to get this information for the hon. member.

I say this as a matter of procedure or principle, in that I did undertake to get the information on the fourth part of the question on Friday, the portion as to the chairmen of the various departments.

As I indicated, Mr. Lloyd was the principal and he has a vocational type B certificate and is a BA and M.Ed. Vice principals are Mr. Sykes, who has a vocational type A certificate, BA and M.Ed; and Mr. McLennan, vocational type A certificate and master standing in a trade. The chairman of the applied arts section Miss J. Cornish Bowden, M.Ed degree plus teaching certificate from Tufts University. The chairman of the engineering and technology branch is Mr. H. R. Pritchard, vocational type B certificate and BA.

In addition there are four chairmen in the field of trades and related subjects. These are Mr. C. W. Adamson, Mr. B. A. Beetles,

Mr. J. A. Stirling, Mr. D. M. Livingstone and these personnel have journeymen's or masters' certificates in a trade, plus a minimum of seven years' industrial experience, plus grade 12 standing, plus a vocational teacher's certificate from the Ontario college of education.

Mr. Speaker, I really do not have the other research done in time for any answer this afternoon. I wonder if the hon. member might consider contacting Mr. Lloyd, and I am sure that he would readily provide this information for him.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, if I might have a chance just to comment on this, I would just say briefly that the colleges of applied arts and technology are quite different from university affairs. I will just leave it at that.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I do have I believe sufficient reason for asking the Minister of Education this question. I do not intend to bombard him with this type of detailed question on every college of applied arts and technology. I feel that I would like to have these answers from the Minister himself in this particular case.

Mr. Speaker: Would the members agree to revert to the order of presenting reports, so that the Provincial Secretary could table a report?

Motion agreed to.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the 1967 annual report of the workmen's compensation board, Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answers to questions 6, 11, 12, 19, 33, 51, 52, 55, and 56, standing on the order paper. (See appendix, page 3501.)

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there is an outstanding question directed to me by the hon. member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) having to do with the purchase and sale of rubber footwear.

I would just like to repeat the question as it is:

> Is it true that producers of rubber footwear, such as those located in Granby, will ship their goods to Toronto, Winnipeg, Edmonton, Vancouver and so on, prepaid, while the same goods are shipped to northern Ontario collect—?

And so on.

Now Mr. Speaker, may I say this: If the situation exists as described by the hon. member, in all probability it is a matter of private contract between the suppliers and retailers involved. I suggest that the smaller market in northern Ontario could be a factor affecting a laid down price, especially if compared with the volume in the large urban centres mentioned.

As I have stated in this House previously I do not think that any province can successfully implement a unilateral system of price control. The potential complexities of the situation are magnified clearly in the question, which deals with goods which originate in another province and where the contract of purchase and sale, involves parties resident in different jurisdictions of Canada.

Now regardless of where the jurisdiction may be in a constitutional sense, and by jurisdiction I mean jurisdiction with respect to price control; regardless of where the jurisdiction may be in a constitutional sense, if a change in approach to the whole question of price control is to come, I believe that it will have to be evolved at the national level in co-operation with all of the provinces.

I agree with the opinion of Judge Mary Batten, chairman of the Royal commission study on consumer problems and inflation in the prairie provinces, who said that price increases were beyond the capacity of provinces to control.

I anticipate, Mr. Speaker, that this principle will be a major topic for discussion at the forthcoming Dominion-provincial conference on consumer protection.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 16th order; the House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND FAMILY SERVICES

(Concluded)

On vote 2011:

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Chairman, at the time of the adojurnment last night I had outlined to the House the development of the interdepartmental committee and had gone to the federal scene and indicated to the House the major problem that has arisen. I had touched on the aspect of responsibility, a word that had been used by the hon. member

for York South (Mr. MacDonald), in that he quoted the Hawthorne study, which I ask you to note, Mr. Chairman, was done on a national basis with a national approach.

Now my reading of The British North America Act in section 91, leads me to believe conclusively that the responsibility from a constitutional point of view is at the federal level, because section 91 says:

> It is hereby declared the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated, that is to say—

And I point out that item 24 is "Indians and lands reserved for Indians," and that is in the same listing as such things as "currency and coinage," "naturalization, and aliens." So that it is clear to me, at least, and this is a matter which I will be discussing in more detail with the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), where the constitutional responsibility lies.

Constitutional responsibility, of necessity, requires financial responsibility. This is where the member for London South (Mr. White) took his position and, I think, this is something we must always be aware of. I bring this to the attention of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) and those who spoke in support of him: The financial responsibility goes hand in hand with the constitutional responsibility, and that lies in Ottawa.

With respect to the transfer of obligations or the transfer of functions. Let us turn to the point of view of the Indian. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that last night I was talking about a change in attitude and the necessity of involvement of the Indian at all points in this. I believe, and I think it is accepted, that there is a large body of opinion amongst the Indian population that they do not wish the provinces to assume the responsibility in this field. They are very jealous of their treaty rights and their rights to land and they have a feeling that through The British North America Act, as begun and as traditionally maintained, protection at the national level for all of them as national citizens should continue to reside in Ottawa. This does not mean that an increasing number of them are not prepared to accept the resources, the know-how and the facilities which are available at the provincial level; they are willing to do that.

This is such a sensitive area that I recall that one of the most explosive situations that ever arose in this House was a number of years ago when the then Provincial Secretary tried to extend to the Indians the matter of marriage licences. I remember that the father of the leader of the Opposition—I think it was he—participated in the presentation of the petition to Her Majesty the Queen on behalf of the Indians stating that they did not want anything of this kind to happen, so that this responsibility did not become a provincial legislative matter whereby the provinces had full legislative authority to say, this you must do. That one incident is enough to make anybody who wants to transfer responsibility stop and think.

The leader of the NDP talked about the province's refusal to accept. The province of Ontario does not refuse to accept a major role —and I stress, a major role—in Indian matters. I do not have to speak words; actions already talk, because: We proclaimed The Welfare Services Act, we entered into the welfare services agreement, we entered into the Indian development agreement and, more so, we have put into the estimates this year again a very substantial sum of money—$1 million—and the member for Parkdale may not think that $1 million is very much but $1 million is a lot of money—and three or four years ago there was no such item.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, if I can interject, I never tried to poke fun at $1 million. I do not think you are doing enough but I think $1 million is a lot of money, so do not inject that tone.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I accept that. Then that was a misunderstanding on my part, Mr. Chairman.

This $1 million—I stress, this $1 million—is apart from what major sums of money are in other departments. For example, The Department of Education, I would think, will have spent $4 or $5 million which will be in respect of services to Indians. The Department of Lands and Forests will—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Let us stick on that for a moment because the budgetary item is only for the inspection of Indian schools. I do not believe that includes the Moosonee schools—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Moosonee project, for example, is going to cost some 2.5 million and I think about 75 per cent of that is going to come from The Department of Education. We are going to be putting in from our budget about $125,000 a year for two years. This is coming out of The Department of Education estimates.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would permit me to ask him at this point where the sum that the province recovers from the government of Canada is listed in these estimates as a balancing item, because there must be a large sum of money that is paid through this Minister's department in respect to welfare.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No.

Mr. Nixon: They pay the welfare direct, do they?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As I say, the welfare services are covered under The Welfare Services Act and at this point I do not intend to go into that.

Mr. Nixon: They must pay surely 100 per cent of those costs?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, not 100 per cent. We have assumed—

Mr. Nixon: Over 90 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, over 90 per cent. It is a very complicated formula but really, basically, this complicated formula can be reduced to this regard, that we have accepted in respect of the Indian population the same obligation that we have accepted in respect of the remainder of the province.

Mr. Nixon: Except for raising the money.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, no, we pay. We pay the same proportion. It so happens that because of the circumstances of the Indian, in the welfare services the federal government is picking up a major portion of the percentage in dollars; but when we, as a result of our Indian development, have placed the Indian population on the same footing from an economic point of view as the remainder of the population, the province will have assumed more and more proportionately. As the Indian economic circumstances become better, our provincial obligation will become larger.

Their share now works out to about 94-point-something per cent—just under 95 per cent in respect to the Indian, and of course the family benefits which we have is shared on a 50-50 basis.

Mr. Nixon: Is it 95 per cent federal funds?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In the social services, yes. The province has taken the position that it has a major role to play. The hon. member used the expression that this was an opportunity for empire building. It is not the intent of this department to embark upon empire building. No, that is not the function that we play. The resources, the empires, in their respective positions will continue in the various departments – Economics and Development, housing, Education, Lands and Forests, Labour, whatever other departments have a role. We have a unique role to play; we are in effect carrying the ball.

One of the major efforts will be that as the Indians assume more and more responsibility and there is more involvement, sir, there will be a channel through which they can learn how to go to the departments directly to make use of all the services that are available. The Indian development officer will operate as a catalyst, as a pipeline, as a follow-upper, as a chaser, as a supervisor, to make sure that these things take place. If, in a given community, there is more than one department, two or three, involved in a community development, it will be the responsibility of the Indian development officer to make sure that every relevant department is at work and clicking with the others in this over-all development.

This is from the provincial point of view. As I have learned more and more about the Indian affairs department in Ottawa I have come to the conclusion that they must, over the years, have tried to develop within the Indian affairs department a sort of total government of their own, a total service agency of their own. Of course any such development is impossible to attain with any degree of success. It takes hundreds of millions of dollars to set up provincial departments in order that they may be able to service people, and so for one department at the federal level to try to duplicate this is *ipso facto,* I think, an impossibility and I think this is where one of the great difficulties in the past has been.

In a way I am outlining for the House the general outline of the position we will be taking and this is still general, there is nothing very hard and fast about, *vis-à-vis* our discussions at the federal level after this next election and before the coming into being of the new Indian Act. I am going to suggest that at the federal level they also adopt our internal arrangement, that they set up an interdepartmental committee chaired perhaps by the Minister of Northern Affairs and Indians, certainly involving to a great degree the Minister of Health and Welfare, the Minister of Agriculture, the new housing ministry, and Labour, so that the

departments there, with respect to their administrative machinery, can act as a unit. At the present time we have one agreement with The Department of Health and Welfare at the federal level and another one with the Indian affairs, with Indian development.

The number of agreements really does not matter as long as they work, but I would suggest at the federal level a subcommittee of Cabinet working with a subcommittee of Cabinet at the provincial level and an interdepartmental committee at the federal level working with an interdepartmental committee at the provincial level, and the federal grouping to have their own advisory committee, which I think they have—if they have not, perhaps they should have and we would have our own advisory committee. The ultimate would be, that once the general Indian development picture—the umbrella—had been developed, then we could, without assuming the constitutional responsibility, without assuming the financial responsibility, be the agency through which the federal government can bring to bear in the discharge of its responsibilities, services to the Indians. This is done all the time. Our own department uses other agencies to do our work. For example, the children's aid society is one of the really outstanding examples of an agency which is supplied with money, and charged under legislation, to do this.

I envisage no constitutional problem, no difficulty in an agreement being worked out with financial arrangements to bring these provincial services to the benefit of the Indians. But I say this to the House, that once that agreement is formed, it has got to be an agreement which is good to begin with and which is one that will last. I am thinking of the agreement that the Minister of Education—I believe it was, Mr. Chairman—made in the vocational rehabilitation retraining programme where a massive programme was developed. Then suddenly, after a few years, literally the rug was pulled out from under the Minister of Education and from under the province through that ministry.

Now this, is something that could—I do not think could ever be permissible in this regard. My friend, the leader of the Opposition, mentioned a friend of the member for Kenora, Mr. Nitchi and I feel very sympathetic to Mr. Nitchi. He must be very bewildered indeed and I think that his confusion is compounded when agent after agent and arm of government after arm of government comes to him and he does not know with whom he is dealing or without. I am very sympathetic—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): How is your proposed set-up going to avoid that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My proposed set-up is that the federal government deal through the interdepartmental committee of this government, then efforts be channelled through the Indian development branch to our Indian development officer so that there will be one man on the scene. The first point of contact of Mr. Nitchi and his friends initially should be with the Indian development officer who will not carry the ball for them really, but he will say, now in this situation you would deal with The Department of Lands and Forests. If it is an ARDA problem you can deal with the Minister of Agriculture, if it is some other—for example, the Minister of Labour; he will assist them in establishing these contacts.

It is not our intention to set up an Indian affairs branch—to move an Indian affairs branch from Ottawa to Toronto—that is not our purpose. There is no empire to be built within our department.

So this is where I am hopeful that Mr. Nitchi will, at least, have one person to deal with and he will have one person to give some credit to, realizing that the money and the financial responsibility does come from Ottawa still. But there will be able to be pinpointing of responsibility for action. Not financial responsibility, not constitutional responsibility but if these hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent, at least, there will be one point at which somebody can put a finger. Really, the Indian development officers, within our branch, are not going to be in an enviable position for a few years, because they are going to have quite a responsibility, if this is carried out.

I am amazed that the company of young Canadians should be involved, that where there is a responsibility charged to the departments that they should be involved in there.

Mr. MacDonald: Federal and provincial, you are not doing the job.

An hon. member: What do they do?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, we moved in.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a good question but all three are not doing the job now.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: But the one point on which I cannot adopt the position of the

leader of the NDP is in relationship to the thesis of the Indian-Eskimo association and their corporate structure.

I have had a very full discussion with them, and the members of the committee met with them and there was a very full discussion with them.

The context of setting up a provincial corporation is again, transferring an Indian affairs branch out of Ottawa into Ontario, because you would—let me just finish—

Mr. MacDonald: Can we now deal with the details of this?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am going to cover most of the points made, and then I am quite prepared to have a discussion.

Mr. MacDonald: You want us to wait until after you completed them all?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Now, to my way of thinking, if you set up a corporation—a provincial corporation—then you must set up, what literally must be an empire, because you have to duplicate the services of housing, the services of The Departments of Education, and of Health. All of the departments would be duplicated by setting up structures within this corporation, and I said to the Indian-Eskimo association, that I believe that this general thesis that I have outlined is a new approach. It has never been tried. It has not been tried because certain aspects of it are very new and certain aspects of it have not begun.

Some of the problems have been: Duplication of services; too many people involved; no pinpointing of the responsibility for action; responsibility for funds. And this scheme, this proposal, the overall picture as I have drawn it, does enable these to be dealt with.

That it not to say that within the general framework there is not a major role to be played by such agencies as the Widjiitiwin corporation or the Amik association and I have before me—unfortunately only one copy —of a report directed to me which I received last week. It is by an outstanding gentleman, for whom I have a great deal of regard and respect—Father Ferron, a great friend of the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier). In this report he outlined to me the work of the Amik association—

Mr. MacDonald: Can we have copies of that?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, I would be quite prepared—

Mr. MacDonald: At a later date.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. He outlines what has been accomplished. There are some commendatory words, but it is a general outline of what they have done, point by point.

Now these are vehicles in which the Indian himself can begin to get involved on his own. They need a lot of guidance; we provide this and the funds so that they might get the business guidance. Now Father Ferron told me, in the Amik association, and in this memorandum—one of the items is where one of their branches bought buses and they got a transport licence from the Minister of Transport and then they bid in competition with other operators for the privilege of carriage for hire. Father Ferron said that they sat as a group and sweated out their tender.

Here was a group, who had never in the course of their lives, been engaged in anything of a competitive nature of this kind, in a business transaction of this kind. They sweated it out, they proposed a tender and it was, to my mind, successful and they are doing well. Whether they are making a profit or not I do not know. But they are doing well.

One of the things we must be prepared for is that these are not always going to be success stories. This is a place where the Indian is going to try and he is going to fail, and he is going to try and he is going to succeed. In the initial stages, I do not think it would be fair to judge by our standards. A government agency always has to be right, but at that level, we are going to have to permit them to be wrong, and as time goes by we are going to have to permit them more and more leeway for assuming responsibility on their own.

One of the things that is missing and will be required, is that the educational processes which will go into effect should produce young men from the Indian communities who have that dual background which will enable them to at the same time understand and be a part of the Indian culture and understand and be a part of the non-Indian culture. Because as the Widjiitiwin report points out, you get into a whole philosophical approach —the business of community property and the striving for material rewards. As the member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) said, there is a completely different approach. It is when these young men who will have an under-

standing of this develop, that we will have what is still lacking—and where we are trying to fill the gap to the best of our ability—men in the field who will be able to assist in this development. Until that takes place, we are going to have to do with our development officers to the best of our ability.

Now, these general remarks relate, I think, basically to the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition and the leader of the NDP. Before I sit down, I would just like to touch on some of the items that other members mentioned and then we can continue.

The member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) spoke about friendship centres. Our grants are based roughly on about 40 per cent of the budget. It so happens that the federal government sometimes makes matching grants. In regard to general welfare assistance the bands get about 80 per cent between the two governments in grants and they raise about 20 per cent from the communities themselves.

The hon. member for Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick) asked how many there were, and there are presently seven. There were two to begin with and then there were three more and three more, and two this year, so that as each year goes by there are more and more friendship centres being added.

The member for Scarborough Centre also asked about the housing surveys. The Moosonee survey has been completed with 15 low rental units for this year and 20 for next year recommended. At the Manitoulin Island reserve the study is still in process.

The member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar) touched on a very difficult problem in that when we try to deal with the cost-sharing formula under general welfare assistance—the 80 per cent-20 per cent—when we try to apply this formula to the Indian bands in terms of municipalities this is where the difficulty arises. Some of them do have funds, as the hon. leader of the Opposition stated, some of them have no funds, they just cannot make up their 20 per cent.

So that the difficulty is compounded. The poor Indian community that needs the services the most is in the least position to take advantage of the 80 per cent. As I say it is pretty difficult. If a man has to pay a dollar for a meal, to give him 80 cents, if he has not the additional 20 cents, it is not very good from his point of view.

This is one of the problems we are confronted with. As to the homes for the aged generally, I am delighted to say that five bands have already expressed an interest. Walpole Island, St. Regis, Kettle Point, Six Nations and the Serpent River bands have all indicated an interest, which we hope will end up in action.

With respect to the comment the hon. member made about the type of construction; I am going to check into that, I see no reason why there should be any difficulty because that type of construction is acceptable, I think, unless there is something unique in it. But I would like to discuss that in detail to see what problems lie there.

In respect of the comments of the member for Rainy River about the deduction in respect of treaty money income, that is also a matter that I intend to go into to see if perhaps there should be some level at which we will make exemptions.

Now that, I believe, covers most of the statements.

I say this to the hon. leader of the Opposition; he touched on a very personal matter. I do consider this as an opportunity and a challenge. It is true that these problems have been around for a long time. They have come to a head, I would say in the last three or four years. There has been an awareness in the community, there has been a gradual assumption of responsibility, in its total concept, by people in public life and leaders in community life.

Mr. Trotter: The Earl of Elgin was complaining about this 114 years ago.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, when the Canadian government had complete and absolute responsibility for the whole thing.

As I say, at this point I am not going to get into recriminations, we are going to be sitting down and negotiating with the people in Ottawa. As to blame and criticism—there will be ample opportunity in the future if this does not work out the way we hope and expect it to do. But this does present an opportunity at the provincial level, under the scheme as I have outlined it, for us to play a major role—I underline it, a major role—in making sure our Indian citizens are Canadians of Indian origin and have exactly the same opportunity for a full life that is available to all our citizens.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I have one or two questions associated with what the hon. Minister has been discussing.

We now have in Ontario an agreement with the federal government covering welfare matters and community development matters. There is no doubt that in the future you are going to be negotiating more agreements. It does not seem possible that you are going to achieve one agreement which will transfer the responsibility from the federal government to the provincial government.

I am not at all sure that while that would be a very neat solution, whether it would be in the best interests of all concerned.

As the Minister well recalls, I am sure, his predecessor had some difficulty in negotiating the very first agreement, and when it was announced, somewhat prematurely, the Indians responded in such a way that the agreement did not come into effect for a full year because of the inept way it was handled by the representative of this government.

The Minister may want to comment on that, but I do have some continuing interest in the difficulties the Minister seems to be experiencing in negotiating with the government of Canada. This was referred to by the Premier earlier in the session.

I would certainly agree that under the law as we presently understand it in Canada, the government of Canada, whether it is constitutionally required or not, has accepted 100 per cent of the responsibility for health, welfare and any other programmes for Indians on Indian lands. But we in the province have had the same responsibility for those Indians who have not been on Indian lands and are not registered as members of bands from the earliest time. So we have always had at least that part of the responsibility, which has been a very significant one.

If there is going to be an agreement that specifically transfers responsibilities that are now 100 per cent federal, so that they will be somehow retained federally but administered provincially, then I would agree with the Minister's argument that the other level of government should provide the funds that cover the responsibilities that are being transferred.

The Minister is referring to the federal share of our Indian welfare costs as being somewhere around 94 per cent of total costs. This is the sort of agreement that must surely cover the transference of other administrative responsibilities. For example, it appears that the responsibility for health is not entirely covered in the welfare agreement, that there has been a lot of controversy with the government at Ottawa deciding to change their response to the health care requirements of the Indians. This has been quite a serious issue in the last few months and I know it is still an issue with many Indian bands.

I would ask the Minister if in his capacity as chairman of the Cabinet committee he is negotiating for the transfer of this responsibility from the government of Canada to the government of Ontario, let us say through OMSIP, where we could administer that by providing them with OMSIP cards in those areas where they can be serviced with the regular medical services and hospitalization as well?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the medical services, this is one of those matters that comes directly under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Health and he has been concerning himself very much with this, and I assume in contact with his counterpart in Ottawa.

I would think that one of the words we should forget in the context of Indian matters is "responsibility", because the word is so general. It lends itself to so many interpretations, it is an umbrella word. It all depends upon who is saying or using the word just what it means. I do not talk in terms of transfer of responsibility from the federal level to the provincial. Transfer of functions: Yes, then the picture is clear. The responsibility lies with Ottawa and it will be clear to the Indian that the responsibility is with Ottawa. But the functions and execution of the matter will be at the provincial level and I think that this is the major point now. It is true that welfare services represent about 95 per cent federal, but as they improve their position, this will become less and less their share and more and more our share.

In the Indian development, with regard to this $1 million we have in the budget, our experience last year was that of the total expenditures, 8 per cent came from the federal level. This is the great disappointment.

Now I will be fair to this degree, that this interpretation has come over a period of time. At the provincial level we had one interpretation, and we were viewing the agreement on the basis of that interpretation. But in dealing with individual proposals for consideration, this was when we discovered that their point of view was that they would not share in that cost and they would not share in this cost. In the overall picture, at the end of the year they shared in only 8 per cent of the money. Eight per cent in the community development, that is under the agreement with our department; and this is where the—

Mr. Nixon: But they had their own programme going on.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well yes, the old programme. I would imagine they were spending moneys in that regard.

But this is supposed to be the new approach, the new deal if I may use the term. I would imagine that one of their differences is that they have one province, Ontario, in which we are prepared to move in this direction, and nine provinces which have not yet indicated their regard. So that even if they agreed with our thesis, they still have the other provinces to deal with. I am hopeful that this proposition, or general proposal, is acceptable to Ottawa, *vis-à-vis* Ontario, and that this would then be appealing to the other provinces, and they will come into the picture. One of the main points is the financial responsibilities. We will have the headaches, we will have the problems, there is no doubt about it. We are going to have a lot of headache and heartache, and trials and tribulations, but we are quite prepared to accept it because that is the general function of a government agency that is giving social service.

In fairness to the Ottawa people, we have not yet had the opportunity at the Prime Ministerial and Ministerial level, of discussing this and really threshing this out, renegotiating this, because whatever may have been spoken at the time of the signing of the agreement, the development has been such that there has come a time for a second look, a renegotiation, and it comes at an opportune time because the federal government has in mind, the new Indian Act—

Mr. Nixon: The Minister questioned my use of the word "responsibility", and speaking for the Indians, as I understand their attitude in these things, they do feel that the government of Canada is responsible for certain areas of their welfare, including their health and their education. Economic opportunity is something that is a new area, but they consider that the senior level of government is responsible as well. The Minister well knows—and the leader of the NDP raised this last night—that there are deep misgivings in the minds of Indians that they do not want to let the senior level of government transfer this unless they have iron-clad acceptance of responsibility by someone outside the band for a continuation of these ancient agreements.

It is true, and it has been said on the floor of the House, and quoted from so many sources, that the Indians mistrust the representatives of the Indian affairs branch of the federal government, and have learned to do this I suppose over many years. This is a blanket statement that does not hold true in all cases, and I know that the Minister would agree. But just the transference to another group of outsiders is not going to change the general attitude. There has to be a change of attitude on the part of the outsiders, but it cannot be the replacement of the acceptance of the responsibility based on these old agreements, with something that may look much more modern in saying, "Well, now, we are going to bring you people up to the acceptance of responsibility as we understand it."

This is something that they do not believe that they have to do. This is true certainly in the provision of medical benefits, and this is one of the problems that I have to deal with as my constituents come to me with a fear that they are not going to be cared for as adequately as they have been or should be.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to go back over a number of points that I raised. The Minister has commented on them, and to some degree, he has answered questions that were in my mind, but I would like to explore them, because quite frankly, I am not completely satisfied yet. In my view this is the time when we really should do the exploration. As I understand the explanation, we are now approaching, following June 25, what is going to be an historic conference in terms of reassessing the responsibility of the two senior levels of government with regard to Indian affairs, for what may be the immediate future. To get a very clear picture and perhaps a clear examination of the basic underlying principles, now is the time to do it.

Let me start with the first point that I raised last night in connection with the interdepartmental committee. I quoted the Prime Minister as saying that:

> It will be necessary to point out where the difficulty has arisen and why we have been blocked in doing what we set out to do and what we wanted to do. I will agree with the leader of the Opposition that not nearly as much has been accomplished as we would wish.

Those are two quotations from the Prime Minister with regard to the interdepartmental committee. The Minister has seemed to have suggested that the substance of the Prime Minister's comments was in reference to the

province's inability to get the federal government to match a takeover of responsibilities with financial means—matching them with money—so that the province could fulfil the work. Is that the whole substance of the Prime Minister's remarks with regard to the difficulties of the interdepartmental committee?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is basically the difficulty, but then there is the problem that Mr. Nitchi faces, the two agencies still in the same field, the two officers, and this is the dual aspect of it.

What is the date of that statement? Anyway, subsequent to that statement, that is when we renegotiated and these further discussions entered the scene, in a positive way.

Mr. MacDonald: If the Minister was holding useful negotiations in the midst of the parliamentary crisis in Ottawa at that time, then I congratulate him. I am a little bit doubtful of what was emerging from Ottawa at that time, other than greater and greater chaos. However, we can let that matter rest. On this interdepartmental committee I have some general comments to make. May I say that I am open to persuasion, but as yet I am not persuaded that an interdepartmental committee is really an effective instrument for co-ordinating the disparate approach of many departments. I will go back, if I may, to the observations that were made in connection with interdepartmental committees by Professor Krueger in his famous report of some two or three years ago. His statement was that it is simply asking for the impossible in terms of an effective organizational approach, to say that you bring together a group of Ministers, each one of whom is already very busy in his own department, and expect that one of those Ministers, who happens to be made chairman of the committee, is going to be able to reconcile all of the inclinations to empire building, all of the tendencies of one department to feel that another department is muscling in on its territory.

If you are going to get an effective interdepartmental committee, Professor Krueger said that it could be done only if the Cabinet committee was headed by a full-time person who in effect has the equivalent status of a Deputy Minister, sir, responsible directly to the Prime Minister—so that everybody in that interdepartmental committee knows that the centre of power and authority is coming from the Prime Minister and that there are going to be no rivalries, no lack of co-ordination in their approach. If the full-time person who has the equivalent of Deputy Minister status is, in effect, going to be acting in the name of the Prime Minister, therefore he is going to be in a position to resolve any conflicts and differences that may arise.

The Minister has one of the most magnificently developed capacities to pour out an orgy of words in glowing comment on what is happening, so that one feels almost a little ungenerous in thinking that there is anything wrong at all. He has such a well-developed capacity, that for the moment he had me overwhelmed, but when I thought once again on what Professor Krueger said, he had not completely persuaded me. I am not persuaded that this Minister, with all of the departments that are involved, has solved all of those basic administrative problems.

I do not know how much further I can go than this—to express my doubts, to say to the Minister that he is no genius, he is not God; the man who is closest to being God is the Prime Minister himself, and you are not he. Therefore I am not persuaded that you have beaten the basic problems in an interdepartmental committee. All I can say is that I will watch closely for continued evidences of the weakness in the structure that Professor Krueger pinpointed in his dispassionate analysis of this whole kind of organizational setup.

Now let me go on to a second aspect.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have never read that article by Professor Krueger. I would like to have it.

Mr. MacDonald: Professor Krueger? It is in the famous Krueger report on the conflict in The Departments of Tourism and Trade and Development—about three or four years ago. His comments were made in specific reference to the sad experience of the conservation committee which was set up back in the 1950's and really just drifted off into oblivion. No effective consequences flowed from its efforts at all.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I did not ask for an essay, I just asked where it was because I have not had the opportunity of reading that.

Mr. MacDonald: Well I will tell you what I will do just to show that my desire to co-operate with the Minister is almost unbounded. I will give him the pages in that report so, that with no waste of time, he can get to the crux of the issue. I know the report is readily available in my office.

The second point that I wanted to raise is with regard to the Minister's reassertion that the constitutional responsibility for Indians under The BNA Act is a federal one. I am not going to argue the point at great length. All I am saying is that the Minister is back in the old rut. Let me give you another quote, different from the one I gave yesterday. Mr. McEwen in his brochure quotes in reference to the Hawthorne-Tremblay committee and said this on page 33:

> The provinces have traditionally shown little or no interest in their registered Indian citizens and are still reluctant to assume their share of responsibility. It has been too easy to escape responsibility on the grounds that Indians are wards of the federal government. The position of the provinces has been based on legal or constitutional considerations that have been challenged in the Hawthorne-Tremblay study referred to above.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have made it perfectly clear that the constitutional responsibility can stay where it is. That it is not the major issue. The major issue is how does the federal government discharge the constitutional responsibility? We are now taking the position that we will play our role.

Mr. MacDonald: I will concede that the Minister has said that you are willing to play your role, and I want to go forward to examine exactly the proportion of the role that you are willing to play. All I am saying is that the Minister, in effect, is dismissing out of hand the conclusion of the Hawthorne-Tremblay study which challenges the contention that the constitutional right is exclusively a federal right. And to the extent that you, the Minister, or the hon. member for London South, or others may try to deflect criticism of your achievements by saying that basically this is a federal responsibility, all I want to say is that the ground has been undercut, sir, from that argument by the Hawthorne-Tremblay study. The Hawthorne-Tremblay study, I think the Minister will have to agree, is an authoritative study that has just been completed.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): You are beating a dead horse.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): That is not a dead horse. You just do not know the government.

Mr. MacDonald: When this young man, if I may be patronizing for a moment, has been around here for a little longer he will realize you have to beat dead horses for a long, long time to contend with this Tory government. Indeed he will beat lively issues until they are nothing but dead horses and still not have achieved his purposes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is unwilling to accept the basic thesis of the Hawthorne-Tremblay report and the IEA with regard to the inadvisability of proceeding upon a piecemeal agreement approach. The Hawthorne-Tremblay committee is pretty devastating. I have already put it on the record. I am not going to take the time, again, of saying that there will have to be an infinity of agreements which will drag on for ever—you have only two in the last two or three years—and that the best way to do it is to have something more of a totality of approach, admittedly matched with the necessary moneys to proceed with its implementation.

I was interested in the interjection of the leader of the Opposition and the Minister's willingness to seize upon it. Namely, that on one previous occasion when we attempted to shift some of this responsibility from the federal government, it produced some considerable reaction among the Indians because they are fearful. They have been double-crossed by the white man so consistently for over 100 years that the leader of the Opposition is correct that they should get iron-clad assurances that when the responsibility leaves Ottawa somebody else has really picked it up; and it is not going to get lost somewhere in transit from Ottawa to Queen's Park, or to any other provincial capital. This I would agree has got to be done and this is where the negotiations, that the Minister is going to move into, are going to be vitally important. But again the Hawthorne-Tremblay study is very emphatic and conclusive in its assertion that the quicker we get away from this piecemeal agreement approach, the sooner we are going to be able to come up with an answer to the problems of the Indians.

That brings me to what is really the most worrisome aspect of the Minister's comments on what has been said by those other organizations; and what I have been attempting to give voice to in this House. He paints a picture, in effect, of parallel organizations. He hopes that Ottawa is going to parallel what he has achieved, almost with perfection here in Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We are considerably short of that point.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the Minister is willing to concede more than he normally does, but what he is suggesting is that Ottawa should have an interdepartmental committee with a Cabinet subcommittee, and an advisory committee. He suggests that Ottawa should do everything we have done here. We have got the sort of model that should be followed. When you have done that you are going to have two parallel organizations. Now, resolving the possible conflict in having two parallel organizations is not as simple as the Minister says. There is only going to be one community development officer and he will be the provincial officer. He is not really going to have any power.

Indeed, the Minister says he is going to have a pretty tough time for the first few years. All he is going to be is an "expediter". If the Indian community requires assistance he will say to the Indian community—"that is what you want, there is where you can get it—go to Lands and Forests, go to Mines, go to Education, go to The Department of Trade and Development, or alternatively go up to Ottawa—go to the department of Indian affairs".

Forgive me, Mr. Chairman, but the Minister has not persuaded me that one man, acting for the provincial government, is going to direct effectively, the Indians who are seeking necessary assistance to any one of ten different provincial departments and at least one, and perhaps two or three, departments in Ottawa; so that in some miraculous way, there is going to be a more effective bringing together of resources to meet the needs of the Indians. There is really no substance of change. It is true you may have removed competing development officers, and the company of young Canadians, and an almost infinite number of other departmental officials, but there is nothing that suggested a substance of change.

There is another worrisome aspect in the whole approach, and that is the underlying argument of the Indian-Eskimo association presentation, and the underlying argument of every successful community project in any place in the world you want to go to—whether it be Mexico or the Caribbean or the far east, or anywhere the United Nations has sought to develop. If you have a great number of departments in the picture, you are not going to get an effective focusing of the resources to meet the totality of the communities' needs.

When, for example, they faced that kind of a problem in the United States back in the depression, and they had a half a dozen government departments at Washington who were attempting to help in the Tennesee Valley; they got nowhere until they established the Tennesee Valley authority which was completely responsible, and had complete jurisdiction. The money came from any one of the departments you want to talk about, but it came into the TVA, and the TVA had the authority to decide how the money was going to be spent.

So you did not have what the Indian-Eskimo association points out, is an Indian community coming up with a certain project that happens to be in relation to Lands and Forests. But you go to Lands and Forests, and unfortunately their appropriation for this year is expended, so you have to wait for another year.

You get over that problem, which has bedevilled community development by having one organization which is totally responsible for the development, into which all the resources are poured. That body, which is a truly representative body, then applies those resources to effectively meet the community needs.

That is what they did in TVA. That is what they are doing now in the ARDA development in the eastern parts of the province of Quebec. There is now an effort to bring together a dozen or so federal and provincial departments.

The Minister asks us to accept that an approach that has been tried and found wanting, that has failed abysmally, not only in relation to the Indians in Canada, but in relation to community development whether it be in the United States or Mexico or the Caribbean, is somehow going to work this time. He is continuing on the old approach.

Mr. Chairman, I just do not believe it will work. I am as certain as I am standing here, that the Minister is ignoring the lessons that have emerged from the experience of the past. Two or three years from now we are going to come back and find that you simply have not been able to achieve it, because you are not coming to grips with the basic lessons that have been learned in widespread, worldwide experience on community development in helping to pull an area up by its bootstraps—helping the people themselves to pull it up by its bootstraps.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If you are wedded to this proposition, where would the province fit into the picture? The people could set up their own provincial corporation and we would not have to be in the picture at all.

Mr. MacDonald: A very good question, but let me bring two other related and current facts into the picture. I was interested to read the hon. member for Kenora's exposition as to what the situation is with Amik and with the various subsidiary corporations of Widjiitiwin—and the name escapes me.

Well my Indian friend over there might be able to help me.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Sabaskong!

Mr. MacDonald: Sabaskong, thank you. There was another one, the name escapes me for the moment.

The interesting thing about these, Mr. Chairman, is that—here is Amik, a federally chartered organization into which this government is putting money by paying the salary of the business manager of the association. This is the body which is, in effect, sitting down with the Indian community, working out their needs and setting up corporations like the Widjiitiwin corporation as a subsidiary, into which money is being poured.

May I draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, that when money is poured in it is not being poured from a half a dozen different departments, if I understand it correctly, because the Widjiitiwin corporation is a combined social, educational and economic corporation. The annual report goes through economic matters, it goes through welfare matters and it ends up with an extensive discussion of educational matters. In other words it is dealing with the situation in total.

Now the Minister says: "Where does the province fit into the picture?" Quite frankly, this is what I would like to find out.

In the Indian-Eskimo association proposal —they suggest you should have at the federal level a native Canadian development institute that does the overall planning, and that the implementation of any plans that may be agreed upon should be financed with the money that comes from the federal government, which will be added to money that comes from the provincial government so that the work may be carried out on a community basis.

My question is, what sort of a regional basis? Is it going to be the spawning of Widjiitiwin corporations?

I concede, with everybody, that we have got to let the Indians take the lead.

We are not imposing something upon them. This is something they want, something they worked out; so we do not have these emerge suddenly overnight. They have got to grow, grow out of the Indian community. But any time it grows out of an Indian community, it is going to be a community corporation. But in relation to Amik, which exists now and is federally incorporated, or in the new IEA setup, what is going to be the relationship between these local corporations and the native Canadian development institute at Ottawa.

I do not know what the pattern is.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, just on a point, I think the hon. member's associate from Riverdale, pointed to the fact that it is federally chartered. The source of the charter has no significance to me. It could very easily have been a provincially incorporated body that became the vehicle. The federal aspect of the charter, to me, has no significance.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine. I think the Minister as a lawyer is making a very valid, legal point. I was not pretending to suggest that because it was federally chartered that really makes any difference.

The Minister asked how the province fits into this picture. Well as I understand the possible application of the Indian-Eskimo association proposal, if you had the institute at the federal level, which is mapping out the overall programmes like the overall programme body for ARDA, the implementation would still be at the provincial level: Through what? Through local corporations like Widjiitiwin? Through Amik or some comparable sponsoring body at the provincial level?

Which of course brings me to the next question put to this House by the hon. member for Kenora: Is the Indian development branch the appropriate body for spawning corporations wherever a development has reached a point where the Indians want to have a development corporation?

I see no problem in fitting the province into the picture, because the Minister of course is dead right; if you are going to have a development in a community that is basically an economic development and related to the culture of the Indians, and so on, all of the resources for that development,

with the possible exception of the necessary money, are now under provincial control, which should be the catalyst to get it into being. Resources, fishing, land and mining, and everything else, all of this comes under provincial control.

I am not going to pursue it any further. I hope I have raised, in the course of my remarks, some questions with regard to what I think are the inadequacies of the Minister's concept of what is going to happen. I can see immediately that he is maybe thinking out loud. I am thinking out loud. The IEA is thinking out loud. Maybe in the conferences that are held after June 25 we will get some reconciliation of the views.

All I am pleading for is that in getting a reconciliation, let us not fail to learn from the lessons of the past. In my view the Minister is flying in the face of some of the lessons in the past—by such as a piecemeal approach of many, many departments—when TVA and all these other community development programmes have suggested you must have a co-ordination in one body, which is an autonomous body and has full control of the total programme that is going to be implemented within that community, as indeed the Widjiitiwin corporation apparently has.

You have a small example of it here in Ontario, right before our eyes, for which the department is claiming some credit, and I would assume some legitimate credit.

Let me make one reference in passing to the Minister's expression of appreciation to me for bringing the hon. member for Kenora into the picture.

I have not been in the game of politics for a few years for nothing. If I bring the hon. member for Kenora into the picture it is with a bit of malice aforethought. The Minister said: "I agree with everything that the hon. member for Kenora said." Well you see, this is the Minister's way of blunting the pointed criticism. He agrees with everybody, with their contradictions and rather sharp criticisms; but he agrees with them all.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I do not want *Hansard* to record that I agreed with everybody or everything. I do not want that quoted to me a year hence. I was talking of the total picture and in a very general way.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what I was afraid of, it was the "totality and very general way" and printed criticism gets lost—

Mr. T. P. Reid: A sponge!

Mr. MacDonald: It is all rolled up in a ball of wax, or maybe a sponge is a better analogy.

However, just let me take two minutes, Mr. Chairman, to put something back onto the record from the hon. member for Kenora. If the Minister agrees with these observations, then good. He is admitting that there are some basic flaws in the whole government approach.

On page 994, he said:

> The concensus in northwestern Ontario is that too often policies and programmes are based on ideas originating in the administrative centres of Ottawa and Toronto and lack the resident's insight into the problem. The difficulties encountered in the failure rate of such policies and programmes would attest to the validity of these views—

Now this is the basic criticism of the whole operation of the department of Indian affairs and, indeed, a criticism that is now being repeated pretty directly towards this government too because of Nitchi's problem in coping with such an infinity of officers from both these levels of government.

Also, the comment of the hon. member for Kenora when he said that:

> Under the existing agreement, very little authority is being transferred from the federal to the provincial goverment. The transition is difficult but one may question if there is enough effort being made at the provincial level to speed up the process.

The hon. member for Kenora is on our side. When he sits there, he is in an appropriate place, on this side of the House, in criticism of the government.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, he is on the Minister's side too.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, he cannot be on both sides and I am just quoting from him to show you that on this, he is on our side, so do not try to slough that off.

However, Mr. Chairman, I want to go to one specific case if I may. I am sorry that the Minister of Highways has gone because there is a rather graphic illustration of what, to my mind, is the psychological miscalculations of the white man and this government in speaking for the white man in some of his efforts to rebuild better relationships with the Indians. I am coming to the problem of the Batchawana band of Indians on the outskirts of Sault Ste. Marie.

As the Minister, I am sure, must be familiar, The Department of Highways has been attempting to get from this band, a strip of land for a bypass for one of the main high-

ways past Sault Ste. Marie. And the incredible proposition, Mr. Chairman, is this. The Indians are demanding $45,000 for 30.86 acres of land. The department is offering $31,000 and has dug in its heels. Why and when they dug in their heels is a mystery. But, on this occasion they have dug in their heels even at the expense of building another bypass, which the normally very friendly Sault *Daily Star*—friendly towards this government—is critical of, and calls, "a second-best bypass."

In short, here is a government which is responsible in the eyes of the Indians for stealing their heritage a hundred years ago. The Indians feel that what they had when they occupied this continent before the white man came was, in effect, stolen from them; that they were given some little bit of a song and a treaty right representing a few dollars; and they have been hived off into their ghettos and have been bypassed by the mainstream of Canadian development.

Here was an opportunity to correct some of the bad feeling and to restore some of that heritage. And what does it amount to, Mr. Chairman? It amounts to $14,000, the difference between $45,000 that the band is asking and $31,000 that the department has offered to give and yet, this government will dig in its heels and even build a second-rate bypass which everybody agrees is going to have to be duplicated a few years from now.

The Minister—when I asked him yesterday before we got into this, said that when we got to the Indian development branch, because he is chairman of the interdepartmental committee, he would answer questions on behalf of all the Ministers involved. I invite him to comment on that, on behalf of the Minister of Highways. How do you justify it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was talking about future estimates. I was not talking about past estimates. My recollection is that the hon. member did discuss this in the House, with the Minister of Highways.

Mr. MacDonald: No. No. I did not. I did not discuss it and, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, just to show you that I am very much up to date, I think this letter was written by the hon. Minister of Highways on May 3, to the Batchawana band chief, John Corbiere. So we are really dealing within the issue three weeks after the final adamant decision of the department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It seems to me that I have heard about that situation.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, we raised it a year and a half ago.

Mr. MacDonald: Agreed. Negotiations have been going on for two or three years but my point is, that the Minister is the chairman of an interdepartmental committee, one member of which is now chiseling an Indian band on a $14,000 difference; even to the point of cutting off his own nose to spite his face, because he is going to have to build a second-rate bypass—and everybody in Sault Ste. Marie thinks it is a second-rate bypass. I suspect even the hon Minister from that area may think it.

Now, for a matter of $14,000, what is the point? I have seen this government, for example, enter into deals with people who built liquor store outlets and got 20 or 10 rental agreements with the government, so that at the end of five years they had the whole building paid for and they walked off with a big chunk of the public treasury. Why are you so sticky on the $14,000 to an Indian band, that might be some token return to them of the heritage which the white man stole from him over the centuries?

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Just to humiliate them. That is why.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the Minister said yesterday he was going to speak on behalf of all his interdepartmental committee members. I notice that he is silent and perhaps this is an appropriate time for him to be silent because I think it is indefensible.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, may I speak to this matter? I know a good deal more about it, I think, than the hon. member for York South.

This matter was in the estimates, I believe, of The Department of Highways last year; the matter of the bypass by The Department of Highways around the city of Sault Ste. Marie. It was suggested that The Department of Highways should acquire a portion of land through the Indian reserve, of the Batchawana band, of the Garden River reserve lying to the east of Sault Ste. Marie, some 31 acres of land to extend the bypass further to the east. The report of the engineers of the city of Sault Ste. Marie did not recommend that bypass.

The bypass which was recommended was the bypass which commenced further to the west, closer to the limit of the city of Sault Ste. Marie and proceeded along, what is known, as the extension of the second line road or Highway 550. However, sir, since

the city council were anxious to have the bypass extended further east, which was not the recommendation of their consulting engineers, The Department of Highways agreed to consider that proposition and did so, at great length.

There were many attempts, Mr. Chairman, extending over a long period of time even to last year, to find out if the land could be acquired from the Indian band. The Department of Highways had the land evaluated. The evaluation, I believe I am correct in saying, was somewhere in the neighbourhood of $15,000 or $16,000. The offer which was made to the Indian band was $31,000.

No response could be obtained from the Indian band, although they turned down by vote the $31,000. I then made it my business toward the end of 1966 to endeavour to bring the Indian band, the chief and his council, in contact directly with The Department of Highways, and with the mayor and council of the city of Sault Ste. Marie and with what used to be known as the department of Indian affairs. That meeting was arranged for January 21 or 25, 1967.

A meeting was held in the council building on the reserve with Chief Corbiere there. I speak from memory but I have a very clear and distinct memory of these proceedings. I was there, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) was there with some of his officials, representatives were there from the federal department having to do with Indian affairs, the mayor of the city of Sault Ste. Marie was there, the hon. member for Wentworth was there, and a discussion took place.

It was at that point it appeared that the Indian band had received little advice or assistance from anyone—I must confess that. And they had received little advice or assistance, I think, from the department which has charge of their affairs. But my correspondence in setting up that meeting brought them into the picture and urged their participation and they were there.

It was then suggested, sir, that there should be an evaluation made of these lands, an assessment on behalf of the Indian band. And I think the federal department then undertook that, if that could be done, they would pay the cost of that evaluation. It was January 25, 1967, that this meeting was held.

We waited some three months. When I say "we" I mean The Department of Highways, the city of Sault Ste. Marie and all those of us who were interested. I wrote at that time—I did not know this discussion was coming up when I walked into the House, my file is in my office and it is a thick file of correspondence—I wrote, and made it my business to write, and say: "Is there any information, can you tell us what your evaluation is? The department is anxious to get on with the building of the bypass. It has now been delayed for months because we have not been able to get any answer; we can not get any idea what you do want for the land. Can we get some word?"

I was told, eventually, in correspondence which I could produce, by the superintendent of the Indian affairs branch, that an evaluation had been received, that it was not satisfactory to the Indian band—and he did not reveal it—and that a further evaluation was being sought. Some further months went by; April went by, May went by, June went by; and we still received no figure, we could still get no answer.

Eventually we understood that a Mr. McCallum, of the firm of Brewin, Weldon, McCallum, I believe it is—was the counsel representing that Indian band.

I have had correspondence with Mr. McCallum; telephone interviews, interviews in my office; and he came up and met and talked, I know, with the Minister of Highways. But, Mr. Chairman, he did not reveal any price or any evaluation; we could go nowhere on any figure which might be acceptable. All we knew was that $31,000 offered by The Department of Highways was not going to be accepted; apparently would not be considered.

Some time, I believe in November of last year, 1967, Mr. McCallum made the suggestion that if the department would take into consideration the figure of $45,000 he would be prepared to present it for consideration to the Indian band. I am quite satisfied that the Minister of Highways will confirm what I say, that it was indicated to Mr. McCallum that such a figure was not acceptable because the evaluation which The Department of Highways had, was half or thereabouts of the figure which was being offered, and that it could hardly be justified, just to satisfy any person whose property was being taken, to pay three times the evaluation.

We then obtained, I think it was perhaps considered to be confidential, the figure which had been given by the Indians' own evaluator, as $24,500. I saw some of the figures on that evaluation and the method by which it was arrived at. I think it was a very generous evaluation.

I say that quite frankly; it was an extremely generous evaluation. The farm lands on the west side of the reserve—cleared, cultivated, fenced, improved—had been acquired by option by The Department of Highways at $500 and $800 an acre. The price which was being offered for the 31 acres was double the $500 and $200 better than the $800; and the Indian reserve land, I say this simply as a fact, the Indian reserve land is sandy scrub. I think anyone looking at it would agree at once it would be useless as agricultural land.

Now it may have had some other features which made its value greater, but certainly the Indian band's own evaluator, a certified evaluator, valued their land at $24,500. As the Minister of Highways pointed out, he is dealing with bands other than this one and could hardly justify almost doubling their own evaluation and a tripling, almost, the evaluation the department had obtained. So he declined the suggested figure of $45,000 where the Indians' own evalaution, which to this day they have not revealed, was $24,500.

Mr. MacDonald: If they did not reveal it, how did the Minister get it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: To this day they have not revealed their evaluation.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Then how does the Minister know it is $24,500?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think I would say quite frankly that Mr. McCallum at one point in his discussion indicated that figure and somewhere the newspaper in Sault Ste. Marie published it. But nobody—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They did not reveal it and they have not revealed it to this day. Mr. McCallum was very much disturbed that the newspaper had it. But nobody has denied it and I am satisfied, as I stand here, that that is the evaluation. If anyone can find it is different, I would be glad to know it.

Mr. Singer: That is a peculiar way of trying to justify value.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well the hon. member can confirm it, I know that is the evaluation: $24,500.

Mr. J. Renwick: That is why the Indian does not trust—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It was never revealed by the Indian band.

Mr. Singer: Well then it was revealed in a breach of confidence.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know who revealed it.

Mr. Singer: Somebody took advantage of the confidential nature of the evaluation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Certainly! The Indian band will not reveal their evaluation, although we went to a meeting and said: "Will you get an evaluation?"; and they said, "yes". It was arranged that it be paid for. They got it and they keep completely silent on it to this date; to this day they have not told us.

Now how do you do business in this situation?

Mr. Singer: Do your departments reveal evaluations?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, we reveal our evaluations.

Mr. Singer: I would like to show you a number of files where this has been refused.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I simply recite the facts of this case. An evaluation was arranged to be paid for on January 25, 1967; and we stand here, almost one year and a half later, and we cannot get the evaluation which was obtained. Now how do you do business that way, I ask?

Mr. MacDonald: Are you finished?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I am not finished.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Deal with confidence!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: So in November of 1967, the Minister of Highways indicated that he would not consider $45,000. The city of Sault Ste. Marie was pressing that this bypass be built. It was already delayed two years and it was badly needed.

So he announced that he would go forward with the bypass as designed by the city's engineers. There was then considerable discussion further. Why, he was asked, will you not put in an additional $14,000 and pick up these lands? The Indian band finally, in January of this year I think, had a meeting of the council and approved the figure of $45,000 originally suggested in November by Mr. McCallum. By that time work was proceeding to get the bypass as designed by the engineers and I think, as I say to you, the land adjoining that reserve was being optioned and was securable at $500 an acre and $800

an acre. How do you justify paying $1,500 an acre for 31 acres?

Mr. J. Renwick: Because it was not as good as farm—

Mr. MacDonald: Well I could give you—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is rather irrelevant to this discussion. I think if you are going to consider the facts of this matter, here is land that is less valuable than land which is available at $500 an acre and you are saying that the government should go out and spend $1,500 an acre.

That is the point. Is that what the government should do in every case? I would love to hear the hon. member say yes!

Mr. J. Renwick: In every case, no.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I should think not, I think not in any case.

Mr. J. Renwick: Every individual case should be dealt with on its merit.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And what is the merit: Because it is an Indian band?

Mr. J. Renwick: Right!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think you should approach the welfare of Indians on a different basis than that.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Did you expropriate the land?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You cannot expropriate Indian land, you have to deal with that at arm's length.

Mr. J. Renwick: Well, you can expropriate—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It takes the federal government approval.

Mr. J. Renwick: It takes the federal government in council to agree with it, but you can expropriate it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Nobody has suggested we should treat the Indians in that way, and if we had expropriated surely on the basis of evaluations, their evaluation of $24,500 and the department offer of $31,000, well above the department's own evaluation, surely they would not have got $45,000?

Mr. Singer: You cannot have it both ways. If the report was not revealed how can you keep on saying that it was $24,500?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I simply say, as a fact, that it was $24,500.

Mr. Singer: Which figure you have no business using!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am using it in this House where I have a right to use it.

Mr. Singer: It is the same thing, you are speaking on behalf—

Mr. J. Renwick: You have no such right.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well look, let us have the facts. Do you not want the facts?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Those are the facts, and you will not find anything wrong with those facts.

Mr. Singer: We want more of them.

Mr. MacDonald: We will get all the facts when you are finished.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well maybe there are more, that I do not know about. But what I am telling you are the facts; and the ones that I have stated are correct, those I can certify. The bypass is underway and nobody is chiseling on the Indians.

Mr. MacDonald: But you are giving only part of the picture.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No they are not. A good, generous offer has been made and has been outstanding for more than a year. But as yet there has been no action, unless you want to pay whatever figure is suggested without regard to value or evaluation, and without regard to even the facts of evaluation being revealed.

You cannot get to grips at all. I would like Mr. McCallum to recount his experience if he were free to do so.

Mr. J. Renwick: He is counsel for the tribe, he cannot do that—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I say I wish he could recount it. I know that he cannot, I wish he could.

Mr. J. Renwick: Of course you are suggesting that because he cannot, he would support your views!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well I think he would.

Mr. J. Renwick: You have no right to do that in this House.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have every right.

Mr. J. Renwick: You are suggesting in this House, the member for Sault Ste. Marie—and the Attorney General—is suggesting in this House, in a backhanded way, that the counsel for the Indian band would support his view. I know that the counsel is not free to ever support his view.

Mr. MacDonald: Shame! Shame!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not suggesting my view. I am suggesting that if Mr. McCallum would recount his experiences he would back up, entirely, the facts I have recounted in the House.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. We have listened to this business about the facts long enough. Now let us get a few more of the facts.

The Attorney General is to be commended for his Cabinet solidarity, but nothing more, nothing more at all; because, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Make the point of order.

Mr. Nixon: That is a speech, not a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Is this a point of order?

Mr. MacDonald: Well yes, it is a point of order, because I would like to get another basic fact into the picture. Whose side are the Liberals on anyway?

Mr. Nixon: I am interested in the facts.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, let us get the facts.

The first offer, Mr. Chairman, the first offer that this government made—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: On a point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, go ahead and finish if you are not finished.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I did not think the hon. member had a point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: I do have a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Okay, let us have it.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister says that he has got all the facts. Will the Minister deal with the fact that the first offer made to the Indians by this government was $100 an acre —only $3,000 for the whole of the land? Now will you defend that kind of chiseling?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You are out of order.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not out of order. That is a very relevant point in the overall picture.

Now let us deal with that and defend the position!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I admit quite frankly that there were some early negotiations.

Mr. MacDonald: There were negotiations? A chiseling offer on the part of the government to get the land at $100 an acre!

Mr. Chairman: Order! Let us continue with the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I know that there were some early negotiations.

Mr. MacDonald: If the Indians had been suckers enough to take it, the government would have got that land for $3,000. Now he says that their offer was $31,000.

This is the kind of thing that the government offers. It offers $3,000, then $31,000!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There were some negotiations earlier. The only thing that I know of that, and again I only state what I know, is that their solicitor stated in a letter from himself to the band that the government would offer $500 an acre, which was the figure for which they were acquiring the farm land surrounding the reserve.

So I do not call that chiseling. You put your label on it if you like. But if that is the point of order, that is easily disposed of.

All I say, Mr. Chairman, is—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): You said that they got $500 for the farm land, and all you wanted to give the Indians was $100—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I did not say that there was an offer of $100.

Mr. MacDonald: There was though.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know that!

Mr. MacDonald: There was!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well you can make that point.

Mr. MacDonald: I do—on behalf of the chief, who said so.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The letter of which I have a recollection—

Mr. Chairman: Order. Let us keep it to one point.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —was from the Indians' own solicitor who wrote them and told them the reason they could get $500, I think it was $500 he mentioned.

And I think he advised them to take it. Their own solicitor advised them to take it, because, quite frankly, when the farm land was negotiated and picked up at $500—auctioned at $500—I cannot say he was chiseling or not treating his clients with proper consideration. That was their own solicitor.

Mr. MacDonald: They dismissed him!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, they dismissed him; they were not happy with that offer.

Mr. MacDonald: They did not trust him.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, he is a pretty trustworthy man.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the Indians did not trust him.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I know, that is one of the troubles.

Mr. MacDonald: How can you blame them?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well I dare say that the white man, the non-Indian as my colleague says, certainly has not treated the Indians fairly over the centuries, but I cannot take all the responsibility for that on my own shoulders. I do say that in this case the offer made by the department was reasonable, I think, and generous; and it is generous to this moment.

But the work must go forward. The bypass cannot stand forever, waiting for people who will not talk or negotiate or reveal what is a fair and reasonable price for land.

Perhaps I may say this, Mr. Chairman—I think the Minister of Highways has indicated this, certainly he has indicated it to the council of the city of Sault Ste. Marie—they were anxious, as I was anxious, to locate the bypass further to the east and go through the Indian land. I was most anxious that this result should be achieved. It seemed impossible to achieve it in any reasonable time and the traffic situation compelled The Department of Highways to get on with the job.

The Minister of Highways has said this and I am sure he will confirm this statement. He said, in my presence, to the council of the city of Sault Ste. Marie when we had our last discussion: "Let us get on with this shorter bypass as recommended by your engineers, and if and when the traffic count and the traffic conditions indicate that we should go further to the east we will make another attempt; and we, the department of this government, will be there to pay our share and try to achieve that bypass."

But the simple facts of this situation are that we could not get to grips unless we met the arbitrary figure of $45,000, which had no justification whatever in value unless, as the hon. member for York South wants to put it, it was just because it was an Indian band you should pay whatever they ask.

I do not think that is a situation which you can justify in reason and common sense. Much as I would have liked—and I am the one who will perhaps have to bear the brunt of the failure to get the bypass where I feel it would be most properly situated, that is to the east of Sault Ste. Marie—much as I would like to have achieved that result, I cannot be critical of the final decision of my colleague; not because I want to justify Cabinet solidarity, but because I think it was reasonable, fair and the only decision in the circumstances.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to thresh this bit of straw much longer. When a Minister of the Crown can get up and quote hearsay figures from the paper and not give the House the basic fact that the first offer by this government, to its eternal shame, was a chiseling $100 an acre, and now it has gone up to $1,000 an acre, then at that point says that it cannot go to $1,500 an acre—on what basis does it operate? If you were trying to steal the land at $100 before you got out and did your estimates—before you got the estimate which the Minister said at some point was $500 per acre—it is a perfect example of how this government operates in trying to buy land and in expropriation, a perfect example of it.

But the point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is we have heard from the Minister of Social and Family Services all this rather ghoulish sentiment with regard to Indians. It dripped for the past 24 hours—this story of building better relationships with the Indians, and this is the kind of thing that the government is doing.

You think you are going to get better relationships with the Indians? Well look, just let me put on the record the views of an organization that normally is not on my side; it is normally 105 per cent on the government's side and that is the editorial writers of

the Sault *Daily Star*. We will let their view speak as a consensus for the Soo community. They are referring to the letter of May 3, from Mr. Gomme, in which The Department of Highways finally ended the whole effort at negotiation:

> And so it was that the Highways Minister closed the lid on any hope of the Second Line bypass going through the Rankin reserve. And so it was the provincial government decided that second best was good enough for the Sault—and let there be no arguments about it. And let there be no mistake. The extension of the Second Line to link Highway 17 east and Highway 17 north through the Black Dirt Road as a bypass is without doubt the second best route for the bypass. As far as this city is concerned, the route through the Rankin reserve would be a more superior route.

I am concluding with a paragraph at the end of the editorial:

> Despite appeals by the city for the province to develop the Rankin route, because it was the best possible route, and for the province to pay the Indians the $45,000 for their land, because it was not too far out of line and would help the Indians—

Some little payment back on the heritage that was stolen from them.

> —would help the Indians and foster better city-Indian relations, the government insisted the city do it their way and their way was the Black Dirt Road.

If the Minister wants to defend that kind of thing let him go ahead and defend it and I just hope that he gets into a pack of trouble over it. Indeed I will do my best to make certain that the pack of trouble gets bigger.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will welcome those efforts to make trouble, I am used to them, but let me say that just quoting an editorial comment does not make it proof, it does not make it valid.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps it is as valid as your argument on behalf of the government.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We all would have liked—I would have liked—the bypass well to the east.

Mr. MacDonald: Speak up on behalf of the Indians then!

Mrs. M. Renwick: Fourteen hundred dollars for the "Bypass Ball".

Hon. Mr. Wishart: When you say it is not out of line, bear in mind that $45,000 is nearly 100 per cent out of line, when you talk about $24,500.

Mr. Singer: You cannot talk about $24,500.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I can talk about it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And when you talk about it not being out of line, it is 50 per cent out of line when you compare it with $31,000.

Mr. J. Renwick: Compared with the department's original offer, that does not make it the only one.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: So just quoting an editorial from the Sault *Daily Star* does not make the editorial valid.

Mr. MacDonald: The offer started out at $100 and is now up to $1,000 an acre.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member would like to go back to the first offer, which he says was $100; I do not know that, and I do not know where he gets it.

Mr. MacDonald: The chief says so.

Mr. Singer: Where do you get your $24,500 figure?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That was the evaluator's figure.

Mr. Singer: How do you know? You say it was not revealed to you.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Do you want me to get it for you?

Mr. Singer: Did you have access to that report which was a confidential document?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No I did not. I have never seen it, but I know my figures are correct.

Mr. Singer: How?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You know perfectly well. I will venture to say the hon. member for York South knows it is correct.

Mr. MacDonald: I know nothing of the kind.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You do not? I will venture to say the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Gisborn) knows it is correct, if he were in the House. You doubt me; I would like to have him say so.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: The leader of the NDP does not know the figure, neither does the member for Hamilton East. If the Attorney General wants them to stand up and say so they will do so.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I want to put it simply to the government and I want to put—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Your wife is heckling you.

Mr. J. Renwick: Heckles from front and back.

I would like to put a very simple proposition to the Attorney General and to his colleagues, and to the Minister of Social and Family Services and to the Minister of Highways. If their figure of $31,000 is a correct figure, in their view, of what should be paid, then I would ask them to proceed to expropriate that property, which is subject finally to the determination of the price by the government in Ottawa.

If you will take the procedures that are set forth and go through all the procedures which are required and get the approval of the federal government which bears the final responsibility in this instance, then I think we can say you have offered them a fair price.

But you cannot now back down from the position that you took with that band originally of starting at $100, and now try to suggest it is their fault that they have not accepted the $1,000 an acre which you have now arrived at and that their figure of $45,000 or $1,500 an acre is out of line. The government should do that—which is what they do in other parts of Ontario; they do not hesitate to expropriate for public purposes—they should expropriate in accordance with the procedures that are laid down and let the federal Cabinet ultimately decide whether this government is paying a fair price for that property.

Vote 2011 agreed to.

On vote 2012:

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask a few questions of the Minister of Social and Family Services regarding the assistance that is given to those who have a right to aid under the legal aid plan. I would like to ask first of all, how many cases have been approved from this department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I give all the figures, Mr. Chairman? The legal aid plan received—for the period to April 29, 1968—48,966 cases. There were 2,988 that were refused by the plan, that is by the legal aid plan itself, and there were 45,978 referred to the assessment branch for assessment.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if there is new staff in his department to handle the evaluation of these requests.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are presently 42. We are setting this up as a new legal aid branch, and there were 42 being transferred from the family benefits and the field services branch. There will be a total approved complement provided for in the coming year of 79.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Are any of the people at the present time new staff, Mr. Chairman, and is this their sole job, not transferred from some other field service branch? New staff to take on the checking of these almost 50,000 applicants? And is this their sole job? No additional staff? Sure as anything they have not got any new staff.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The idea of setting up the branch is that ultimately the personnel was assigned to this branch. This will be their sole work, but we are now in a transient stage, of course, removing from the old setup into the new procedure.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask just a very simple question. Is there any additional staff for the 50,000 odd cases that have been handled, and is there any additional staff in the Minister's department to check these applicants' files to see if they are eligible? It seems to me, to look after 50,000 new inquiries in the department, there surely must have been some additional staff.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The 42 positions were all new.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Very well. And is their sole job looking after legal aid?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Right. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, what the floor and the ceiling are for a single man or woman without any dependants in order to qualify for this assistance?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is no floor.

Mrs. M. Renwick: This is the ceiling and floor in cold hard cash—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is no ceiling or floor.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Is the contributing money received back in this department then, Mr. Chairman—the contributing money from the people who have had partial assistance?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The law society receives the money.

Mrs. M. Renwick: The law society. Is it based on a graduated scale, Mr. Chairman, could I ask?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is based on the ability of the person to make a contribution towards the legal services.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, are the contributions on a graduated scale or a lump sum?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This varies on amount in relationship to the individual needs.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Are some of the payments, Mr. Chairman, graduated or are they all in a lump sum?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Some are in graduated payments and some in a lump sum.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Both. Would the Minister know, Mr. Chairman, how much money has come back into the law society from this type of operation?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We do not have that figure, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Do you not have a a figure, nor how much it still owing?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, does he know how this is collected?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Would the hon. member mind repeating that question?

Mrs. M. Renwick: I would just like to ask, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister knows how this money—when the people have received partial assistance, and they in turn now owe money back for the legal aid they have been given—is collected from the people.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is left up to the law society to make their arrangements.

Mrs. M. Renwick: The law society?

I would like to ask the eligibility aspect of legal aid. Are the requirements, Mr. Chairman, similar to the financial requirements, similar to those under other Acts?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They are more generous under the legal aid.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I would like to ask about item 10, section 3. And I quote:

> In respect of any life insurance policy on the life of the applicant, that the applicant has available for contribution—

I presume, Mr. Chairman, that refers back to the debt that he now owes for having received legal aid.

> —the amount of cash surrender value of the policy less the sum of $100.

Is this enforced, Mr. Chairman, might I ask? Do we actually leave these people where they have now no life insurance, except for the sum of $100?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The cash surrender value of an insurance policy in the case of some policies might be tens of thousands of dollars, I believe. I know that I had a policy in which I took a cash surrender value one time, and it amounted to quite a considerable sum of money.

Mrs. M. Renwick: And you are not applying for legal aid, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It may be $5,000 or $1,000, and that is considered as an asset, less the sum of $100. That does not mean that the people are left without insurance.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I think, no. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would explain that again, then, because my interpretation is obviously quite different. I would like to have it assured that we are not in fact leaving them with just the sum of $100 in life insurance.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): No, no.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They can borrow against the policy. There is a cash surrender value worth say $1,000, and they can borrow against that.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to read again exactly the way this section is, because it says that the applicant has, "available for contribution, the amount of the cash surrender value of the policy, less the sum of $100"—contribution to his debt from having received legal aid assistance. Not a way to borrow against it.

I would like to quote, Mr. Chairman, for the record, item 10 (3):

> In respct of any life insurance policy on the life of the applicant, that the applicant has available for contribution, the amount of the cash surrender value of the policy, less the sum of $100.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That does not mean he has to take the cash surrender value.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He can borrow the money from the policy.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He can borrow against the insurance policy which still remains in effect.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Then in item 4, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask in respect to real estate, and I partially quote:

> —except to the extent that in the opinion of the welfare officer, the value exceeds the needs of the applicant and the dependents of the applicant.

I am wondering how you base the rate, or how you judge this decision, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The local director makes that decision, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister be able to tell us on what criteria this is based?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would assume that if a man had a 14-room home and there were three people, the director would take into consideration how much space in the community three people should occupy, by and large, and what the remainder of the accommodation was.

Mrs. M. Renwick: The last question, Mr. Chairman. Are any of your interviewers, the interviewers of Social and Family Services, right in the director of legal aid's office in the Toronto area?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am afraid I did not catch that question myself, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, are any of the interviewers who decide the eligibility of an applicant right in the office of the director of legal aid?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am advised that there are about ten persons.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the Minister concerning legal aid outside the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario. I am aware of a case in northwestern Ontario where people who are not able to provide legal aid of their own or pay for it by themselves, wanted to bring a court case against some people in Manitoba. The decision of the director of legal aid in that area said that they could not do so outside the province of Ontario.

In northwestern Ontario in particular, and certainly in some of the southern areas of Ontario and possibly eastern Ontario at the Quebec border also, we run into a number of problems where court cases of one kind or another have to be brought up in other jurisdictions. I understand at this time legal aid does not cover this area.

Mr. Chairman: I would point out to the member that this question would be more appropriately addressed to the Attorney General.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I am sorry, I was under the impression that this would be under this vote.

Mr. Chairman: No, this is just the welfare assessment.

Mr. T. P. Reid: May I ask the question while I am on my feet then: Is it possible for legal aid welfare to be taken under consideration outside the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As was pointed out by the Chairman, that rightly should be directed to the Attorney General; we are just dealing with the assessments.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer the Minister to a case that came to this department for assessment, that of Paul Polman, who applied for legal aid and of course the Minister's department had to assess his ability to pay his own fee. There are other aspects to the Paul Polman case, but this particular aspect here relates only to the Minister's department concerning the assessment of his income. And I was surprised to find that the report that I saw of the assessment by the Minister's department stated that Paul Polman was wealthy enough to pay the full $300 lawyer's fees.

In looking through how this was assessed —I just draw this to the Minister's attention —it just strikes me that he must surely now review the criterion by which he makes these assessments. For example, Paul Polman did have a small amount of money in the bank

and one of the points I am concerned with is that he was penalized for this in the sense that this detracted, in the department's eyes, from their payment of his legal bill.

It is a very simple point; because he had money in the bank, he was said to be in a better position to pay his legal bills than someone who does not. The point is this, Mr. Chairman, that if Paul Polman had lavished that money on girls or cars or if he had been acting as a teen-ager in disposing of his money in this way, then he may have had a portion of his legal bills met by legal aid.

The problem, Mr. Chairman, is simply that this type of assessment by The Department of Social and Family Services discourages people from saving, discourages people from trying to make the most they can of their meagre income. And the general point, which we raised under another heading, is that you must be very concerned with incentives and how your department affects incentives to people. I suggest in this small example again, that you actually discourage people from saving. In this particular case, if he had spent his money, I think he probably would have had part of his bills paid for him through legal aid. I suggest this is the wrong principle; the department must do research in this area to see what the incentive effects are.

Another point on this particular case is that he had a motorcycle and you know from your report that he used this motorcycle for transportation to work. The market value of the motorcycle was $200. If he had not had that motorcycle, presumably your assessment would have been more favourable towards him in terms of paying part, if not all, of his legal bill through legal aid.

Because you include this type of necessary asset—necessary in the sense he needs this motorcycle to get to work as an alternative of taking public transportation—you are actually putting a disincentive on people who save to buy this type of transportation as opposed to taking public transportation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the Minister's attention that I was just staggered when I came across this type of assessment by his department, I was just staggered by the fact that you assessed this fellow as being able to pay a $300 lawyer's fee entirely. When I look at his disposable income, I see you take it over an 18-month period, instead of what I would think would be a more reasonable 12-month period, and you come to a disposable income over a 12-month period of $94 a month. And somehow, according to your criterion, you say; well, that is a lot of money for this fellow, single, although saving up to get married—this, he said, was one of the reasons he had the money in the bank. I am just astounded, Mr. Chairman, that this department's assessment schedules say that a fellow who has a disposable income of under $100 a month—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What was his total income?

Mr. T. Reid: Total income? The department uses the disposable income figure to arrive at its evaluation. I simply say this, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion to say that a person with a disposal income of less than $100 a month is in a position, particularly in a metropolitan area like Toronto—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, does the hon. member understand that disposable income means the income which is available to him after his ordinary necessary living expenses?

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, I have all the figures here, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is virtually a surplus amount.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, it is not a surplus amount; it is disposable income after you knock off living expenses, right? Using form 2, section 1, sir, you list income of applicant and dependent annually or monthly—in this case $277 a month. You put in living expenses, which you net out at $182.66. That gives you your disposable income figure.

For the Minister to suggest that this is somehow surplus over an amount necessary to live is sheer nonsense, Mr. Chairman. The only thing he has taken out of there is living expenses. How about clothing? How about all the other things that are necessary to exist? I was shocked, Mr. Chairman, to see the Minister stand up now and say disposable income is some sort of surplus. Nonsense, Mr. Chairman, I suggest the Minister change his thinking on that.

And to suggest that someone who has less than $100 a month disposable income, in your own terms which nets out only living expenses, to suggest that person has enough money under the present legal aid system in this province is not right.

Vote 2012 agreed to.

On vote 2013:

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I am wondering under this vote if the Minister's department does any research into glue-sniffing. This has been a problem which is recurring more frequently of late. I noticed in the press where a number of young people have indulged in this activity and I know that it does have very serious effects on their health and actions and so on. I believe it affects the liver and the nervous system and it does affect some people in school; it has a very profound effect on the learning process. In short, it is a problem which is becoming more difficult; it is on the increase, and I wonder if the Minister's department is engaging in any research in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That would properly come under a combination of the Minister of Health and the Attorney General.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he has considered, in this department, instituting studies relating to having certain classifications of jobs set aside for people who suffer certain disabilities or types of disabilities. In other words, say park attendants in some instances.

An individual does not have to be in 100 per cent physical shape and could be gainfully employed in that type of field. There are other types of employment that the physically handicapped and disabled could perform and in that way, we would be able to remove them from the rolls of receiving governmental assistance and making them once more gainfully employed.

Have you studied any occupations?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is a new and developing branch. We have not had that opportunity but I will say that I think there is a good deal of merit in that type of proposition. I can imagine all the difficulties surrounding these people.

We do have a project which is comparable and that will be called our over 50 units. This is to try to get certain jobs available to certain individuals along that line and it is part of our overall rehabilitation programme. But there must be a greater acceptance on the part of the public, management and the unions in this overall scheme. It certainly is something, I think, worth looking into.

Mr. B. Newman: As I come to the buildings in the mornings, on the subway, Mr. Chairman, I see that there is an occupation there that possibly could go to an individual who suffers from some type of handicap; maybe the TTC actually do this on their own. Take the elderly and give them the job of selling tokens and so forth. I think there are fields of employment that could be set aside solely for those with physical handicaps.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, of the Minister under item 4, about the demonstration projects. I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to outline what demonstration programmes we have provided by government?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This past year, there were six projects on behalf of the government. The neighbourhood services unit was sponsored by Metropolitan Toronto on a purchase of service basis from the social planning council of Metropolitan Toronto. The Burlington social centre was the one that we had a bit of discussion on the other day; the credit counselling service of Metropolitan Toronto which we pay for—they are sponsored by The Department of the Attorney General, but we pay for them; and the very recent Hamilton unemployed youth project sponsored by the Hamilton YMCA, just started in October of '67 and will continue for two years.

A very interesting new project, the data processing and systems analysis for child placement is the project being carried by the Metropolitan Toronto children's aid society. If I may just read a sentence or two.

> The purpose is to demonstrate the advantages of using electronic data processing machines to match the foster home placement needs of children with the placement resources available and to predict future needs so as to achieve more effective placement results.

That will continue until the end of this calendar year. Then a model community service for the retarded, a project in the Hamilton-Niagara region being carried out by the national and Ontario associations for the mentally retarded, was started in July and will last for five years.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask. There was not, anywhere in that list, correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Chairman, a mention of any sort of pilot project to understand the problems—of the need for—after-four centres in our communities, such as

the pilot project of Duke of York school which, Mr. Chairman, was turned down for assistance by Mr. Anderson, the welfare commissioner. I wonder if the Minister would care to comment as to whether he would consider sponsoring a pilot project, or in fact allowing this one to continue over another year and we might get better research from it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I think that with respect to the after-four clubs, Mr. Chairman, this is the only difficulty that I am aware of and really it might be called an administrative difficulty. There has to be a new, and I think more adequate, presentation made of the project. It has not been turned down on the merits.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I believe, under the Minister of Education—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This project, I pointed out, is a city of Ottawa project, the after-four club.

Mrs. M. Renwick: You have one after-four listed then, have you, Mr. Chairman, in that group? I am sorry I missed it. You are speaking now about a project that is in effect; may I ask, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No after-four project has been actually approved. There was one put forward on behalf of persons in the city of Ottawa but, I understand, it was not turned down on the merits; it was dealt with on the basis that there would be a re-submission.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Could I ask then, Mr. Chairman, on what basis Metro welfare commissioner John Anderson would have declined following up on the needs of assistance for the Duke of York public school's projected after-four centre?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: May I say that I have been speaking on behalf of the province. I will let Mr. Anderson speak for himself.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I may be very wrong, but Mr. Anderson, as welfare commissioner, does he not have any sort of connection with the Minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He is employed by Metropolitan Toronto.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Could I ask then, in the light of the two-year pilot project in Burlington on the need for information centres in our province, is the Minister contemplating, or do you have at this time, any plans for a pilot project, a demonstration project such as the Burlington project, for an information centre?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, the report and recommendations are under study.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Quinte.

Mr. R. T. Potter (Quinte): Mr. Chairman, for many, many hours now we have been hearing about the inadequacies and inefficiencies of this department and I just wonder if the research and planning branch is giving any consideration to perhaps recommending we take a new look and develop a new approach to this whole problem of assistance.

We have, in our province, and we always will have, those who require total and adequate assistance on a permanent basis, and then we have those who require assistance only of a temporary nature. I think perhaps this group, instead of being offered a handout as everyone is suggesting that we must do, should be given the opportunity of providing their own needs.

In a society such as ours, where we have not enough jobs and where many are not prepared to accept the type of work that is offered to them, I believe that new forms of creative activity must be developed in order to provide both for self-fulfillment and the assumption of social responsibility on the part of the individual.

This objective requires not only a comprehensive programme of rehabilitation, education and training but also an extensive and highly developed public works programme.

Recently we have been hearing a great deal concerning the guaranteed minimum wage. In fact, I believe Mr. Stanfield, who will undoubtedly be the next Prime Minister of Canada, expressed interest along this line.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Potter: One of the fundamental principles of our income tax system has been the exemption of a part of our income from taxation, and at the inception of this system, the exemption ensured that taxes would not be paid on that part of one's income that was required to provide for a reasonable level of subsistence. But since the second world war, the tremendous costs of the war, and inflation of course, have led government to forget the intent and the aim of this type of taxation.

I believe that the immediate aim of our Minister and of our government should be to encourage the federal government to revise

the income tax laws, bring them up to date, and to raise the basic exemption to a level that will guarantee an untaxed income, adequate for minimal subsistence. Then those whose income does not reach this level should be subsidized to bring them up to the desired level so that they can assure their own basic economic support. While all this is going forward, we should assure, and we must assure, all the residents of Ontario of an adequate standard of living. There is no question about it, our policy falls short of this goal because of the inadequate maintenance levels that are offered, and because there are often restrictive and punitive eligibility requirements.

I would ask the Minister if any consideration is being given by this branch of his department, to a revision of the whole system of assistance.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I would just like to draw to the attention of the Minister, a brief on the use of lay assistance for lunchtime supervision of pupils in Ontario public schools prepared by the Toronto home and school council *ad hoc* committee 1967-68. At a general meeting the Toronto home and school council on January 26, 1967, presented a motion to press the necessary bodies for lay assistance for lunchtime supervision. Now, Mr. Chairman, this leads right into; if the children are eating lunch at school because they have not parental supervision, then the question comes to mind, what is happening to these children after school?

It was brought up in the House in earlier discussion by another member that lay assistants could be employed quite easily. It has been discovered they have been used quite successfully in California and England, and in some school districts this is a service that the family pays for at the rate of $2 per pupil per year, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that mothers and working mothers would be glad to pay this amount of money in order to have some lay supervision in the school at the lunchtime period.

In Ontario, the brief states, that there are 49,670 students who stay for lunch because their mothers are working. There are an additional 231,799 who stay for lunch because they are brought by bus or taxi, and 28 schools have 500 pupils plus remaining for lunch. I think that this does really show some merit for a pilot project of some substance in the Metropolitan area as to the use of lay assistants during the lunch hour period and the after-four period of school. I would ask the Minister that he give it serious consideration. The provincial legislation would have to be changed in order to allow lay assistants to give supervisory duties in the schools, but I think that this, and leading into after-four, care, is something we have to come to deal with, and put an end to our latch-key children in our society.

Vote 2013 agreed to.

On vote 2014:

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, that is the one where we asked about the numbers of people on staff, is it not? The Minister referred my very first question on these debates to vote 2014. Am I correct, Mr. Chairman? The staff complement—personnel. Would you like to take a moment, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, you are right.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you. Under vote 2001, item 1, when I asked the complement and the basic qualification of the staff in item 1, the Minister referred me to vote 2014.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What item was the hon. member on?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, item 1, salaries, under vote 2001—$256,000.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is an approved complement of 34 and there are 28 on staff.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I was asking, Mr. Chairman, for the basic qualifications.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The staff complement of the main office, 26 persons. The staff complement as of April 30, 1968, is 26 persons. This includes the Minister's staff, the Deputy Minister's staff and the staff of the executive director of the programmes branch. I do not have the individual qualifications.

Mrs. M. Renwick: That is sufficient, Mr. Chairman. Under vote 2002, item 1, I was questioning as to the complement and if some of these people are field workers of their basic requirements.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The approved complement, 301 and the employees on staff are 273 and there are no field workers.

Mrs. M. Renwick: No field workers in that particular item on salaries? Then the last one, Mr. Chairman, was under vote 2004, under the family services branch. Item 1. Salaries.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are no staff assigned to that branch, as of this moment.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Under salaries, Mr. Chairman, $391,000.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is for the coming year.

Mrs. M. Renwick: How many counsellors, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask, will be included; or else a breakdown of basic qualifications of what staff that will cover?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Thirty-eight out of the 54 will be classified as social workers.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Are social workers able to give counsel?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Vote 2014 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of The Department of Social and Family Services.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions):

Recently I tabled in this House the annual report of The Department of Reform Institutions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967. Copies of this report were placed on the desks of all hon. members and I would hope that most of them have had an opportunity to read the report and examine the charts and statistics contained therein. Because this was a very comprehensive report, I intend, in this my fifth presentation of the estimates of this department, to review briefly, and very briefly, only some of the major developments of the past year and plans for progressive programmes now underway or expected to begin in the near future.

Undoubtedly, the most important development in the past year, in terms of increased responsibilities for the department, was this government's assumption of all costs of the administration of justice in the province. This move placed all responsibility for the maintenance and administration of 35 county and two city jails upon the shoulders of the officials of my department. In addition, it brought an influx of approximately 900 new employees. There are now or will be shortly, under the jurisdiction of this department, a total of 82 institutions which are spread across the 412,000 square miles of this province.

I am most pleased that the government saw fit to relieve the local property taxpayers of the cost of these jails. I am also very pleased that my department has assumed responsibility for these facilities because of the advantages that this takeover presents for the development of an integrated correctional system throughout the province.

One advantage of the takeover will be the extension of the department's rehabilitation programme to the local jail level. Among the other advantages are the following: We will now be able to move forward in a planned and systematic programme of providing regional detention centres without the restriction of adherence to county boundaries; uniform standards will be established in all jails in such areas as food, medical and other services; highly qualified technical and clinical staff will now plan programmes within the jails. In addition, all staffs in jails will be trained by the department to meet its standards for correctional personnel.

Unfortunately, some of the municipalities in which these appalling structures are located have been content to retain them, with only minor patchwork repairs, for well over one hundred years. Despite this situation, the introduction of uniform standards will bring about many improvements in the operations of the jail system. Obviously, however, attempts to provide programmes with a maximum potential for rehabilitation will be greatly restricted until such time as these ancient structures are replaced with modern facilities.

We intend to replace these relics of the past as quickly as possible with modern regional detention centres.

Mr. Singer: Will London be first on the list?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I think, Mr. Chairman, we have already announced which is first on the list. Quinte regional detention centre.

Mr. Singer: Where does London come?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This, of course, cannot be done in one day, or one week, or one year.

Mr. Trotter: Oh, we know that, with this government.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any government that can place them all in one year.

This would require too large an immediate expenditure and so it must be done on a long-term basis. We have set a goal of building one regional detention centre a year until the programme is completed. We believe that this programme—which in some areas will provide for the replacement of up to four old jails with one new unit—is practical and in keeping with the taxpayers' ability to absorb capital expenditures.

I have often criticized these old jails as being dark dingy mausoleums whose physical structures mititate against rehabilitation programmes. They also provide no proper facilities for interviews between prisoners and their families, friends, lawyers, social workers, psychiatrists, and other interested parties.

For some months now we have had a task force in the field visiting each of the jails—and I should add the official task force.

This task force has the responsibility for determining short-term maintenance requirements, setting up new and uniform procedures and standards of service, and establishing priorities for replacement. In addition, officials of my department are now re-examining the regional detention centre concept in the light of the implications of such developments as the establishment of regional detoxication centres.

One of the major advantages of assuming full responsibility for implementation of the regional detention centre programme, not mentioned earlier, is the flexibility which this provides for integrating the jail system into the total correctional programme at a substantial saving to the taxpayers of the province.

One example is the saving which will occur in establishing the proposed regional detention centre in the Kawartha area. It is the department's intention to convert a portion of the maximum security facilities at the Millbrook reformatory for use as a regional detention centre. Since maximum security cells are the most expensive facilities in such centres, this will greatly reduce the overall cost of this unit. There will, of course, I should add, be no mingling of the inmates of the reformatory with prisoners in the regional detention centre.

The existing minimum security facilities at Durham camp adjacent to the reformatory will be enlarged and improved to accommodate prisoners not considered to be security risks.

This utilization of existing facilities will avoid an expenditure of several million dollars through costly duplication of maximum security facilities in this region alone.

In keeping with our attempt to streamline the Ontario correctional system, we have also streamlined the legislation under which provincial reform institutions operate. The Department of Correctional Services Act, which I introduced yesterday, replaces 18 existing Acts related to the correctional and rehabilitation field.

This new Act is the culmination of four years of work in attempting to standardize the provincial system with the federal system in such matters as statutory remission and temporary leaves of absence. The implementation of the live in - work out programme and other rehabilitative plans visualized in this Act indicate our commitment to the adoption and setting up of progressive rehabilitation programmes based on modern, forward-looking correctional philosophy.

In this connection, it is our intention to greatly enlarge clinical facilities for the treatment of alcoholics, drug addicts and sexual deviates. To this end, the Mimico reformatory buildings will be completely renovated to provide for expanding treatment units for these three groups of offenders. The location of these clinics will assist in the recruitment of qualified staff on a full-time and part-time basis from the universities, hospitals and other treatment facilities in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

Over the years the department has attempted to continually improve its in-service programme for correctional personnel. In this connection, a staff training school has been operated at Guelph to which employees throughout the system have been sent for instruction and training. The influx of many new employees from the local jails will place additional strain on existing facilities. To alleviate this situation, the department will construct adjacent to the clinical facilities in Mimico, a new staff training college. The location of this college will assure a ready pool of lecturers from among the senior administrators at the main office in Toronto, and from universities, hospitals, and other treatment units.

A new forestry camp will be opened shortly in Grey county, four miles east of Durham. This camp will be named the Oliver forestry camp in honour of Farquhar Oliver, MPP, who represented Grey South riding in this Legislature for 41 years. I hope to have the honour, Mr. Chairman, of inviting Mr. Oliver to officially open this camp which will

accommodate 40 short-term offenders from the Guelph reformatory.

This camp is part of our on-going programme to reduce the populations in our larger institutions so that we can concentrate our efforts on small groups of inmates.

Hon. members will be pleased to learn that construction is well underway on the Vanier institution for women, and there is every expectation that it will be occupied this year.

The Vanier institution, which will provide a cottage setting for adult female offenders, will, of course, replace Mercer reformatory.

We have continually sought, over the years, to improve our facilities and our programmes and to attract staff of a high calibre. Prior to 1965, we had great difficulty in attracting and retaining highly qualified teachers for the academic and vocational programmes in our institutions. However, a dramatic improvement in this situation occurred when we began, in 1965, to hire teachers on a contract basis. Since that time, we have competed on the open market for teachers; and, as is the practice of progressive school boards throughout the province, we have provided an annual bonus of $500 for our teachers because of the special aptitudes and training required in our schools.

I am very pleased to report that we now have acquired an excellent team of teachers and that this year the number of vacancies at hiring time was lower than in the average school in the outside community, and that a high number of applications were received from teachers seeking these positions.

In addition, all academic and vocational programmes in our institutions must meet the same Department of Education standards that all other schools in the province meet, and are examined regularly by Department of Education inspectors.

I am certain that it will be gratifying to all hon. members that the high calibre of teachers which we have been able to attract and retain has resulted in high standards being achieved in our academic and vocational programmes, particularly in training schools. The variety and quality of these programmes greatly facilitates a smoother transition back into community school programmes.

Earlier this year, in reply to a question in this Legislature, I expressed my pleasure and that of my staff with the programme which is operating at White Oaks village for boys under twelve admitted to the school after an adjudication in juvenile and family court. This programme, which has been in operation since January, 1965, was developed on the premise that the immediate need of these children is to feel secure, to be able to make and preserve trusting relationships with adults and each other.

Control is established in an aura of mutual respect and warm worker-child relationships. The programme employs a cottage setting where boys live in groups of eight to ten and each is cared for by a team of five workers.

I am very pleased to report that longitudinal research indicates that this programme is very successful in assisting youngsters to adjust in their relationships to their homes schools and communities. This study is continuing.

We place, in our department, great stress on our programmes for juveniles because we realize the importance of attempting to reach and help youngsters before they establish a pattern of anti-social behaviour which may continue into adulthood in the absence of positive intervention. Thus we provide a wide variety of programmes in our training schools to try to meet the individual needs of each youngster admitted to our care.

To further increase our effectiveness in determining each child's needs, it is the department's intention to construct a reception and assessment centre for juveniles on a site in the Oakville area. All youngsters will be placed in this facility immediately following adjudication in the juvenile and family court. This unit will accommodate 120 boys and girls and will serve all training schools in the province, including the three private training schools operated by Roman Catholic religious orders.

This unit will operate in close co-operation with the regional assessment centres for emotionally disturbed children that are being established throughout the province by The Department of Health.

Our reception and assessment centre will be fully staffed with social workers and psychologists, with psychiatric consultation available. This centre will replace reception and assessment facilities now provided at Pine Ridge school for boys, and Grand View school for girls.

Mr. Chairman, I have highlighted only a few of the recent developments, plans and projects of my department. What I have attempted to indicate to this House is the general direction in which we are moving,

the progress we have been making, and our intentions for the future.

We realize that we have a long way to go; that we must continually strive to improve our approaches and techniques, our facilities and our programmes.

We feel we are making progress, but we are by no means smug or complacent. Having achieved a measure of success, we have no intention of merely treading water. We shall continue in our serach for a better means of assisting those in our care so that they may return to the community to live meaningful and productive lives.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank all of the after-care agencies and community services clubs and other groups who have assisted the department and lent support to its programmes. I would also express special thanks to the members of my advisory boards and planning committees who give so freely of their time and abilities.

Earlier I mentioned the increased responsibilities that have fallen upon the department this year because of the assumption of the administration of jails and their operation. This has placed a great strain on all the staff of my department by greatly increasing their work loads and they have responded, sir, magnificently to the new challenges which have arisen.

To all staff members I pay a well deserved tribute for their untiring efforts in maintaining and continually striving to improve our programmes for the people admitted to the department's care.

Sir, I commend to the hon. members, the estimates of my department, and ask approval for the funds to carry on our work.

Mr. R. Ruston: (Essex-Kent): Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the efforts of the hon. Minister and his staff in dealing with the problems he is faced with in our modern society.

The new Act announced in the Legislature yesterday to change the name of The Department of Reform Institutions, to The Department of Correctional Services is in line with my remarks I am about to give at this time.

I believe that the title of the department whose estimates we are now considering has a special significance, because it includes the word "correction". That surely must set the tone for the whole approach to these matters, just as the word "penal", in former days, emphasized the punitive aspects. Prison was then a penalty to be paid for a wrongdoing and there was little, if any, thought given to the idea of rehabilitation.

Today we are concerned with bringing a man back into society, after his lapse, and enabling him once more to play a useful role, whenever this can be done without danger to the fabric of society itself. Of course there are the repeaters, and for them, rehabilitation, while possible, becomes increasingly more difficult as society becomes ever more suspicious and fearful of their motivation and their stability. But even in these cases, we must never give up hope, for if we once admit the philosophy of "abandon hope all ye who enter here", then we are really saying that society as a whole should abandon hope.

We are all appalled by the amount of crime on our streets, and most thoughtful people are coming around to the belief that there must be something very wrong in our total social climate, sir, to permit violence to rear its ugly head at the slightest provocation—be it in a mild form on a university campus, or in the extreme form of a murder on the streets in broad daylight, with people passively looking on while the crime is being committed, and then not even being willing to come forward as witnesses.

One of the factors that seem to be speeding up the decay of intelligence is the modern emphasis on the senses and their gratification. It is not without significance that the great scholars of the past were ascetics—they were monks, they were celibate, or at the very least they subscribed to what is now derived as the so-called "puritan ethic". The puritan ethic used to be very strong in Ontario, and some of us are inclined to think that Canada would be better off today if we had been less willing to abandon its strictures in favour of every temptation which came along.

But, for better or worse, we have opened the door. We have what we are now pleased to call a "pluralistic society", which is a kind of situation in which you do not have to profess any kind of belief or faith, where it is all right to make a quick dollar, even if that dollar is made by selling two dozen tubes of airplane glue at one time to a ten-year old, or cigarettes, singly, or contraceptives to teenagers, or girlie magazines and Hollywood scandal sheets to any child with free funds who walks into the store.

We have a society in which the movies and television profess values and hold up as ideals, attitudes which are far from wholesome, yet we are asked, in the name of individual freedom, to allow the exhibition of any film or play and the sale of any book,

without censorship or restriction. In this kind of climate, we cannot be surprised if people's attitudes are changed in the direction of what they see, what they hear, what they experience all around them—and frequently for the worse.

Some of the consequences of the new sexual freedom are already upon us. We are told that venereal disease is out of control in the United States, and that there are at least 35,000 cases in Ontario, although only a tenth of them report for treatment. Presumably, the other nine-tenths are going around infecting others in their happy-go-lucky way. Then there is the untold misery of the abortion factories, the sleazy underground operations, the callous attitude toward procreation and life itself which must arise from the belief that people can do just what they like in the matter of morality.

But, Mr. Chairman, the sexual revolution pales into insignificance when considered in relation to the revolution of violence. I am concerned with promiscuity mainly because it begets permissiveness in other areas. But by far the greatest change in public opinion has occurred in its tacit acceptance of the growing percentage rate of crime in relation to population as something quite inevitable, something that the individual can do nothing about. And alongside this, we have the situation that nobody wants to be involved. These are danger signals indeed, Mr. Chairman, and they relate directly to the philosophy of this department as expressed in its statement of purpose.

That outstanding social worker, Paul Goodman, in his now-famous book *Growing Up Absurd* tells many stories of the disillusionment of teen-agers fresh from school. They go to work and, in their various places of employment, they are confronted with sharp practice. What is a young boy to do? He cannot fight obviously accepted values alone. He takes his guidance from his elders, and soon he, too, is charging for the TV tube he did not replace, or the grease job that he skipped when doing a car lubrication job. There is, about our whole environment today, the atmosphere of a "confidence job". Watch out or you will be tricked, let the buyer beware, never give a sucker an even break—and, of course, the idea of the "big deal", and the marked-down price on everything. When I look at a "cents-off" package, I often feel that the only thing that has really been marked down is the integrity of the buyer and the seller alike.

When these practices are so all-permissive, how can we accomplish the rehabilitation of the prisoner, except in one sense—that of fitting him for the real world, a world which is itself so riddled with poor ethical practices that the prisoner who tries to go straight must be as perplexed by the moral indifference as any of the teen-agers cited in Paul Goodman's book.

If I have taken some time to come to my first point it is because it is a subtle one. I now refer to page 4 of the annual report of the Minister of Reform Institutions for 1967, the well-produced book "The Ontario Plan in Corrections", which was tabled in this Legislature on May 9. Under the heading Principles and Methods, we find, in the fourth paragraph, the blanket statement that "those in our care broke laws because of a particular set of attitudes towards society and life in general. In order to modify these attitudes, open discussion with staff is a prime necessity —" and on page 5, an illustration is given whereby selected custodial staff are used as leaders in guided group discussions. We are asking staff to deal here in value judgments, and my first question of the Minister is, on what tenets are these value judgments based?

We are told, on page 5, that "the moral values of staff associating with prisoners should be in the main those generally acceptable to society at large." I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in today's permissive climate, the moral values which most people are apparently prepared to accept in their neighbours are not necessarily high enough values for the staffs of our correctional institutions, who should, I suggest, be displaying leadership of the highest order. They should be dedicated men and women as, indeed, most of them already are.

In order to attract men and women of this high calibre to service in the often remote locations and always arduous routines of correctional institution life, a number of incentives are necessary. Foremost among them is not money, as some might think, but an image of respect in the public mind. We ought to be undertaking a programme of public education aimed at the general recognition of the qualities of leadership, of integrity, of uprightness, of vocation and of dedication; qualities which many of our correctional staff members possess in full measure.

I also believe that the professional aspect of staff training should be enhanced by appropriate recognition of qualifications on the part of the public. Everybody knows a doctor, or

a lawyer, a professor, a research scientist to be a man of learning and standing. Yet I venture to suggest that in the field of correction and rehabilitation there are many men and women who have devoted as much time to their calling and with as much earnestness as any in the professions I have named. And it is time that we mete out honour where honour is due, and not in the form of verbal thanks, but in the form of continuing qualifications based on study and service and ability, so that the profession of corrections officer becomes improved in the public eye. Then, and then only, will we begin to attract to this rewarding career, high calibre recruits in the numbers needed to make rehabilitation meaningful. For it is on the quality of staff that the success of the whole reform institutions programme hinges.

We are into value judgments once more as we tackle the need to break down the inmate sub-culture, as we are asked to do so in the statement of purpose; because we immediately have to ask ourselves: "break it down in favour of what?" We have to be able to replace that sub-culture with something better, and that something better has to have about it something of an "ideal" nature, while still being recognizable as being a definite part of today's way of life. Perhaps what I am trying to say is summed up in the phrase "aim high". Too often, I think, we set our sights too low. We are content with less than the best.

At the same time, we are in dangerous waters if we believe that moral values are "given" values. They have to be deduced from the conditions of contemporary living. The limitations that are set in our goals are the limits of the possible. I am suggesting that it is in this area—the area slightly above the norm yet within the range of the practical and possible, taking into account the people one is working with, that the hope for correction and rehabilitation lies.

This must always be in our minds, even when we talk about the "inmate sub-culture", because it is well known that human beings emancipate themselves on the basis of natural groups. This would perhaps explain the success of the group therapy attitude changes described on page 15 of the report. My concern is that the graduates of this enlightened therapy should not then be thrust out into a world where they will once again be overwhelmed with loneliness, once more to prowl the streets with weapons in their hands and a lump in their throats.

For this reason, I am, in the main, concerned about after-care and the idea of the half-way house. I want to look in detail at this in a moment. But first, let me underline once more that, however fine the 1967 report of the department may appear on first reading—and it certainly is the most elegant document to come off the government presses so far this season—yet it will not stand up to critical analysis if one asks the simple question: how does the statement of purpose reflect itself in what different contributors to the report have shown to be their philosophy of correction?

To go through the report, with this question in mind and a pencil in one's hand, is a revealing exercise. Thus, on page 14, under treatment services, we are told, in column 2: "Correctional staff have been trained by the treatment personnel and are thus able to assume an active role in the inmate therapy programme, offering group and individual counselling as their own effective level."

Yet on page 20 we find that a disappointing 36 persons out of a total correctional staff of 1,200, attended the Ontario group psychotherapy association workshop, a distressing 136 attended the correctional officers' staff training course, and that the total enrolment in the certificate course in corrections at both McMaster and the University of Toronto, was only 107. The implications of this low proportion of correctional staff taking advantage of key courses are serious if they are to be coupled with the progressive attitude of the psychological staff of using correctional staff as the front-line runners in the rehabilitation process.

Correctional officers have to have a basis, for example, for knowing the power of suggestion upon the suggestible. They have to know the effect of the intensification that results from a restricted environment. On page 71, we are told that the setting of Hillcrest school represents to the 48 boys sent there for reasons of security, "aspects of external security that are necessary for internal feelings of security". Yet it is surely true that suggestions made at Hillcrest would provoke a different response from similar suggestions made in the freer surroundings of White Oaks village at Hagersville, where the base of normal community life is more accessible.

Similarly, in reference to Galt, on page 16, we are told that the programme seeks to apply "behaviour therapy—the systematic use of rewards and sanctions for the purpose of encouraging acceptable behaviour". Mr.

Chairman, this is much more than a "carrot-and-stick" philosophy. In the days of the little red schoolhouse, the community was stable, the standards were known, the goals were agreed. Today it is not so. There are so many variables, there are no fixed positions, and the very norm of society has changed in the interim while a prisoner is incarcerated, perhaps as a first offender. This means that updating of staff must be a continuous process, and the correctional staffs must be paid to learn, with new techniques being an essential part of their continuing education.

One would hope, for example, that those members of the team who are not psychiatrists, but who are involved in giving the aversion therapy referred to on page 16, at the Alex G. Brown memorial clinic at Mimico, are familiar with the moral implications of this treatment. A good many people are clearly setting themselves up, if not as gods, at least as counsellors, and, while this may be essential if we are to make any progress at all, it is irresponsible if not accompanied by mandatory in-service training and education for those involved.

That is why perhaps the most frightening aspect of this report is the sketchy nature of the section on staff training and development. Here we have a 110-page report, and only three pages are devoted to this absolutely vital aspect of corrections.

Of course, that is not surprising when we look at vote 1901 on page 116 of the estimates for 1968-69, only to discover that, out of a total budget of over forty million dollars, staff training and development occupies such a low place in the order of things that it is much less than a quarter of a million dollars. In other words, about only one dollar in every 170 dollars goes on this most vital business of trying to tell the staff what the aims and purposes of correction are and how to achieve them. No wonder some people in this department think that the staff training and development story can be told in only three pages of text.

Mr. Chairman, this is just not good enough. It is a gratuitous insult to the members of this House to expect that we will be satisfied with a sketchy report like that. On page 18, two lines tell us that in the five-week basic staff training course that all correctional officers must complete during their first year, before being appointed to regular staff, there are, and I quote, "sessions designed to modify attitudes of trainees". That is all we are told about it. What kind of sessions are these? Who conducts them? According to what recognized principles? With what goals in mind? Towards what end?

On the same page, our fears increase as we realize that the author of this particular section of the report at least has fallen into the familiar trap of regarding only his own people as professionals. Again I quote, from page 18—"This will permit the extension of counselling services by using correctional officers in areas formerly open only to professional staff". The clear implication here is that the correctional officers are non-professionals.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is this kind of thinking within the department itself—and let me assure the Minister that his department is not unique in this pecking-order problem, which is probably far worse in The Department of Education—it is this kind of thinking that bedevils the whole approach to correction and rehabilitation. The danger is that it sets up two poles of thought—two sets of goals rather than one—and if that happens, the whole Statement of Purpose is set at nought.

Taking this point a little further, there are 833 male correctional officers in grades one and three, according to the figures on page 21 of the report; 107 in grade 4, 70 in grade 5, a low 35 in grade 6 and only 8 in grade 7. The figures are rather better for the female correctional officers—64 in grades 1 and 3, 4 in grade 4, 10 in 5, two in 6; and here again one suspects that, because smaller numbers are involved, upgrading has been possible more closely in accord with qualifications.

I am quite sure that professional pride is involved here, too, as it is in the ranks of the clinical staff. I am sure that professional pride manifests itself in the ranks of the training school supervisors also, whose pattern also shows the familiar promotional tapering-off. But do you not see, Mr. Chairman, how very devastating it is for a progressive statement to be made under the heading "treatment services" on page 14, by the late, and respected, Vladimir Hartman, and for this to appear in the same publication as the regressive statement about "professional staff" which appears under staff training and development, page 18?

I find myself asking: Am I really looking at one report? Is this really one department, with a common aim and purpose? Or is it, in fact, merely an aggregation of people, all of whom have their own ideas of right and wrong, and of goals to aim for, and of the

kind of society they are counselling the inmates back into? This suspicion is intensified when I turn to page 24, to discover, in the paragraph the chaplain and his teaching that, and I quote, "The chaplain's goal is the development of a law-abiding person". That must come as something of a shock to those of us who regarded that as the domain of the chaplain's secular colleagues!

Is it too naive to suggest that perhaps the chaplain's goal might be set on a somewhat higher spiritual plane, perhaps even on the plane of the kingdom of heaven? But clearly, the whole tenor of the chaplain's report is concerned with social adjustment, the creation "of understanding and goodwill towards the offender." We are told that the chaplain, "by intensive community involvement, fosters understanding and increases community responsibility in the field of corrections". What we are not told is how the community can assume responsibility for something over which it has no control—the direction of rehabilitation. In fact, the whole tenor of the report is extremely vague in this regard.

Yet another goal is held up under recreation, page 28, where Dale Carnegie speaking diplomas are on offer as awards. This department picks out the words "useful citizens" from the umbrella Statement of Purpose. In fact, it is possible to be diametrically opposed in your aim from the goals of your colleague, and still find something appropriate in this all-embracing August 1965 Statement of Purpose, "which was prepared by the department and announced by the Minister as the policy on which all programmes would be based and by which future planning of the department would be guided." At least, that is what it says on page 40.

For food services, on page 30, the goal is "to do a job efficiently" and "to appreciate the satisfaction of achievement." Confidence, skill, opening up of better job opportunities on an inmate's return to the community occupy this section, but attitudes are not mentioned. Perhaps this is because, as we approach the real world of work, the kind of work that in practice is available upon release into the community, the dichotomy between the psychiatrist's hopes and the chaplain's expectations on the one hand, and the chance of earning a dollar again on the other, becomes evident.

Now the ideal evaporates altogether, for we discover that the terms of reference of the trades and industries advisory committee are to assess correctional facilities not with the aims and purposes of page 4 in mind, but rather, and I quote, "to ensure that each inmate is receiving training suitable for employment purposes". Gone are the high hopes now. We are down to brass tacks. We must mould the correctional system to fit the available labour market. We must shape the supply to meet the demand.

Whoever wrote the section on county jails and the regional detention centre plan did not fall into this trap. He states that the aim here is "to offer a positive and useful programme geared to special needs, in line with an effective correctional and rehabilitative philosophy". But he does not say what that philosophy is.

In adult female institutions, one of the best sections in the report, we are told: "It is a fundamental error to assume that academic or vocational training is the answer for all". That is on page 41. But the trades and industry advisory committee is not concerned with namb-pamby nonsense of that kind. Its terms of reference say everybody gets trained, and that is that. Meanwhile the lonely voice of Miss Aileen Nicholson sounds the warning on page 41, that "many have emotional problems that must be solved before they are likely to benefit from training."

So, Mr. Chairman. I have to ask, how much public money are we wasting in putting people through a training mill, who ought to be in analysis? Miss Nicholson makes what might be a key point in saying that programme should set out objectives which are attainable within the length of a sentence. Is it always possible, I wonder, even to embark upon trade training within this length of time? How much pressure is coming from the syrup bottling company to get people back into a Chaplin "modern times" routine, instead of getting to the core of their disabilities? Is there any evidence of this at all? Because, if there is, it is a doubly short-sighted policy, as automation and cybernation sweep assembly line jobs away. In this climate, it is probably better to prepare inmates for the creative use of enforced leisure, of which they are likely to have plenty, than to put them into a repetitive minimum-wage situation merely because that is where society expects such people to go.

Miss Nicholson's essay says that, within her sphere of influence, "a system of on-going staff meetings ensures that the programme is being carried out consistently, and also that adjustments in the programme are made as a woman's attitude or situation changes." In other words, the principle of feedback is at work here. We learn of a co-operative working

relationships, of the inmate's active involvement in plans for her own rehabilitation, and of small group living and social interaction. All of this is excellent and progressive. But we were back to brass tacks again on page 47, talking in terms of "productive work" and "useful skills" in male institutions, after page 45's high hopes about reducing tension and conflict, re-integration into free society, and programmes being set up on the basis of each offender's personality assessment.

On page 45, it is said that "changes external to departmental control, could render buildings disfunctional in the face of new demands placed upon them". But nowhere in the report is the more important and parallel point made that rehabilitative programmes themselves may be rendered disfunctional by the rapid changes that are now abroad. For example, one has only to be aware of the existence of the British Wolfenden report, and the influence it has had on the thinking of Canada's justice department, to realize that some who are now incarcerated for certain offences may re-enter the community to discover those offences have been legalized in the interim. How do you counsel an inmate that the crime for which he or she was sentenced is now socially acceptable and perhaps as common as a coffee break?

Mr. Chairman, on page 56, we are told that "The department continues in its attempts to reach the point where it will be generally recognized as a model of correctional procedures and practices." I think I have said enough to show that the department may be not one model, but several. The impression given by the annual report is of many well-meaning and often highly-qualified people all convinced that they are the professionals, all running in different directions, all uncertain of the departmental goal. And I want to suggest that The Department of Reform Institutions has never defined its aims in terms more precise than its 1965 Statement of Purpose, which is vague enough, and platitudinous enough, to mean all things to all men. For this state of affairs, the Minister alone must assume responsibility.

The recent seminar on "The Police and the Youthful Offender" at McMaster University has shown how very wide is the gap between the poles of opinion on how delinquent youngsters should be dealt with, and I am quite sure that this strong difference of opinion extends right through the age groups.

For this reason I have left until the last the most controversial proposal that I have to make in this general critique of the department. I know that there is nothing in the current estimates for it, but I feel that there ought to be something, and that whatever is budgeted here will be more than saved under item 4 of vote 2003 of The Department of Social and Family Services. What I want to see is a tiny fraction of that $38.5 million to be spent as assistance under The General Welfare Assistance Act, being spent instead to pay the minimum wage establishment for Ontario to all prisoners who are gainfully employed in the production of goods while incarcerated.

I propose that 75 per cent of this sum should compulsorily go to the dependents of the prisoners, and the other 25 per cent be held in trust against the day when the prisoner enters the community again as well as paying for his keep. Safeguards would have to be written into a detailed statute, of course, but we have competent advice at our disposal—the advice of devoted men and women who have given this matter a great deal of thought. I think that it would be possible for a reformed prisoner to really start a new life on the straight and narrow road, with a little nest-egg to begin with, and controls over the way in which that money was used, possibly as part of the terms of probation.

I certainly do not want to see anyone being done out of a job by this proposal, but if I thought that that would happen, I would not make it. However, I think that there is a good enough case made out for the establishment of a select committee to look into this whole issue.

Let us have some hard facts. How much money was paid out of the general welfare assistance fund to dependents of prisoners in Ontario over the past series of years? How did impersonal payments of this kind take away from the father-image and the vestiges of dignity that even a convicted man might be expected to retain, given a sound psychological approach to his position? The fact that a man is weak and fallen does not entitle us to deprive him of responsibility forever thereafter. In fact, we should be building back his responsibility, shaping that part of his character that will make him once more a man, a person who can play a meaningful role in society.

How much better if a prisoner can think to himself: "I made a mistake, but at least I am still supporting my family, even in jail." Turn welfare handouts into income, that is all I am asking. Pay the recognized hourly minimum wage for the job in Ontario, and

make the prisoners work. I am convinced it would not cost more. I suspect there are hidden savings here that a select committee could well explore. And, most certainly, there are big psychological and rehabilitative gains to be made through this progressive change.

The Minister says: "The world is looking to Ontario in the matter of reform." Very well, let them have something that will make them look twice. Let us be a world leader in our psychological approach. Let us not make the mistake of emphasizing the word "institutions" at the cost of the larger concept of "reform."

Thank you.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I want to make an announcement to the House, which is why I asked the committee to rise and report. It was on May 2, in response to a point of order raised by the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), that I said I was going to look into the Cara Villa affair, as I suppose it might be termed because of the conflicting statements that have been made and the conflicting opinions that have been put before the House.

I asked the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), if he would refer this matter to the criminal investigation department of the provincial police, in order that they might investigate and establish the truth and falsity of some of the statements that were made. Their recommendation has been that charges should be laid against Mrs. Gurman and information has been made by the provincial police against Mrs. Gurman containing nine charges of common assault and four charges of assault occasioning actual bodily harm with respect to patients at the Cara Villa nursing home.

I believe the summons has been served—it was served last evening on Mrs. Gurman—and this matter will be dealt with, from here on, in the courts.

Mr. Speaker: Might I, before the Prime Minister deals with the House business, remind the members of the Clerk's meeting again tomorrow at 12:30 noon in committee room 1, for the purpose of studying the rules and procedures. They are good meetings, and I would hope that many of the members could find time to be present.

Clerk of the House: The 16th order; House in committee of supply, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sandwich-Riverside. He has something to say.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): I was suggesting we might adjourn.

It being 6 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.

APPENDIX

11. *Mr. T. Reid* (Scarborough East)—Enquiry of the Ministry—(a) Has the office accommodation division of The Department of Public Works rented office space for government use at 1 St. Clair Ave. West, Toronto? (b) If so, how many square feet of floor space have been rented for government use, what is the monthly rental rate per square foot, on what date did the rental agreement come into effect, and how many government office employees worked in this office space as of the middle of December, 1967?

Answer by the Minister of Public Works:

(a) Yes—property section, Department of Public Works.

(b) 69,115 square feet; $5.14 per square foot per year; December 1, 1967.

Information to be supplied by occupying department.

11. *Mr. T. Reid* (Scarborough East)—Enquiry of the Ministry—(a) Has the office accommodation division of The Department of Public Works rented office space for government use at 1 St. Clair Ave. West, Toronto? (b) If so, how many square feet of floor space have been rented for government use, what is the monthly rental rate per square foot, on what date did the rental agreement come into effect, and how many government office employees worked in this office space as of the middle of December, 1967.

Answer by the Minister of Health:

(a) Answerable by the department concerned.

(b) (last part) No employees of The Department of Health.

6. *Mr. T. Reid* (Scarborough East)—Enquiry of the Ministry—During the year ended December 31, 1967: (a) How many members of the staff of the educational television branch visited what European capitals and for what purpose? (b) How many members of the educational television branch have travelled overseas at government expense, and state the purpose of these journeys? (c) During the year ended December 31, 1967, how many telephone calls were initiated between Europe and Canada or vice versa by the staff of the educational television branch and how many of these were in excess of $25?

Answer by the Minister of Education:

The following is given in reply to question No. 6 on order paper No. 6:

(a) and (b) Four regular members of the staff and five contracted members of the staff travelled overseas at government expense. The European capitals visited by the regular members of the staff were London, Dublin and Paris. The contracted members visited various locations in England, Germany, Belgium, France, Holland, Poland and Italy. Two of the officials of the branch attended the 3rd EBU international conference on educational radio and television at the invitation of the Canadian broadcasting corporation to be part of the Canadian delegation. On route they conferred with members of the London institute of education, officials of the British broadcasting corporation, the inner London education authority, the associated television limited, London, and the Glasgow education authority. Two other officials visited the British Isles to examine production operations, procedure and the budgeting cost control systems, administrative procedures, potential programme exchange and copyright requirements, network operations and procedures, as well as relationships established between the educational community and the broadcaster and the professional broadcasters. In addition, two members of the ETV branch visited the Bahamas at the request of the government of the Bahamas in order to advise that government on the possible development of educational television in that jurisdiction.

(c) The members of the educational television branch staff initiated ten calls between Europe and Canada, contracted production personnel initiated 15 calls. Each of these calls was in excess of $25. The calls related primarily to negotiations for the availability of studio production facilities. A direct result of these telephone conversations was the final negotiation of agreements considerably below the costs initially tabled by the suppliers. In negotiations with a major production facilities supplier, a saving of approximately $48,000 was effected.

The telephone calls made by production personnel were in each instance approved by the executive producer as being necessary to arrange production personnel, production facilities, to conduct research, to obtain programme materials or to arrange on-camera persons. The purpose of the calls was to make prior arrangements for resources in Europe before local crews and contracted producers undertook actual production.

12. *Mr. T. Reid* (Scarborough East)—Enquiry of the Ministry—(a) Has the office accommodation division of The Department

of Public Works rented office space for government use at 15 Overlea Blvd., Thorncliffe Park, Toronto? (b) If so, how many square feet of floor space have been rented for government use, what is the monthly rental rate per square foot, on what date did the rental agreement come into effect, and how many government office employees worked in this office one month after the rental agreement came into effect?

Answer by the Minister of Public Works:

(a) Yes—property section, Department of Public Works.

(b) 155,324 square feet; $4.83 per square foot, per year; December 1, 1967.

Information to be supplied by occupying department.

12. *Mr. T. Reid* (Scarborough East)—Enquiry of the Ministry—(a) Has the office accommodation of The Department of Public Works rented office space for government use at 15 Overlea Blvd., Thorncliffe Park, Toronto? (b) If so, how many square feet of floor space have been rented for government use, what is the monthly rental rate per square foot, on what date did the rental agreement come into effect, and how many government office employees worked in this office one month after the rental agreement came into effect?

Answer by the Minister of Health:

(a) Answerable by the department concerned.

(b) (last part) No employees of The Department of Health.

19. *Mr. Pilkey*—Enquiry of the Ministry—Having regard to the projected five-year requirement for construction, salaries and other related costs to the education system, what effect will the regional education board system have on the future mill rates applicable to education costs in the city of Oshawa?

Answer by the Minister of Education:

In reply to question No. 19 on order paper No. 13, it is impossible to say what effect the regional education board system will have on the future mill rates in the city of Oshawa. The new regional education boards are proposed to provide special educational services over wider areas and to equalize educational opportunities. It is hoped that the centralization of administration will effect more economies but the additional services which are required in some parts of the proposed new divisions will necessitate additional expenditures.

33. *Mr. Brown*—Enquiry of the Ministry—(a) What government departments used the services of Public Relations Services Limited during the 1967 calendar year? (b) For what periods did each individual department contract for those services? (c) What was the cost to each department employing the services of Public Relations Services?

Answer by the Prime Minister:

(a) Department of Transport; Department of Tourism and Information—main division; Department of Tourism and Information—centennial centre of science and technology; Department of Health.

(b) Department of Transport—month-to-month purchasing service; Department of Tourism and Information—main division—month-to-month purchasing service; Department of Tourism and Information—centennial centre of science and technology—month-to-month purchasing service; Department of Health—January to May, 1967, inclusive.

(c) Department of Transport, $19,253,41; Department of Tourism and Information—main division, $80,395.82; Department of Tourism and Information—centennial centre of science and technology, $25,444.26; Department of Health, $16,218.34.

51. *Mr. Martel*—Enquiry of the Ministry—(a) How many gallons of gas were sold in Ontario in 1964? (b) Would this have netted the government approximately $230,000,000 for taxes for 1964 if all the money had reached the Treasury? (c) What, in fact, did the Treasury receive from gas taxes in 1964? (d) If there is a difference in what should have been collected and what was actually collected, why? (e) Where did this money go?

Answer by the Provincial Treasurer:

(a) As provincial records are kept on a fiscal year basis, the answer to this question has been based on the fiscal year from April 1, 1964, to March 31, 1965, which is the fiscal year closest to the calendar year 1964. Gross sales for use in Ontario of gasoline and liquefied petroleum gases, exclusive of aviation fuel, were 1,598,935,172 gallons in the fiscal year 1964-65. After deducting tax exempt sales to the federal government, the sales for which a tax liability was incurred for the fiscal year were 1,593,901,932 gallons.

(b) See answer to (c).

(c) Revenue from gasoline tax is recorded on a fiscal year basis, and due to the method of collection and adjustments at the fiscal year end, the revenue does not relate, pre-

cisely, to the taxable sales reported in (a). For the fiscal year 1964-65, after providing for remuneration of one-tenth of 1 cent per gallon (authorized under revised regulations of Ontario 1960, Reg. 206, section 1), revenue from gasoline tax was $237,614,835. After a further provision of $16,426,280 as refunds (authorized under sections 2 and 5 of the same regulations), net revenue in that fiscal year was $221,188,555. This latter sum includes a net revenue from tax on aviation fuel of $1,081,027 for that fiscal year.

(d) Where gasoline tax is remitted in full on the due date by a collector under agreement, relief may be given subsequently to the collector if licensed retailers, for reason of bankruptcy or inability to pay, fail to remit tax to the collector. A difference in what should have been collected and what is actually collected will then arise. During the fiscal year 1964-65 the extent of this difference, relating mostly to previous years, amounted to $27,798.

(e) Subject to any direct collections by The Treasury Department, outstanding balances deemed, after full consideration, to be uncollectable are recommended for write-off under section 22 of The Financial Administration Act.

52. *Mr. Sargent*—Enquiry of the Ministry—(a) What are the names of the firms which received consultants' contracts from The Department of Highways last year? (b) How many years has each firm received government business? (c) How much money did each firm receive last year? (d) What is the basis of payment? (e) Is the basis of payment consistent with payments in private industry? (f) If the basis of payment is cost plus 50 per cent, are there any other contracts let on this basis?

Answer by the Minister of Highways:

1967-1968

(A)	(B)	(C)
	years	
Canadian Aero Services	2	$ 106,976.98
Capital Air Services	1	17,240.00
Damas & Smith	7	92,597.24
De Leuw Cather	14	1,543,693.28
Dillon, M. M.	9	271,213.02
Ewbank, Pillar	4	102,246.25
Foundation of Canada Engineering Corp. Ltd.	10	668,712.07
General Photogrammic Services	3	29,159,30
Geocon Ltd.	12	370.20
Giffels & Assoc.	10	509,189.98
Golder, H. Q. & Assoc.	8	91,520.55
Graham, R. Bruce	1	312.65
Hydrology Consultants	1	493.40
Johnston, Paul & Assoc.	1	300.00
Jorgensen, R. & Assoc.	3	113,968.47
Kilborne Engineering	1	1,782.24
Lockwood Surveys	2	64,018.85
MacLaren, J. F.	1	2,960.00
Makeymec & Assoc.	1	
Marshall, Macklin & Monaghan	3	56,060.69
McCormick & Rankin	12	776,737.90
Parker, C. C.	11	735,975.70
Pathfinder Air Services	3	9,972.12
Proctor & Redfern	11	209,454.49
Spartan Air Surveys	3	19,664.71
Terea Surveys Limited	1	15,574.90
Tomlinson, J. N.	2	57,102.42
Totten, Sims, Hubicki & Assoc.	4	71,533.01
Woodstock Engineering Vance, Needles)	3	64,995.46
Wylie & Ufnal	8	57,364.87
		$5,691,190.75

(D) Payment is based on the schedule of fees for consulting engineering services—1967, as recommended by the association of professional engineers of Ontario.

(E) Yes.

(F) No.

55. *Mr. Martel*—Enquiry of the Ministry—(a) Can the Minister of Municipal Affairs explain the high mill rate in Lively, Levack and Onaping? (b) Are the mill rates in these three municipalities comparable to the mill rates in other mining municipalities of similar size? (c) How will those rates affect the mining and shelter grants?

Answer by the Minister of Municipal Affairs:

(a) The Department as of May 3, insofar as 1968 expenditures are concerned, had approved only the budget estimates of two mining municipalities in the Sudbury area. These were for the town of Levack and the improvement district of Onaping.

The 1968 consolidated residential mill rate for public school supporters for the town of Levack is 15.13 mills higher than in 1967. The increase is due principally to increased expenditures for general government, for protection to persons and property, and for education.

The consolidated residential mill rate for public school supporters in the three areas of the improvement district of Onaping is lower than in 1967.

(b) A comparison of the 1967 equalized mill rates for mining municipalities of a similar size reveals the following:

CONSOLIDATED MILL RATES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPPORTERS

	Lively	*Levack*	*Onaping*	*Chelmsford*	*Haileybury*	*Cobalt*	*Geraldton*	*Manitouwadge*
Residential	57.35	37.58	33.81 29.39 25.24	31.38	32.26	45.41	38.23	35.75
Commercial	64.60	42.09	37.67 32.76 28.15	35.29	35.86	51.63	42.95	39.34

In the town of Lively it is estimated the 1968 consolidated residential mill rate for public school supporters will be approximately 20 mills lower than in 1967.

(c) The mining revenue payments in 1968 are calculated in part using the commercial rate levied on public school supporters in 1967. The effect of this year's mill rates will not be known until the 1969 mining revenue payment is calculated.

A higher tax rate will produce a correspondingly higher residential property tax reduction credit. This is consistent with the situation in respect to non-mining municipalities.

56. *Mr. Nixon*—Enquiry of the Ministry—1. How many days did the construction strike last at the Pickering nuclear generating station? 2. Was any part of the announced delay due to design-changes arising from experience at Douglas Point? 3. What delays have been experienced in obtaining delivery of equipment? 4. (a) Were any such delays due to the failure of contractors or subcontractors to meet contractual commitments? (b) If so, were any penalties imposed, by whom, and in what amount? 5. Were any such delays due to incompatibility of equipment produced by different suppliers, for example, pump components, as a result of extreme fragmentation of tenders? 6. Were any such delays caused by failure of any component to come up to the specification laid down in any particular? 7. What senior staff changes have taken place in relation to the Pickering project in the last 12 months?

Answer by the Minister of Energy and Resources Management:

1. The following summarizes strikes which occurred at Pickering generating station:

(a) Ironworkers—unlawful work stoppage between December 7, 1966 and January 17, 1967.

(b) Legal strike by the plumbers and pipefitters—May 1, 1967 to January 2, 1968.

(c) Legal strike by ironworkers—May 1, 1967 to November 1, 1967.

(d) Legal strike by carpenters and joiners —May 1, 1967 to August 22, 1967.

(e) Ten other unions of the allied council, including boilermakers, bricklayers, plasterers and masons, electrical workers, labourers, machinists, operating engineers, painters and decorators, teamsters, hotel and restaurant union, all on legal strike from May 1, 1967, to July 17, 1967.

Major curtailment of work during the entire period from May 1, 1967 to January 2, 1968, required forced layoffs of other trades.

2. No.

3. With one important exception, delays in equipment deliveries to the project have been nominal and could have been accommodated within the original schedule. That exception is the reactor end shields. At present it cannot be determined whether end shield delivery or the construction strikes which have occurred will prove to be the controlling factor in the announced deferment of in-service date. Both are considered to be equally responsible at the present time.

4. (a) Yes—see answer to question No. 3.
(b) No penalties have been imposed.

5. No.

6. No.

7. The general superintendent at the project resigned to accept a position elsewhere and has been replaced.

No. 97

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, May 28, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 28, 1968

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman, continued 3507

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3545

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS
(*Continued*)

Mr. Chairman: Before we proceed with the estimates, I would like to take this opportunity to extend a welcome to the group of young people in the gallery, the YPCs from Peel North.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, the introduction by the Minister of The Department of Correctional Services Act, 1968, has enabled me to review and revise and shorten the remarks that I have had ready for the past few months. I would appreciate his bringing forward the bill at this time, as it saves me the necessity of advocating the many progressive ideas that the Minister is now apparently willing and able to adopt as official policy. This is very thoughtful of the Minister. It may have reduced my speech by several hours, and I am sure that all members are grateful for this move on the part of the Minister.

As the lead-off speaker for the New Democratic Party, in discussing The Department of Reform Institutions, I wish to state that my assessment and understanding of this subject is based on discussions and correspondence with people in this field, and upon my own experience with, and knowledge of teenagers, through some 34 years as a collegiate teacher in that part of Windsor that is still known as Walkerville.

First of all, however, Mr. Chairman, I must commend the Minister for his almost constant presence in the House, and for the fact that he almost always listens to what is being said, and even tries to follow the discussion. In fact, if it were not for his numerous humorous interjections, the attendance would be much lower than it usually is.

I have been told that Canada has the greatest prison population per capita in the world, and that 80 per cent of the released prisoners return to prison. If this is true, there are many conclusions that might be drawn. One might conclude, erroneously perhaps, that our police force is the most efficient, or that our people are the most disorderly, but the valid conclusion, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, is this: Too many offenders are being sentenced to imprisonment, and too little is being done to prepare the released prisoners for society, or too little is being done to prepare society for the released prisoners.

As many hon. members already know, Windsor has the distinction of having the first St. Leonard's house in Canada. The success that has been achieved by this half-way house, in helping released prisoners return to society on an accepted and acceptable basis, has led to plans to establish 20 St. Leonard's houses across the breadth of Canada. For the benefit of members who may not be familiar with the resident programme of St. Leonard's house, I should like to read a brief description from the 1960 annual report:

> Our two houses at 491 and 495 Victoria Avenue, housed 18 men at a time, and during the year 1967 there were 120 guests at St. Leonard's house. At the rear of the property, in a converted garage, we have space for office administration, and the basement of 495 was converted, at the end of the year, for use in our employment and out-client programme.
>
> Of the 120 men who passed through St. Leonard's house last year, 46 came from federal penitentiaries, 62 from provincial reformatories and 12 from county jails and other institutions. Their average age was 30 years and each had spent an average of four years in prison on their last four convictions, which did not include their total criminal history.
>
> The criminal categories for the men coming through St. Leonard's house range from theft to manslaughter, including the general range of assault, robbery with violence, armed robbery, false pretense and breaking and entering. In addition to facing the problems of changing from criminality to adjusting outside the prison walls, many of our men had special personality problems to resolve. Fifty-nine per cent had

problems with alcohol, 5 per cent had a history of narcotic addiction.

St. Leonard's house is designed to work with men from the most disadvantaged groups in our prison system. Due to the fact that most of the men coming to St. Leonard's house do not have a home to go to after their release, the average length of stay at St. Leonard's house in 1967 was 47 days.

Now it gives some further information which I think I shall abridge:

We have two students from the school of social work at Wayne State University. The idea is to make the transition of the men as smooth as possible from complete dependency in prison to independency by setting both short-term and long-term goals in conjunction with the men. This is accomplished through conferences with the case workers assigned, group conferences which occur weekly, and through the experience of living and sometimes by trial and error in the real world outside prison walls.

Not all men survive this encounter. By the end of the year, 13 per cent of our men were back in trouble with the law, either charged with new crimes or technical parole violations. Of the men who remain outside at the end of 1967 and who have survived the initial crisis, 69 per cent are working and doing well at the end of 1967.

That, Mr. Chairman, gives a concise objective description of the resident programme of St. Leonard's house.

Before I continue with my main theme, Mr. Chairman, I wish to mention a further programme at St. Leonard's house, one that has developed perhaps unforeseen but quite naturally—ex-guests, come back for further counselling and for job placement assistance. They come back for recreation and for just plain fellowship. Casual visitors who have been in institutions turn up seeking help and advice. Prisoners who may become guests, correspond regularly. Parolees who do not live in, seek guidance, and ordinary citizens whose friends or relatives are getting into difficulty with the law come for help and advice.

All of these come to St. Leonard's house, creating what the staff calls their out-client programme. By 1966 such interviews totalled 2,367 during the year. This was in addition to over 5,000 recorded interviews with the residents; out-clients average three interviews each annually. During 1967, a staff member of St. Leonard's house visited or corresponded with 273 prisoners who were still actually serving time. From this it can be seen that this aspect of the work is extremely important, since St. Leonard's house is available on a seven-days-a-week, 24-hours-a-day basis. More and more people are seeking the service outside of normal working hours.

How much is an institution or an organization such as St. Leonard's house worth to the province of Ontario? How much is it worth to the work of the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman)? Let me give you a few statistics before you answer, or try to answer, those questions.

St. Leonard's house has a board of directors, numbering 25 citizens, an advisory board of 18 citizens, a woman's board of 17, and a staff of 12 with three students training in social work on a part-time basis. If the Minister were running St. Leonard's house, what kind of a budget would he establish for such a residence, including its out-client facilities?

The Minister has opened a rehabilitation office in Windsor with a staff of two, open over a period of eight months, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. and closed probably on Saturday and almost certainly on Sunday. I wonder how much this office costs, or has cost for the eight-month period? It must be remembered that many of the released prisoners who have problems are working during the daytime and cannot go to the rehabilitation office. Secondly, problems often arise during the non-working hours when the rehabilitation office is closed. Thirdly, many ex-prisoners associate the rehabilitation office with the government and with the whole prison system—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Very sound Conservative point of view.

Mr. Burr —and they prefer to go to St. Leonard's house for advice.

Mr. White: You have there a good argument against socialism.

Mr. Burr: I am very pleased to see the member for London South present and in good humour tonight; in good voice too.

Let me give you a very brief look at the 1966 statement of income and expenses. The income from grants of various kinds was $29,000; contributions, $20,000—I am using round figures—and other income, which includes the $2 per day payment that the guests

are expected to make, $6,000, for a total of $55,000. I wonder how much one would expect to pay for 12 workers on the staff, seven of them full-time and five others who are probably part-time volunteers? St. Leonard's house paid $34,522 for this staff of, let me repeat, seven full-time and five other workers. Their total expenditures came to $55,600, so that they had a deficit of almost $600.

Mr. White: Best NDP speech I have ever heard.

Mr. Burr: In the next year, 1967—

An hon. member: Now wait till you hear the rest.

Mr. Burr: With the increase in business, their full-time staff increased to ten. So their salaries increased to $45,000, and if you figure out the average salary, it is nothing for us to be proud of. Their total budget increased to $75,000.

St. Leonard's house needs a grant from The Department of Reform Institutions of $15,000 or $20,000, and I claim that St. Leonard's house deserves such a grant and heaven knows it has earned such a grant.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I hope the member for London South heard that.

Mr. Burr: He will support me, I am sure.

The Minister has been given a splendid opportunity by St. Leonard's house to establish a model for a chain of, what I call half-way in, as well as half-way out, homes in Ontario. I will explain a half-way in later, I hope. This would go far towards reducing our institutional population in Ontario and would eliminate the necessity for building many of the new institutions now in the planning stage.

St. Leonard's house is now doing almost the same kind of work as the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry societies, but unfortunately it is not receiving the grants received by these other two societies for the some kind, or virtually the same kind, of service. I appeal to the Minister—wherever he is; oh, there he is, I am glad to see that the Minister is taking a different view of matters tonight—I appeal to the Minister to give St. Leonard's house a meaningful generous grant instead of the meagre $10,000 which they are hoping for. Do not force them to dissipate their energies in time-consuming fund-raising activities, frittering away the time and talent of useful people.

If the Minister would give financial backing to privately organized groups such as this one, he would achieve several desirable objectives including, first, saving young lives from permanent disaster, secondly involving the community in this humanitarian work, and thirdly saving the taxpayers millions of dollars.

I regret, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot keep to the suggested 20 minutes introduction, because my remarks will deal almost entirely with the philosophy of corrections rather than with details of the individual items in the vote. So even though I take longer now, I will take very little time later.

Mr. Chairman, to return to my theme, which could be summed up as "less incarceration, more probation," it is generally agreed that young offenders are the products of homes or families or parents that can be described by the word inadequate. Occasionally the inadequacy may take the form of over-indulgence, which is a misunderstanding of the true meaning of parental love. Usually, however, a broken home, parental indifference, apathy, or neglect forms the background of the young offender.

Many authorities look deeper and place the blame on the whole fabric and framework of society. However, whatever the direct or indirect cause may be, it is recognized that the young offender has come into conflict with his community. He has come into conflict with the rules and laws that govern society. He has begun to reject society and society has begun to reject him, and the youth is in trouble. Somehow the home, the school, the church, and the community have failed him, and he had failed them. And he is on the brink of disaster. He faces a sentence in court, and that worst of all possible labels, the word "criminal."

It is my belief that even at this desperate point in the young offender's life, it is not too late to save him. I believe that there are enough concerned citizens, kind hearted people, willing to devote much of their time and talent to the task of reintegrating this young offender into society—if not into his own community, then into some other—and to the task of rehabilitating him, if not within his own family, then outside of it. And what better place than in a half-way house with a residential rehabilitation programme in the community, and involving the community?

The sole purpose of imprisoning lawbreakers, Mr. Chairman, used to be, in more primitive times, the punishment of the offender. Later a second reason advanced was that the imprisonment of one offender would act as a

deterrent to others. Today we justify imprisonment on different grounds. We say that it is necesary in order to protect society from the anti-social behaviour of the offender. In recent years, we have seen many worthy efforts made by such societies as the Elizabeth Fry and John Howard, to give the released prisoner a helping hand as he tries to re-enter society. Yet the odds are four to one that he will soon be back in prison either because he still rejects society, and/or because society still rejects him.

The expression, "He walked out of prison a free man," is one of the most shallow and untrue observations ever made by one human about another. I believe it is fair to say that all civilized governments now proclaim rehabilitation of the prisoner and protection of society as the two objectives in sentencng offenders to prison. In actual practice, however, the young offender, when released, is usually more confirmed in his hostile attitude towards society than he was when he first entered the prison. Therefore, society is not better protected, it is even more vulnerable because the amateur offender is in many instances now well on his way to becoming a professional criminal. The gap between him and society has not been narrowed, it has been widened.

In most instances, the sentence to prison has failed in both its objectives—it has not protected society except, of course during the time of the prisoner's incarceration, and it has not rehabilitated the prisoner. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, because the sentencing of young offenders to prison or an institution, any institution, is a failure to be used only as a last resort, let us try somethng else before we push this fellow over the brink with a millstone labelled "criminal" around his neck.

This "something else," I suggest, is a half-way in home to match the half-way out home. We now have St. Leonard's house and other half-way houses to which the more fortunate prisoners on their way out of prison are helped in their efforts to re-enter society. Let us promote the organization of half-way in houses a chance and perhaps a last chance, offender a chance and perhaps a last chance, but at least a genuinely good chance, to come to terms with society before the indelible brand "criminal" is placed upon him.

In this way, Mr. Chairman, we shall be helping to save an unfortunate human being, and to the degree that we are successful, we shall at the same time be helping to save and protect society. We shall be achieving the two objectives which we are trying to achieve but failing to achieve under our present method of sentencing young offenders holus-bolus to institutions.

The hon. L. T. Pennell, in a recent speech, said:

> It is a contradiction in terms to talk about training men to accept responsibility in a free society by confining them in a place of captivity. In prison, we expect a prisoner to be completely passive and obedient while in the community we expect him to be responsible and self-sufficient.

To imprison an offender in a Canadian penitentiary costs the taxpayers, as far as I can ascertain, about $3,500 per year. This is not the complete cost. In addition, in the case of a married man, his family may be added to the welfare rolls and, while we pay out thousands of dollars to imprison him, we may pay several more to support his family.

There is also the loss in productivity to the province and to the nation. We, as taxpayers, are paying to keep many men in idleness, whereas they might be out in society on probation, not only earning their own living, but even sharing and reducing the common tax burden.

Mr. Chairman, Canada cannot afford to have the largest prison population per capita in the world. It simply is not good business. We cannot afford to operate crime schools where our young offenders' amateur inclinations will become professional realities. We cannot afford to graduate them, to recapture them, and to send them back to a crime college for a post-graduate course. We must keep as many of our offenders, young and old, out of prison, for no better reason, if you wish, than to lower our taxes and increase our production.

I will tear out some of the pages that the Minister has saved me the trouble of inflicting upon you. It has been said, Mr. Chairman, by the way that it treats its offenders, now that Canada has the greatest prison population per capita in the world. And that 80 per cent of released prisoners return to prison, having failed to adjust to society. If this is true, there is something terribly wrong about our penal system.

The work being done by the various half-way houses in helping offenders enter society cannot be praised too warmly. But, Mr. Chairman, their work is done after the offender has had months or years of prison life, during which almost all contact with other human beings have tended only to widen the gap between him and society.

How much better it would be if half-way houses could help these offenders before they were sentenced to prison. The offender would not be handicapped by the deterioration of spirit that must inevitably result from incarceration. Nor would they be forever haunted by the spectre of the criminal record which threatens to materialize out of thin air at any time, either while the offender is seeking employment, or after he has obtained it and is making a successful comeback to society.

The 1966 report of the Minister of Reform Institutions devotes two lines to the subject of probation, and they appear on page 94. I believe that the 1967 report says the same, two lines on page 103, showing that in Ontario out of some 51,000 sentenced, 2,355 were released from jail on probation, while 10,900 were placed in institutions.

Contrast this with the whole of United States, as described in the task force report "Corrections," the President's commission of law enforcement and justice administration, on page 27, which begins with these words: "Slightly more than half of the offenders sentenced to correctional treatment were placed on probation." Slightly more than half, and I have the figures here, it is 53 per cent.

I mentioned earlier that the young offender facing sentence—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): I wonder if you might read that last sentence again, I did not hear it.

Mr. Burr: Is there difficulty with the mike, or—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I really should have stayed where I belonged. I cannot hear as well down here.

Mr. Burr: I am sorry. One of our members wants you to come back.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Perhaps I will do that.

Mr. Burr: I thought that you would be glad to know that they cared.

The words, Mr. Chairman, were: "Slightly more than half of the offenders sentenced to correctional treatment in 1965 were placed on probation," and then a dash "—supervision in the community subject to the authority of the court."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where is that from?

Mr. Burr: This is from the task force report, "Corrections." It is the President's—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I read that report; I do not like to interrupt the hon. member, but, perhaps—you see, I cannot understand that, because when a person is put on probation, it is in place of going into a correctional institution. That is why I am a little puzzled at this.

Mr. Burr: The figures, Mr. Chairman—and I am not—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, it is not the figures. It is the fact regarding being in a correctional institution and allowed out on probation, I do not understand that.

Mr. Burr: I have the figures, but not the supporting background. This is what it says. There are three headings. The first heading is "location of offender," and under that it says "probation," and the number is 684,000, and the percentage is 53.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Who wrote that?

Mr. Burr: It is in the report for the President of the United States.

Mr. Singer: Who prepared it for you?

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): He prepared it himself, of course.

Boy! We do not have any ghost writers in the NDP.

Mr. Martel: We heard your ghost writer's report this afternoon.

Mrs. M. Renwick: He is an articulate gentleman.

Mr. Singer: Keep talking.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, I have no ghost writers, I have no researchers. I summoned this in the library myself.

Mr. Chairman: I think that the member should be afforded the courtesy of continuing his opening remarks.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I did not hear you this afternoon.

May I just draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for London South did not make any objection when the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), spoke for an hour and a half. He did not make any objection when the member for Etobicoke

(Mr. Braithwaite), spoke for an hour. But suddenly, the member for London South is aware of an agreement which has not been kept, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. White: On a point of order. I most certainly have objected to the lengthy speeches from the member for Sudbury. And I certainly did object when the member for High Park was absent all afternoon when the speeches of the Minister and the Liberal critic were given, in view of the fact that this gentleman has set himself up once again as a self-appointed expert in this field. I am shocked that he would not be in his place.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sandwich-Riverside has the floor. Please proceed.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, if I am not out of order—

Mr. Chairman: You are out of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: If I have survived Judge Parker, I will survive Eric Dowd and the member for London South.

Mr. Chairman: May I bring to the attention of the members that, in the committee, the affairs are conducted by a Chairman, I think.

An hon. member: The member for Sudbury is so innocent.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Does he mean to insinuate that you are going to tolerate such diabolical nonsense from anyone quite so insignificant as him?

Mr. Chairman: May I ask the member if he does?

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank all the hon. members for giving me this brief respite. I was beginning to wonder if my voice would last, but I feel revived now, and I thank them all.

If the member for Downsview would like to read this and interpret it, I would be very glad to let him have it afterwards. I interpret it as meaning what it says, that is all. I will read it a third time.

I just took the quotation from the President's commission on law enforcement and administration of justice, page 27. The authors of this report say—and I am going to give it a third time, and probably a fourth or a fifth, if necessary—I quote: "Slightly more than half of the offenders sentenced to correctional treatment."

Now I do not suppose that means to institutions. That is my interpretation. You may differ.

In 1965, in the United States—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am going to get up to apologize.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it was my fault. It just occurred to me that in the President's report they were referring to those areas where there is probation after sentence. And probably this is what the hon. member is referring to.

Mr. Burr: The hon. Minister was in a poor position for hearing and I accept his apology with pleasure.

To continue—I mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, that the young offender who is facing sentence has begun to reject society and society has begun to reject him. Similarly, the released prisoner or the paroled prisoner usually finds that he is not ready to accept society and/or society is not ready to accept him.

Part of the secret—and this is important—part of the secret of the success of half-way houses, such as St. Leonard's, in Windsor, lies in the fact that increasing numbers of members of the community are being involved in helping the offenders to re-enter society.

If you remember, I read the number of directors, there were 25, I believe. The advisory board is 17, and that included, incidentally—the hon. Minister would be interested to know—the venerable Archdeacon M. C. Davies, who is an advisory member of the Minister's; he is one of the advisory members of St. Leonard's house.

The secret of success lies in the fact that increasing numbers of members of the community are being involved in helping the offenders to re-enter society. If members of all communities could be involved in forming what I call half-way in houses—I do not know whether this is my term or someone else's.

This would be for the young offender who is destined for some kind of institution and it would be a half-step in, and we would hope that he would not take the rest of the step. By forming half-way in houses, which would permit judges to suspend or withhold more sentences and to try more supervised

probation, it seems certain that even greater successes would be possible. The probationer would not have become handicapped by the damaging effects of serving a term in prison.

In other words, it should be easier, much easier, to save a youth by putting him on probation than by sending him through prison or jail and then trying to save him. We are handicapping those who are attempting the rescue. As a matter of fact, a subcommittee of the board of directors of St. Leonard's house, Windsor, has been working on what they call the youthful offenders project. This committee is planning a home for up to 20 young men from 16 to 20 years of age and the purpose of this home is to provide a place other than a penal institution to which young offenders could be sent. The name of this home is Northfields youth treatment centre, and plans for a programme of treatment are already being carefully worked out.

The programme committee consists of an increasing number of professionals and laymen from many walks of life in the Windsor area. It has the blessing of local magistrates and it is one of the most exciting ventures of this kind being undertaken in Ontario at the present time.

How much better it would be, Mr. Chairman, if instead of pouring millions of dollars into more jails and penitentiaries and other prison institutions, Canada and Ontario would spend a fraction of this amount in giving generous grants to private organizations who are willing to donate their time and their talents to this most commendable work.

The Minister may say that if such private groups are formed, the grants will be forthcoming. I am convinced that there are enough people who would join such groups. I believe there are hundreds, perhaps thousands of men and women in Ontario who, at this moment, have no thought or any awareness of such work, who would become interested if they knew the problem and if they were persuaded that there is a solution. How can these people be reached? The answer is by enthusiasts or zealots, if you like.

We have an enthusiast in Windsor in the person of the Reverend Neil Libby, the guiding force behind both St. Leonard's house in Windsor and St. Leonard's society of Canada. Perhaps the Minister himself is or could become another enthusiast and perhaps the Minister knows of other people who could play this role.

Earlier, I commended the Minister on his good attendance in the House. Perhaps I was wrong in doing this. Perhaps the Minister should be travelling up and down Ontario, selling this idea of youthful offender treatment centres that private groups would initiate and operate and The Department of Reform Institutions would back financially.

If the Minister does not fancy himself as a crusader, let him find a couple more Father Libbys and turn them loose with one purpose —to increase probation and reduce incarceration. I have not come across the figures for Ontario, but the following figures for Canada as a whole should give us pause:

In 1958, when Canada's prison population was 98 per 100,000, that of Holland was only 16; 98 for Canada, 16 for Holland.

In 1953, Sweden, with population of seven million had only 91 persons committed for terms of two years or longer.

I would explain, Mr. Chairman, I got these figures out of a book. I cheated a little on those. Would you let the member for Downsview know?

I have said enough about that, and for the benefit of the member for London South I explained that because of—oh, he is gone so I need not explain it. What I have to say deals with the philosophy of reforms and not the individual details of the votes; that is why I am taking my time now and letting others have it later.

Let us go back one step, in our efforts to reduce the number of young offenders. There are many organizations doing good work in this regard—the children's aid societies, the family court, the various service clubs and churches. But there is one place, however, where potential offenders can be identified and predicted at an early age. That is in the school, even in the nursery and kindergarten. Every school should have one staff member —and I hope this is getting into The Department of Education field. I think it is tied in inevitably and inextricably with the whole philosophy that I am discussing.

In every school there should be one staff member sufficiently trained to recognize, not to treat, but to recognize these potential offenders and every school board should have a sufficient number of psychologists or psychiatrists or both to provide the necessary treatment and family counselling that would go with it.

In the school system the whole philosophy of grading by examination results, and the effect upon a child of being branded as a failure in school, should be reviewed to see to what extent this lays the foundation to

what is usually termed teenage delinquency. If we are to be successful in reducing the numbers of young offenders, we must go back one more step and find out what produces these young misfits of five and six in the first place.

Very few would deny that the cause lies in an inadequate family environment. So the question is, what produces or causes inadequate parents? And the answer to this, of course, is a complex one, but one cause is the fact that some parents have too many children for their resources; whether their resources be financial or emotional, or intellectual, or a combination of those. The average parents can probably cope with two or three children. Below average parents can probably cope adequately with one or two children.

In India the current slogan is "a small family is a happy family". Perhaps here the reference is to the financial resources of the parents. One partial solution, on which I shall not dwell, is of course the guaranteed family income or full employment through economic planning. Even if there were no financial problems for any Canadian family there would still be a great need for an approach which is just now being initiated in some of our schools.

Let me say briefly that most married couples approach their task of raising a family, or simply creating a satisfying marriage, without any advice, without any instruction, without any training or counselling of any significance. Certain private organizations are organizing marriage counselling classes and these are commendable programmes. However, the place where all or almost all future parents can be reached and given meaningful and valuable ideas is in the schools. In other words, the prevention of crime could begin in our educational system.

There is a vicious circle of unwise and often hurried marriages—then unwanted children, then rejected children, then young offenders, social misfits, and again unfortunate marriages. And the circle repeats itself almost inevitably.

Now the best hope—perhaps the only hope—of breaking this vicious circle, lies in education for family life. And our educational system gives training for virtually every type of trade or profession or occupation. We have training for physicians, training for nurses, plumbers, lawyers, almost every vocation, except that of parenthood or marriage. The one trade, the one vocation, that almost every pupil is going to follow.

The great majority of pupils who are now in our schools will get married and most of them will have families. And most of these will instinctively model their behaviour on the behaviour of their own parents. This may be all very well when the models are good, but amongst those who have had inadequate parents and unfortunate family environments, it is quite likely that the mistakes of one generation of parents will be repeated by their children, who become the next generation of parents.

I would just like to suggest four objectives in this family life education programme. They are by no means definitive, but just to follow this train of thought I would suggest these four objectives.

1. Knowledge and appreciation of the importance of the family and of the responsibilities of each member to his own family, and to the family that he may establish in later years.

2. Development of standards of values as a basis for making decisions.

3. Appreciation of the importance of wholesome human relationships. For example, parent/child, boy/girl, youth/community.

4. Understanding of sex and its importance in human behaviour, and the methods by which this should be taught. I would suggest seminars, panels, group discussions in the class room, debates, essays, films and professional guest speakers.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman—and the member for London South has not returned yet, he would be very happy at this point—I ask the Minister to use his influence in four ways. First, to have the probation system extended as rapidly as possible in Ontario by throwing his full support behind what I have called the "half-way in" houses.

Second, to have the parole system extended as rapidly as possible in Ontario by full support of what I call the "half-way out" homes. Third, to have, or to encourage, community involvement in both these projects; and fourth, to have family life included as a subject of major importance in the curriculum of our school system.

Mr. Chairman: I believe that we can take votes 1901 and 1902.

Order!

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, will the Minister reply?

Mr. Chairman: I was just trying to inform the committee that I think we should take

the votes item by item. Is this agreeable to the members of the committee? All right; at least the first two votes in any event.

Vote 1901, item 1. The member for High Park on item 1, salaries.

Mr. Shulman: I hope that I will not wander too far from the field here on salaries, Mr. Chairman—I hope I am correct here, though if there is some other vote this should be discussed on, I would be glad to—I believe under salaries we should discuss this fine new bill, which the Minister produced yesterday. I would like to make just a brief comment on that bill.

The Liberal Opposition last week pointed out to the government that all the fine legislation that comes from the government is taken from speeches which they had made some three years previously, and so I thought that it would be interesting to see from whose speech this particular bill came. And we looked back three years through all the Liberal speeches and could not find it. Very confused we finally went back to 1962, because this particular department takes a little longer to read the Liberal speeches, and we found John Wintermeyer, way back on March 20, 1962, proposed this very bill. And—

Mr. Singer: He had some very good ideas.

Mr. Shulman: —it is interesting to see where the progressive thoughts come from.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That was a 35-page speech which was written by someone in the school of social work.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to read one paragraph out of his speech, because it so nicely sums up the bill which—

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): I was under the impression that after we had the introductory messages by all three speakers, that we would delve into the estimates and provide information to all members of the House. I did not think that the purpose of the estimates was to read into the records. I was under the impression that this was the opportunity to give information to the members of the House.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the members to stick with the estimates that are before us. At the same time if they have information that is relevant to the vote, there is no reason why it cannot be introduced. This is the main office vote, vote 1901, and I would expect the member for High Park will stick to the main office vote.

Mr. Shulman: Stick to the main office vote; and I understand that it has meant, at least since I have been around here these few months, no limitation on what we say as long as it is relevant to the particular vote.

I would like to quote Mr. Wintermeyer, just to get this on the record, and just so we know where this bill came from.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: It is quite all right; I have all night. If you have all night you can wait.

An hon. member: Stop wasting time over there.

Mr. Shulman: John Wintermeyer at that time suggested that it was time that Ontario moved up into the 20th century. He suggested that they look at British Columbia where there is a fine place which had adopted many of these suggestions, called Haney.

If I may quote:

> Contact with the family is encouraged. The staff hold regular informal meetings with the family until the inmate is paroled or released. Other visitors to the prisoner are encouraged, including those offering services such as alcholics anonymous, the Salvation Army, trade and advisory committees, and athletic teams.

And if I may interject, the reason I am putting this on the record is because other material, which will come out later in the votes, will indicate that this is perhaps not the policy in Ontario. I continue:

> The trade training programme is improved by volunteer citizens advisory committees drawn from labour, management and education. The institutions also are recognized field work agencies for the school of social work and the department of physical education of the University of British Columbia.
>
> The local high schools night courses in vocational training have been made available to inmates. Once a week, the institutions send men outside the institutions to Vancouver to visit the John Howard society, because the Vancouver branch of that society does not have the money to provide a field service worker to go to the institutions. Inmates are encouraged to register with the local office of the national em-

ployment service, but they find employment during their last two months before discharge, and it is possible for them to work during the day and return to the prison at night.

I am always pleased to find the Minister does take the progressive thoughts from the Liberals, but because I do not want the Liberals to get too excited about this, some four pages further on I would like to read—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): When you speak we never get excited.

Mr. Singer: I never get excited.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to read one further paragraph—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: You sound like a Tory.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I am quoting now the member for York South, who was commenting on the fine ideas of Mr. Wintermeyer—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! If we had fewer interjections we could proceed better. Order!

Mr. Shulman: If I might quote, Mr. Chairman:

> If we come back to this part of the country, Mr. Chairman, all we need to do is recall the name of that Agnes McPhail who inspired the committee that lead to the Archambault report and led the fight, Mr. Chairman, in the federal House of Commons and here in this Legislature, for a modern penal reform programme.

When I came into this House, Mr. Chairman, I was proud to be able to continue the tradition of this party and to fight against this government and its archaic policy while the Liberal Party sat silent for 10 years.

An hon. member: Let him talk!

Mr. Shulman: They were not only sitting silently, but I have listened to them support this government. For example, when this government prides itself on the excessive use of the strap, from the former Prime Minister, Mr. Frost, down, I have listened to members from the Liberal Party cheer the Prime Minister on.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is reading into the records something that really was simply out of order when it was originally presented in 1962. I am not particularly objecting to him taking part in the debate in this way, but I cannot see the point in raising all this old stuff that was useless in 1962.

Mr. Chairman, if I might continue on the point of order, the hon. leader of the NDP is still sitting as the leader of the third party here and he can make the same speech again himself, surely, if he wants to.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, it is simply this. They get their ideas from us and then ten years later the government gets it from them.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was prepared to listen to see what connection this had to the estimates. The hon. member got up on his feet and said he was discussing the bill I had introduced yesterday. With all due respect, sir, I would suggest that when this bill comes up for second reading, that is the time to discuss it.

It will probably come up tomorrow or the day after and we will have to go over this debate all over again. I see no point in discussing the bill at this time.

Mr. Chairman: Order. As the Minister has intimated he has been doing, he had been listening to the member for High Park to try to relate his remarks to this estimate and particularly to the bill that the member referred to in the first instance. So far, there has been no reference on the point of order that has been raised. I think the member is simply reading into the records speeches that have been made by previous members of many years ago, and they have no relevance to this particular vote. I would ask the member to get back to vote 1901 if he would, please.

Mr. Shulman: I have not completed that portion of my remarks, Mr. Chairman. I would like to come up to date—

Mr. Singer: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if they would tell us about Bill Grummett—one-time CCF leader!

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, can we talk about the estimates? A lot of money is going to pass here.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman has just ruled and instructed the member for High Park and that is that. There is no further point of order. The member for High Park.

Mr. Sargent: I would humbly suggest you make sure he does it, sir.

Mr. Chairman: I will do my best.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, to come up to the policy of the department of present time, I am talking now on vote 1901, salaries. I am referring to a book, "Society Behind Bars," by Dr. W. E. Mann, who was a chaplain in one of the reformatories. I am referring to page 147 which is not referring to a specific reformatory, but is referring to policy of the department, and the staff which they hire. I would like to read his explanation of the problems that they have with salary and with staff and may I say that this was done as a result of some years' work in the institution. I quote:

> Broadly speaking, the major initial obstacles reflecting substantial changes in correctional policy in Ontario lies in the provincial Cabinet's long standing disinterest in the subject. It is also not surprising that few, if any, of its members are very conversant with the major fields of penology, and do not permit significant changes.
>
> This is, of course, to be expected from a man whose party is conservative, and a group in which business and legal interests are most prominent. Businessmen are not generally noted for liberal sentiments or programmes and lawyers are generally conditioned to accept the conventional and formalistic approach of the legal apparatus, including the punitive aspect. Secondly, The Department of Reform Institutions is low in the status hierarchy of departments, partly because it is believed that a policy of aggressive prison reform is hardly calculated to gain votes at the next election.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Come on, be honest!

Mr. Shulman: Sure. I am delighted to have just been informed that he is now an NDP candidate, which shows that progressive thinkers come together ultimately.

Mr. MacDonald: Another expert in the field of penal reform.

Mr. Singer: Tell us some more about your leader Grummett.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: May I say, Mr. Chairman, I did not have the pleasure of meeting Grummett and I am not sure what the member is referring to.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Martel: Will the member for Downsview tell us about the great coalition which took place in Timmins?

Mr. Shulman: If I may continue, Mr. Chairman:

> Sometimes the department is regarded as a potential powder keg and it is feared that a political scandal will blow up and may deter some good men from attempting such a Cabinet post. It is a difficult post to fill. At times appointments have been made for political reasons and not because of a particularly strong man being available.

I go on to a further paragraph:

> It must be added that if a Cabinet Minister honestly desires to update the Ontario prison system and makes plans to proceed with some penalogical practices, he will meet substantial difficulty within his department.
>
> First, as in other departments, he is forced to rely heavily upon his Deputy for detailed implementation of policy, particularly if he has, as is very common, little expertise or understanding of the field. In addition, he has to depend upon the Deputy for much of his understanding and appreciation of prison wardens and other such officials. The Deputies in Ontario have typically been men who rose from the lower ranks, they have numerous and intimate relationships—

Mr. Sopha: What is wrong with that? I rose from the ranks.

Mr. Shulman: I will refrain from answering that question, Mr. Chairman, out of kindness:

> They have numerous and intimate relationships with persons at the higher levels of the department, of bureaucracy and for various reasons tend strongly to a custodial orientation.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): What is the department of bureaucracy?

Mr. Shulman: To continue:

> In their public appearances and statements, they often appear to favour rehabilitation programmes, but such expressions

are, in practice, usually hedged about by significant qualifications and reservations. In general, they accept reform proposals provided they upset the *status quo* in a minimal fashion. By these means, they are open principally to superficial or patch-work adjustments.

In effect then, the problem is that a Cabinet Minister not only tends to see the administration of his department through the eyes of his Deputy, but is obligated, however unwillingly, to accept much of his advice, especially on the nature and the pace of changes in correctional policy. If he finds it unacceptable and fires the Deputy, he must simultaneously or shortly fire many of the other top administrators and immediately try to find trained persons to fill their positions.

Clearly, this would be no enviable task and might well bring unfavourable publicity to the department and also appear to the Cabinet as a threat to votes in the next election.

Mr. Chairman: Is the member going to relate this to salaries?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I will, if you are patient.

Mr. Chairman: Are you at the end of the book or in the middle?

Mr. Shulman: Just this last:

> As long as the present Conservative administration has power in Ontario, it is most unlikely that such a course of action would be followed.

I would point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that a large part of the problem lies in the salary schedule which is paid by this department and which I will submit to you is too low to attract men who are going to be competent to bring in the reforms that are necessary in this department. And I may sum the whole thing up very, very easily, by reading the very last line in this book:

> To ask such men to run a treatment programme would be like asking persons of grade 12 education and some road building experience to engineer the 12-lane Highway 401 at Toronto.

This is the problem which I wish to raise under this particular vote, the salary schedule; and I am referring to salaries of guards, to assistant superintendents and to superintendents, in fact to every level up to but not including the Minister, which are too low. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the salary schedule should be raised at all levels with the one exception I pointed out.

Mr. Sopha: What does the member say about the Ministers now?

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps there could be some reduction there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I ask the hon. member, now that he is concerned so much about how low the salary schedule is, having taken his research from a book that was written on the basis of what this man's experience was eight years ago, what he thinks the salary schedule should be for, say, the superintendent of an institution?

Mr. Shulman: Superintendent of a large institution like Guelph?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: I believe it should be a minimum of $20,000.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, he is up to $18,000. I should have said close to $19,000. The member should have said $50,000, that would have made it safer.

Mr. Chairman: I would point out this comes under vote 1904.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, you have allowed the hon. member to refer to this book and it consists of a great number of errors. I do not think it should be allowed.

Mr. Sopha: That is like another book I am thinking of.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It has gone into the record and quite frankly the excerpts should not have been allowed to have been read. They refer to a so-called—

Mr. Sopha: It is called "How to Make a Million".

Hon. Mr. Grossman:—study this man made as to the sub-culture in Guelph eight years ago.

Mr. Sopha: What is "sub-culture"?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: W. F. Mann started this book about 1960 or 1961, and had a difficult time getting it published. Finally he found some obscure publisher to issue a paperback edition of it, and perhaps the hon. Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis) could explain it, but as a layman without a formal education I find it somewhat surprising. Perhaps this is something that someone

could discuss under University Affairs and perhaps my colleague will not appreciate it.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the Minister talking about?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How can a man become the professor of sociology at a university and then order that this book be required reading, even though it was turned down by everyone because of the inaccuracies in it, and then turn out a book which is so patently biased, so politically biased, so partisan, as witness the member's own words; how anybody should be allowed to teach young people in a school—I am sorry the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) is not here. I would like to have him here on this discussion and explain to an ignorant man like myself just what sort of training you give to young people when you teach them with this kind of text. Perhaps the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman) can explain it for me.

In the first place, the author of the book started visiting Guelph reformatory in February of 1960, with the permission of the Anglican chaplain, to assist with religious exercises. After a short period of time he attempted to extend his activities by suggesting he be allowed to conduct a sociological survey, and more particularly by allowing Bible classes to develop into beef sessions against the institution.

Mr. E. A. Winkler: (Grey South): For the NDP!

Mr. MacDonald: Nothing to do with the NDP.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He was informed, Mr. Chairman, by the chaplain that he must confine himself to his religious activities and when he refused to do so he was denied the privilege of administering in the institution by the senior chaplain. Just to get to some of these matters which were referred to by the hon. member, what he did not read—

Mr. Shulman: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no point of order, let me finish what I have to say.

Mr. Chairman: The member brings up a point of order. Will the member please state his point?

Mr. Shulman: The point of order I wish to raise, Mr. Chairman, is in relation to the remarks already made by the Minister; he has made certain comments about this book. I think it is only right or in fairness to the man who wrote it, to point out to you, sir, that the Reverend F. G. West, director of correctional chaplaincy, diocese of Toronto, president of the Canadian correctional chaplains' association, vice-president of the Ontario association of correction and criminology says, and I quote:

> We strongly recommend to all thoughtful Ontarians who are interested in the province they live in and to which they pay the lion's share of their taxes, that they read this firmly based book with care. They will find it knowledgeable, informative and challenging.

Thank you, sir.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order but I am glad the member stepped into that. Mr. West has stated that if he were asked to write that foreword to the book today he would refuse to do it, because it is so outdated. I suggest the hon. member—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is the usual method of research by the hon. member for High Park. It would have been an easy thing for him, as I would do in his case, "Well, now, maybe this man has changed his mind or maybe even the introduction to the book is not authentic." It could happen. It so happens it is authentic, but if he had called Mr. West just to make sure before he got up in the House and made the statement, just to check because he is going to make a charge—

Mr. MacDonald: Why should he do that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because he is going to make a charge here and he is going to document it.

Mr. MacDonald: Where did Mr. West say that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, let those members—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I will just read one more quotation from this book which I think the hon. member forgot to mention. Right through this book it is shot with many statements such as "Conservative

governments" with a capital "C"; he was not saying it with a small "c".

Mr. Sopha: The Minister is not ashamed of that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, of course not. The hon. member might have mentioned to some of the hon. members who come from the rural areas, is the other paragraph in here. "Regions and nations dominated politically by Conservative or rural and peasant parties uphold a punitive and custodial orientation."

Why does the hon. member not tell his colleagues who are from rural areas what this man thinks about people from the rural areas? I do not think I will carry on anymore with this man's book. I will give it as much attention as it deserves—absolutely none!

Mr. MacDonald: Give us your source—where did Mr. West say that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not as brilliant as the member for York South either.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: This vote has been increased, Mr. Chairman, from $847,000 in salaries to $1,378,000, an increase of approximately $.5 million. Will the Minister advise what the increase is for?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This increase to the main office staff is mainly due to taking over county and city jails. We naturally require a larger main office staff to look after the additional 37 institutions.

Mr. Sargent: I do not understand this. You are not having any more institutions. The county jails were being paid before.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I have had a difficult time with the hon. member in other years in estimates. I am attempting to explain that the county and city jails were not under our department. All we did was pay them 10 per cent of their maintenance costs. Now, in taking them over bodily, if I may use that expression—

Mr. Sargent: How many?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Thirty-five and two city jails.

Mr. Sargent: Well, $500,000 increases for 35 jails?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, no, this is only for the main office staff required to administer the additional responsibilities of 37 or more institutions, and their 900 or more staff.

Mr. Sargent: Where are you picking up the balance in the grant then?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In vote 1903.

Mr. Sargent: All right, down in this section they have $600,000 grants to county and city jails. What is that for—in section 9 of the first vote?

Mr. Chairman: Could we deal with—

Mr. Sargent: No, just a moment now, I want to find out. He says that the increased cost of $.5 million is for the taking over of county jails. Now, if you are going to assume all the cost of county jails, where does the balance of the moneys come from? What vote?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Vote 1903.

Mr. Sargent: Then what is the $600,000 for?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The $600,000 is for our share of the maintenance, which is usually calculated in the current year on the basis of what your expenses were in the past year. So we will owe that.

Item one agreed to.

On item 2.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, we are up 200 per cent in travelling expenses. Why is that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The increase—where do you get 200 per cent?

Mr. Sargent: The item is $145,000 now, and it was $41,000 prior.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was $105,000 prior, according to my record here.

Mr. Sargent: On page S (X) 5, in the book here. Look on page S5, under W7, $41,000.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Has the hon. member got before him the estimates of 1967 and 1968?

Find the public accounts—the public accounts last year; this item showed $105,000. I have it in front of me. Main office salaries and travelling expenses, $105,000, and our estimate for the coming year is $145,000.

That is accounted for to cover new courses and conferences for staff training, and also additional staff in the main office. We are

going to require, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, more training for the staff we are taking over from the county and city jails.

Mr. Sargent: I want to thank you for bringing it to my attention, but here we have to use three books to find out what you are talking about.

We have the public accounts for 1967, the estimates for 1968, and the needs for 1969, so we have to jump back and forth in three volumes to find out what you are talking about. This is the continued intelligence of the estimates in this House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I can understand the hon. member's concern. This is not within the purview of my department. Although I know that The Treasury Department and those responsible for drawing up the method of the estimates have improved them from year to year. What is, I think actually happening, is that the member is confusing the estimates last year with the amount that is actually expended, which appears in the public accounts.

Mr. Sargent: I see it now, but you must agree that for any body of men who sit together to discuss a $2 billion budget, we have to jump back and forth from three different books to find out what is going on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member will now know the difficulty that I have as a Minister. Trying to get some of these things that probably are not even estimates.

Mr. Sargent: Well, knowing your thinking, I can realize how you have them.

Items 2 and 3 agreed to.

On item 4.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Chairman, would this be the travelling expenses of moving prisoners from one prison to another, or one jurisdiction to another? Or would this be under 2?

I am trying to discover whether this is the item of expenses of moving prisoners from one prison to another.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask the Minister? There was a little bit of unpleasantness at Millbrook a few weeks ago, and prisoners were taken from Millbrook, all the way to Sarnia. I am wondering on what basis this travelling is done so far?

Why would you take them to a jail which is as far away as that? Why not transfer them to a closer jail? The item is not a monstrous item, but I think that it is important to know the reason.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is asking why we would transfer them so far away?

Mr. Pitman: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Having regard for the type of prisoner that we were dealing with at the time, the staff would consider the kind of security required for this type of prisoner, and where there was sufficient accommodation of course.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on this same subject. Yesterday morning, a group of prisoners were transferred from Owen Sound county jail to Burwash, and they will arrive in Burwash on Thursday night. I do not know what the course is, but they do pick up some by bus in Mimico and other places along the way. It seems to me that, number one, the families involved—

Mr. Chairman: Order! There are too many private conversations taking place in the chamber. The Chairman would like to have a little more silence.

Mr. Sargent: Let them go for a moment and see what happens. Put their speakers on for a second and let us hear what they are saying.

An hon. member: It is all those commissioners in the back row there.

Another hon. member: Will you look at that? All those well paid commissioners. Arguing about their salaries.

Mr. Sargent: Try and follow the proceeding, will you, fellows?

The trying thing about this is, Mr. Chairman—realizing that you have a harder bit, when I saw your release in the *Globe and Mail* that you are going to try and upgrade the lot of the prisoner—the families involved with these prisoners.

When a man is sentenced, a family usually wants to be near where he is going to be, but because of the tight security, no one ever knows where they are, until two or three weeks later. I think this is a fault in your department. The wife and family should be told where the man is being transferred to, so that they can be near him.

Secondly, I think that in this modern day of travel, for prisoners to have to go through Owen Sound, down and take four days to get to Burwash near Sudbury is rather hard to take. I think that there is a bit of need—even though they are treated like animals when they get into your hands—I think that there should be some kind of respect for the individual dignity. Taking them from camp to camp before they arrive at the final end.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I resent, of course, and deny completely, that they are treated like animals in our care. Nobody is treated like an animal in our care.

Mr. Sargent: Did you see the cells in our jails up there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would agree that when they are in the jails that the conditions are less than desirable. I have said that, and on—

Mr. Sargent: And you do nothing about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —numerous occasions.

Mr. Sargent: You do nothing about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member was giving the impression that we, in our reformatories and in transferring them to the reformatories, were treating inmates like animals, which I deny.

Mr. Sargent: It is all a part of—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Many of the inmates, but not most of them, travel by Gray Coach. This is what the average citizen uses—a Gray Coach type bus. I have been in the bus myself—travelled in it—and there is nothing wrong with it at all.

Insofar as allowing the family to wait three or four weeks, the inmates are not only entitled to, but they are encouraged to write the day they arrive. I suppose that would be three or four days, at the very latest. So I do not know where the hon. member gets the impression it is three or four weeks before the family knows where they are. Obviously we cannot let the family—

Mr. Sargent: It takes them four days to get there. What else happens?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Three or four days, that is not three or four weeks. Obviously, the hon. member must understand that when we are transferring prisoners, we cannot advertise to the world, or to anybody for that matter, that they are en route to a particular institution. This has to be as closely a guarded secret as possible.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4 carried?

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, just one more question. I find it rather hard to understand why prisoners will be taken from Millbrook, which on your chart is "D" maximum security prison, why they would be taken from that prison and placed in a county jail where surely, security would not be as great as it would be in a maximum security prison.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A good county jail would be as good, if not better than the Millbrook reformatory as a security institution Millbrook reformatory is the most maximum security institution within the reformatory system, but there is a great deal more freedom within the reformatory than there is in a local county jail, which is all maximum security. One of the problems of the county jails is that they are geared to the highest requirement for security whereas the reformatories, generally, are the other way around. That is why we have one completely maximum security institution. So when we transfer them to a county jail, it is for this purpose because that is where there is complete security.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4 carried?

Mr. Shulman: No, Mr. Chairman. I would like to pursue this transferring of prisoners a little further.

The member for Peterborough has already pointed out that a few weeks ago, prisoners were transferred from Millbrook to Sarnia. Also, this month, we have had prisoners transferred from Guelph all the way up to North Bay while there was capacity available in jails in southern Ontario. I would like to ask the Minister why in the world he transferred prisoners to North Bay?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the first place, it is quite possible that for the maximum security we required for these people, there was ample accommodation for them in North Bay, although, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I do not appreciate the fact that the hon. member has announced here that these particular people were transferred to a particular institution.

We try to keep this as secure as we possibly can and it is going to be difficult—I know it is going to be difficult for the hon. member to do this—but it is important for

many of these hard core prisoners. It is going to be very difficult for us to handle them if, by and large, the public is going to know where they are being transferred to from time to time.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to you first of all, before I pursue this matter, that just a few minutes earlier, the member for Peterborough pointed out that hard core prisoners had been transferred from Millbrook to Sarnia. I subsequently pointed out that first incarcerated prisoners had been transferred from Guelph to North Bay.

I want to point out for the record, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister took no umbrage at the mention of the hard core prisoners being transferred to Sarnia. He did not get up and protest about that. He found it very, very upsetting that these boys from Guelph had been transferred to North Bay. He should be upset because those boys, when they are transferred up there, find it difficult to have their families visit them.

I have had occasion to visit a number of jails in the last few weeks and I find prisoners who live in Toronto, transferred down to southwestern Ontario; prisoners from southwestern Ontario transferred into the other areas including the north; and this whole system appears to be a part of this punitive policy carried out by this department.

When there is capacity for these prisoners and if you wish to move them to a jail, very well. But when there is capacity for these prisoners in a jail near their homes, you are just being punitive and nothing more in moving them to an area far from their homes where they cannot have visitors.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has deliberately ignored what I stated previously—that they are placed in jails for this particular purpose—where they are being pulled out of a reformatory because there have been behaviour problems and they were creating disturbances. They are moved to jails where there is a maximum degree of security and accommodation for them, and this is the main concern at that particular time.

It is not the policy of the department, in the first place, to transfer them to jails. The policy of the department, in fact, is to pull people out of jails as quickly as possible, quicker than the law heretofore requires, to get them into the reformatory system because we do not like the jail system as it is being operated. But for this particular purpose, we move them to jails where there is the greatest degree of security, and also having regard for the accommodation required.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, let us pursue this a little further, then may I ask the hon. Minister—

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member if he is dealing with motives or is he dealing with some specific action?

Mr. Shulman: I am dealing with the travelling and other expenses of bailiffs and prisoners.

Mr. Chairman: For the sheer allegation of bad motives, I do not think it really requires—

Mr. Shulman: I am asking a question at the present time, Mr. Chairman, if I may. The question I am asking, Mr. Chairman, is why, when there was capacity in the Hamilton city jail, were only two prisoners of this group moved to the Hamilton city jail, while a number were moved up to North Bay and other prisons?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, of course, we could go all the way down the line and I would have to ask my people why they transferred a particular prisoner to a particular jail, and why they transferred one to another. We could go on this way for hours. I am advised that at the time we transferred those first ones to North Bay because there was separate and ample accommodation for them in North Bay as against Hamilton.

If the hon. member wants me to go into the details of what I mean by separate and so on, we are getting into technicalities. I think this is the sort of thing that can be entrusted to my staff who are concerned about the inmate as well as the security of the public.

It should not concern the hon. member. Perhaps the ones he wanted transferred to Hamilton may have people there—but they came from North Bay originally. So that does not hold water either.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4.

Mr. Shulman: First of all, Mr. Chairman, to set the Minister straight. This is not correct

but I want to pursue one other point which he brought up earlier. I would like to know, and you have mentioned this a number of times in the House, but have not made it very clear. Perhaps you could explain what is the security risk in letting the public know that prisoners are in, for example, North Bay or Sarnia or any other jail? That is what the jails are for.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, it does not require too much imagination on the part of the hon. members of this House to visualize the implications—to consider the implications in allowing it to be known, by and large, where you are moving a hard core, a trouble maker, at a particular time.

Now, if the hon. member needs to have this explained to him, I am afraid that it will be useless trying to, because he obviously is not going to be convinced. I am sure intelligent members of this Legislature will understand the need for that.

Mr. Shulman: Obviously, Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister one question and he answered another. I did not ask why it could not be announced when they were being transferred—that is obvious. What I am asking is that after they have been moved, and this is the question I have asked in the House a number of times, why can people not know where they have gone?

Mr. Chairman: Item 4 agreed to.

On item 5:

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask a question. I read through the Minister's report and I noticed a number of advisory councils on the treatment of the offender—on trade and industry advisory committees. I imagine this expenditure is in relation to these advisory committees.

Do these committees make reports to the Minister on occasion? I understand that under these headings there are reports. Are these reports available to members of the Legislature or to any other groups who are concerned with certain—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All of these reports are privileged to the Minister or to the department. I should say that the Minister's advisory council, when it was set up, I believe by order-in-council about 1960 or somewhere around that time, it was on the understanding that its considerations and its recommendations would be privileged to the Minister.

As a matter of fact, it has worked very well, because they have been given a free hand. They come in with all sorts of recommendations which they might not do if they were giving them to the public, and for the public consumption, and many of their recommendations have been accepted by the Minister and by this Legislature.

The training schools advisory board, while it is in the same capacity, works in conjunction with the department in addition to the Minister. They also have departmental duties and they carry them out. They make recommendations to the Minister in respect of some of the things they find at training schools. Some changes they recommend are, from time to time, accepted, sometimes they are delayed, sometimes they are turned down. They give their views, and they meet regularly as well.

The trades and industry advisory board, of course, has been sitting, I think, for about a year and a half, and they have not come to any concrete conclusions yet. As a matter of fact, one of the things that we are suffering from at the moment is the fact that the chairman of the training schools advisory board has taken on other work, and has asked us to get another chairman—I should have said the trades and industries advisory committee.

We have quite a number of reports from them but they have not been finalized, and it is from this committee that we expect to get a great deal of our knowledge to go ahead, for example, with our work release programme, pay for work programmes, and so on. But these reports are also for the Minister.

Mr. Pitman: If I may just ask a question on this point, I can understand the reason for some of these documents having to be privileged to the Minister, but I am wondering. You have a number of eminent people on these advisory boards. First, does this make it impossible for them to write, or to make known, their own feelings about the reform institutions or the correction institutions in the province. And secondly, is there any possibility that some of the reports, or some parts of the reports of these councils and these committees, could be made available to the Legislature for the general education of the people of this province.

I think there is an educative function in committees of this nature, as well as a function of advice to the Minister which, of course, in some cases must be privileged.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I must admit that I have thought of this from time to time, but I think it becomes pretty obvious that if you are going to make public some portions of the reports, or some reports, there would also follow from that the implication that there must be some ulterior reason for not publishing other reports. And I think on this account it would be, it would militate against the smooth operation of the board.

I am not too sure that it might not have been better in the first place to make this committee not privileged; to have their reports made public. On the other hand, when I discussed it with the members of the committee there was a division of opinion there, because these people are able to debate things that they would not want to debate, perhaps, if these debates were publicly known.

They know that they can go into an institution and come out with some idea. Then in further debate at the committee level, after further investigation, they may find out, perhaps, they were misinformed about it, or wrong about it, and they would then feel badly about their original recommendation having seen the light of day. All I can say is that by and large most of their recommendations, as far as I can recall, and they have been major ones, have been already adopted.

As a matter of fact, the last bill, the one I presented yesterday, was largely a result of the recommendations of this committee. The taking over of the physical operation of the jail systems across this province was recommended by them. I can say that now because it is already adopted. And having regard for all these circumstances, the smooth operation of this committee would be just as well carrying on this way, because it is working well and we are getting lots of results.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: The member for Peterborough, I think, has got a very good point. Probably the advisory committee's suggestions were given to the Minister five years ago, and your shortcomings would be noticed if they were made public. And I think that the Minister is very suave at these estimates. But throughout the year in the House we get up to question him on his estimates and on his portfolio, and he is very arrogant. But today you will see through the estimates that he will be very suave and polite and agreeable.

Mr. Chairman: Will you get back to the point.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about the advisory committee. How many people are on the advisory committee, what are they paid and how often do they sit, and how long have you had them in operation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: While I am getting this information, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I cannot think of a member on this committee that would stay on it very long if they saw no reasonable action coming within a reasonable length of time as a result of their work. They are not interested in attending regular committee meetings as an exercise in frustration. They want to see action. They are getting it. And they are very happy about the action they are getting. As to this specific amount they are paid—$35 a meeting. Are we referring to the Minister's advisory committee?

Mr. Sargent: I am asking you, sir, who they are?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which committee are we referring to?

Mr. Sargent: We are talking advisory now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Minister's advisory committee?

There are a number of committees. The Minister's advisory—

Mr. Sargent: We are talking about item 5, Mr. Chairman, the advisory committee—allowances and expenses.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are talking about all the committees or are we talking about the Minister's advisory committee?

Mr. Sargent: Oh, you have more than one?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We were just talking about that. I just mentioned all these matters. But as to the Minister's advisory committee for the treatment of offenders, the chairman gets $50 a day plus travelling expenses and the members get $35 a day plus travelling expenses. The chairman gets $5,000 per year and acts, in that capacity also, as a consultant. The number of meetings they attend is two a month. They go up in various parts of the province.

Mr. Sargent: For $5,000 a year they have two meetings a month.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is for the chairman. He is also a consultant for the department in addition to that, because he has a—

Mr. Sargent: That covers a lot of ground.

Hon. Mr. Grossman. He has a long record in corrections.

Mr. Sargent: Who are these people?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The chairman is the Reverend Martin W. Pinker. It is right in your book on page 6. You will see there is a—

Mr. Sargent: I will look it up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is a biography for each one of them. I am sure the hon. member will be impressed with them.

Mr. Chairman: Item 5?

Mr. Sargent: Did they five years ago recommend the taking over of the county jails?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am afraid to tell the hon. member that; it would be a contradiction of what I just explained to the hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. Sargent: I did not get that. What was that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It would be a contradiction if I told the hon. member when. In the first place, I cannot remember when they did it and even if I did, I do not think I should divulge that, otherwise I would be contradicting myself. It is better that these things are privileged to the Minister, so that they can confide in him and he can confide in them and respect their recommendations. As a matter of fact, there are other people who recommended this.

Mr. Sargent: That means you call that privileged information.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: John Howard recommended—

Mr. Sopha: That is a new constitutional practice.

Mr. Chairman: Item 5. Items 5 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

On item 8:

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could explain what these compassionate allowances are to permanently handicapped inmates who are wards?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is when an inmate injures himself in the prison.

Mr. Pitman: In the prison?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the prison as a result of some work he is doing in prison. We then allow the workmen's compensation board to make a decision as to what the amount of disability is and what he should be paid and then we go before the Lieutenant Governor in council and ask for an award.

Item 8 agreed to.

On item 9:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, five years ago I stood in this House and I must confess that I was nervous when I made my maiden speech. But my theme was built around the injustice of the county jail and I have never forgiven the Minister because he took it upon himself to take me apart and he did a good job on it. I lost my pitch, my whole point on this thing and I built—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): You will get your own back tonight.

Mr. Sargent: And I built what I thought was a great case for people who could not defend themselves and you were great—you made me look like nothing and probably you can do the same thing again tonight.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I doubt that.

Mr. Sargent: But I want you to hear this, sir, that today I do not give a darn what you people say. I know what you are doing and I—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: I am saying what I think, Mr. Chairman. I stood in this House and I fought for a cause and you laughed me down. I quoted Bill Sands and his book, "My Shadow Runs Fast," I quoted that at length and you made him look like the real crook he used to be, but today, this man is known in penology as a shining light in the United States.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to listen to the hon. member but not when he puts words in my mouth. I never made Sands "look like a crook."

Mr. Sargent: I will get *Hansard* and show you that you are not telling the truth.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member would get *Hansard* and read it—

Mr. Sargent: I certainly will.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And if he turns out to be correct I will apologize but I am sure he will find that—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I wish we could recess the House to get *Hansard* right now because he definitely said that.

Mr. Chairman: Item 9, grants. The hon. member has something to say on that?

Mr. Sargent: I certainly have. Tonight, in Owen Sound and in every county jail in this province, some built 100 years ago, we have people locked in a cell 38 inches wide and about nine feet long with a cot with no mattress on it and a pot and no light. They are locked in there from 8 o'clock at night until 6 or 7 in the morning, like animals. They cannot read. They cannot communicate. They cannot talk.

An hon. member: Run by the CPR.

Mr. Sargent: And here we go, Mr. Chairman, the old Tory front row try and think this is a great deal. And I want to say that we should build jails, that we may use them ourselves sometime; and it would be a good spot for a lot of you guys in the front row there.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this discussion—

Mr. Lawlor: Compassionate society!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —that this discussion would more properly come under vote 1903.

Mr. Sargent: We are talking about grants to county jails.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, this is for the 10 per cent. I think that this discussion more properly belongs under 1903, and in the meantime it will give the hon. member a chance to go and get *Hansard* and not only remind himself and see what I said about Sands but also what I have said in regard to what the hon. member has said in respect of county jails. I do not ever recall disagreeing with him about the conditions of the county jails because he was only repeating the things I said in public about the conditions of the county jails.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, perhaps he could use this time to get those back copies of *Hansard* and he will find out what I said at that time.

Mr. Sargent: You are really stick-handling tonight.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I do not want to restrict the members—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised it is only three years ago. If you get *Hansard* for three years ago and read it out to the House, I will be very glad to hear it.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order, please! I do not want to restrict the members from discussing in connection with county jails. The Minister suggested 1903. I point out that this governs institutions and industrial operations. There is no reference to county jails.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Provincial jails.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, item 9—no, it is county and city jails, $600,000.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the upcoming estimates. The upcoming estimates now come under the heading of provincial jails. All of these jails will now be provincial jails and they are under this heading. I have no objection to hearing it now except that there is no use debating it twice. That is all I am suggesting.

Mr. Sargent. The only point I want to make, Mr. Chairman—and there is some way that he will dodge this whole issue and he will come up like a rose, I guess, but the fact was that these institutions that you are so proud of—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not proud of them.

Mr. Sargent: —continue to operate. For five years you have been saying the same thing, "We are going to replace them."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We never operated them five years ago.

Mr. Sargent: I know you said you were going to change the whole system.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. I said we were going to take them over.

Mr. Sargent: Five years ago you were going to correct it but we still have the same punitive system we had a 100 years ago. People are going into those jails, Mr. Chairman, and they are not convicted. They are in there before they are tried, whether they are guilty or not. But here we have a man's first connection with the breaking of the law. He is put into one of these dungeon-like affairs and this system is continuing to operate and will operate, if this Minister has his way, for many years to come.

I think it is a shocking shame that he sits there and says we are going to change things. He told me that five years ago. We are still going along the same old way, using a system we used a 100 years ago, putting a man in the moon or locking a man in a room at night, like an animal. He cannot read. He cannot talk in the dark there until six or seven o'clock in the morning, and the place has no plumbing. He cannot even walk down the aisle, he is so crowded in a space 38 inches wide. I think it is a shocking shame that you have the nerve to be called the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions when it is such a dishonourable programme you have got.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order! The member's remarks are entirely out of order.

Mr. Sargent: I say, Mr. Chairman, it is a dishonourable programme he has got.

Mr. Chairman: Item 9. The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I think my remarks will be in order on this particular estimate, because this relates to some statistics which the Minister has presented at the end of his report in relation to these jails and these county and district jails. I find it quite—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would you mind pulling the microphone over.

Mr. Pitman: I am sorry. I find some of the statistics here quite shocking and surprising. I wonder if the Minister could perhaps explain them first and perhaps indicate how he is going to change the situation. For example, if you look on page 102 you will see the average cost of each prisoner per day. It seems incredible to me that the average cost of each prisoner per day is $53. In the Dufferin county jail, it costs $7 and $7.3 in the Middlesex jail. I just do not see how there can be a discrepancy from $53 to $7.3.

I admit that the Minister only gives 10 per cent, and is not wholly responsible. Is that not right?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member must remember that figure is the average cost of each prisoner. For example, if he goes down to the Toronto jail he will find that the average daily cost is—

Mr. Pitman: It is $6.7.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes. No, no, that is—

Mr. Pitman: It is $53 in Dufferin.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The difference is the number of prisoners. This is precisely the point that I have been making for three or four years in attempting to put across the regional detention centre programme. You must take into account the average number of prisoners in jail in that particular institution. On another page you will find the average number of prisoners is so small that three prisoners have to absorb the cost of the whole jail. So obviously, the average daily per capita cost would go up. Yet with 50 in the same jail, the average daily cost per prisoner would go down, would it not?

This is the problem here. This is one of the reasons that we said there would be some economies in the regional detention centre programme, where you would eliminate some of these jails. Some of them are going to be closed down. Four will be replaced with one, because there is obviously no reason for keeping a jail going where they have an average daily population of perhaps four prisoners. This is the reason for the high per capita cost in that particular instance.

Mr. Pitman: Would that be the reason also for the next column, where the average cost per day for clothing and fuel is $8; there is only one in Carleton and 39 cents in Halton? In other words, what we have is a massive misallocation of public funds in the county system as it exists right now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I am advised that the reason for that is the cost of the fuel—they are much larger jails. I hope the hon. member will not think I am callous about it, but it is really academic, because all of these inconsistencies, all of this waste of funds in some of these areas, all the human waste has all been discussed and discussed by me in my efforts to convince the counties to come along with us in our regional detention centre programme.

It is one of the reasons we are happy at having to take on the added responsibility of 900 employees and 37 more institutions. We are happy to do it because this will help us alter this situation, and even though the hon. member from Owen Sound keeps saying that it is a horrible thing and we have overlooked it and so on, he is really reading my speeches. This is precisely what I have said.

Mr. Shulman: But it is not what you are doing. You are the one who should do it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the Quinte regional detention centre is now either going out to tender or tenders have already been called. The land has been bought. The location has been chosen. There was even a regional detention centre board set up. There has been a lot of money expended on it. Right at the beginning, this will replace four, 100-year-old jails. Now if that is not a start what is a start?

Mr. Shulman: You took five years to get started.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It did not take us five years.

Mr. E. Dunlop (York-Forest Hill): It would take the member longer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It took us about three years to convince some county jails to come along with it. Some of them decided to come along with it and we started on the programme. Happily, we are now in a position not to have to go and sell the programme; as we are now in control of the situation.

Mr. Singer: Whose speeches has the Minister been reading?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know the hon. member spoke about this, too.

Mr. Singer: For many years!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, it is the old story; this is what anyone can say to a government when in Opposition. It is very easy to get up and say what I know is going to have to be done 10 or 15 or 20 years from today; but we have to find a means whereby we do it. We hope that within 12 years all of these jails will be replaced. We cannot replace them all tomorrow unless somebody wants to get up here and recommend that we take $50, $60 or $75 million in one year and build all new jails. If anybody is prepared to do that and convince the taxpayers of it, as far as this department is concerned we would be happy to do it.

Mr. Sargent: You are spending $30 million on a centennial project.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now we are doing it on a gradual basis. And I am sorry if there is going to be some suffering in some of the other jails in the meantime. We will try to alleviate that. Our task force is working now in attempting to find out those jails where we can put some money into it without obviously wasting it because the jail is going to be replaced in, say, three years. We do what we can in the meantime to alleviate the situation in all the jails, and replace those on the basis on which we have decided.

I should also remind the hon. members that right off the bat we in this department have taken over some $7 million from the burden of the local taxpayer, just to take over the existing system, and are going to spend many millions more in new regional detention centres. And it is going to take time.

Mr. Pitman: Could I ask just one further question, and I do not want to press this point, but it is going to be 12 years before we have these regional detention centres. Is there any way that you can at least alleviate the miscalculation which is taking place here? It means, really, looking at the whole county jail system. There are a number of jurisdictions where it already exists. Can he start closing some of the worst of these? As the Minister says, nearly all of them are 100 years old.

Can he start closing some of the worst of these, can he start putting people into the jails that are the most humane which we presently have, and can he close out some of those that are costing the taxpayers of Ontario an unconscionable amount of money?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know if the hon. member was here when I made my introductory remarks.

Mr. Pitman: Yes I was.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I referred to this. This is precisely what we are planning on doing. There is a task force working now – the member will recall I used that expression– in covering each one of the county-city jails, and on this–

Mr. Pitman: For the purpose of closing some?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is contemplated. There will be some which we will be closing

and I am waiting for their report to find out which ones. I have a pretty good idea which ones are the most likely for this, but there is no use prejudging what their report will be. There will be some closed and we will be making some changes in some of the others, which will be awaiting replacements.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, what bothers us here in the Opposition is the self-satisfied obsequiousness of the Minister, along with the whole front bench there on the government side. The Minister has said at least twice tonight, "you are quoting from the speeches I have made over the years". Well, since he has assumed this portfolio, he has stood in his place and told us that he had a logical programme going, he was touring the province, he was meeting with county councils and municipal councils and the council of London.

Oh yes, he was about to produce in the new capital of Ontario an agreement where they were going to build a new jailhouse in London and in Middlesex county. It never arrived, but he was explaining away this perfectly logical programme, the selling programme, that he had taken from one end of the province to the other. He was saying this was logical and sensible and eventually we were going to replace all these jails he had been talking about.

Mr. Dunlop: He was not using the speeches of the hon. member, I take it?

Mr. Singer: Now the hon. member for Forest Hill was here and he is a good listener; and he is an intelligent man, Mr. Chairman, and he knows full well the point I am making.

The point that bothers me about the Minister is not that he has arrived at the decision tonight or he and his colleagues have arrived at the decision tonight. Nobody can expect him to spend all of the provincial revenue on rebuilding jails, but the point is his self-satisfaction, where he pats himself on the back and says, "This is what I, the Minister, have been advocating over all these years".

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Read my speeches!

Mr. Singer: That is not true. That is absolutely not so. He has been justifying a programme over these several years, until this year, of avoiding the issue. He has been blaming a variety of municipal councils for not having assumed their full responsibility; he has been telling us what a great salesman he is; he has been hither and yon and backwards and forwards, convincing people they should get together and spend municipal tax money.

Only the now deceased mayor of London had the courage to stand up to him, an anomaly, sir, and that is why I was interested this afternoon in learning where in the hierarchy of precedence the city of London ranks concerning its new jail. Apparently it is not No. 1 but I bet it is awfully close to the top.

I would think that the Minister would minimize the credibility gap if he came in and said, "We have been wrong in the past; we now recognize the full cost of administration of justice, including the provision of jails, is the responsibility of all the people of Ontario, and we are now going to attack it, we are going to do away with these hideous creations that we have had, the jails that are 120 and 150 years old."

No, the Minister has justified the present situation, or attempted to justify it over the several years that he has occupied the portfolio.

So I say only this. Mr. Chairman, it sits very badly in the Minister's mouth tonight to stand up and say "you are only quoting back to me my speeches". That is a bunch of rot, with all due respect to the Minister. He would be much more credible if he said, "All right, we have changed our course, now today we are embarking on a new programme, we are now going to build the jails and we cannot build them all at once." And we in the Opposition, being reasonable people, would accept that as a reasonable programme.

But to stand up and try to convince us tonight, Mr. Chairman, that he has been advocating this programme over the years just does not sit. It does not make sense and it is not what the Minister has said over several years.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, would it be a violation of the human rights code in the realm of fiendish punishment to send the member for High Park to Polar Bear Park with a complete set of the speeches of the Minister of Reform Institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Even I would not want to punish him that way.

Mr. Sopha: I doubt that his speeches will equal the popularity of the sayings of Mao. May I ask the Minister, in respect of the John Howard society, whether there is an overall John Howard group. Is there a central office of the John Howard society, a sort of a head office, in the province of Ontario? I notice

two communities are referred to here, Toronto and the district of Thunder Bay.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, they have been to some extent separated, but as of this year, I think, they are working together. As a matter of fact, I think the cheque we sent to the John Howard society at Thunder Bay—

Mr. Sopha: That is not quite what I am after. Is there a head office of the John Howard society?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, in Toronto.

Mr. Sopha: Overall?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, in Toronto, for the province.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, so the item for Toronto—that does not mean the Toronto chapter?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, no, that is for the Ontario association of the John Howard society.

Mr. Sopha: That is very misleading indeed. We have a John Howard society in Sudbury and I wonder why they did not—I want to ask a number of questions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think the reason for that is that up until this year there was the John Howard society, the provincial one, and for some reason or other which I cannot recall at the moment, the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry of the Thunder Bay area operated separately in respect of grants. Now they have gotten together and I think you will find that they will be all under one item and it will be under the John Howard society of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: If it would not violate Ministerial secrecy or fracture the constitution, could we have an idea how much the John Howard society would have like to have had?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: More money!

Mr. Sopha: How much more? You must have some idea.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not have their letter here, but if I recall when they accepted the cheque with graciousness, I think they did remind us they would like more money this year because of increased costs, and I do not think they mentioned a figure. I know that whatever extra we could have given them they would have received with appreciation, of course, but they are not the only ones. I think naturally that any extra money we can give to these organizations would be acceptable, but they are managing to get along with this. As I say, if we did have any extra money to give them we would be glad to give it to them.

There has been a number of times in the year when we had a little extra money left from these grants. We have gone to Treasury board for permission to give extra money to the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry societies and perhaps one or two others when there was some additional money.

Mr. Sargent: You gave a cocktail party or something.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, no cocktail parties—John Howard and Elizabeth Fry do not operate that way. But I cannot tell the hon. member how much more they asked this year.

Mr. Sopha: It would be elaborating the obvious and gilding the lily at the same time to refer in any detail to the nature of the valuable work that this society does in the community. One observes from even the most attenuated contact with it that frequently the people involved are some of the most highly trained people in the community in the sense that some of the most highly educated people in the community are attracted to public service in the John Howard society and it is to their great credit that they take that interest in the sufferings and disabilities that attend those that have run afoul of the law. But I merely remark this—and I have noticed there have been some interjections that really hit the nail on the head, so I do not have to persuade hon. members other than the Minister—that this seems to be a terribly modest amount and creates a shocking anomaly against a background where Canada is said—and it is never challenged in this House, this statement which I have heard for nine years—to have either the highest, or almost the highest, recidivist rate in the western world.

Somebody said tonight there are more people in jail in Canada than anywhere else in the world. I think that statement is rather exaggerated. There are probably a good many countries with less democratic forms than we have that have more people in jail and one has no statistics on that score. Our record is bad enough; we do not need to etch it in blacker framework than it is. But one finds it terribly difficult to understand the sum of $24,500 granted to two organizations such as this when only ten days ago we voted a gravy

fund for the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld), who needs it like he needs another hole in his head, of $75,000 for entertainment. We voted in this Legislature; there was no standing vote on it. He got it and he is going to entertain all sorts of people from in and out of the province, wine and dine them presumably, and take them to the best places.

As a citizen, and having some contact with the criminal element that I have had—I have a good many former clients who have been in these institutions, some are in now; I do not say that lightly, but I have had considerable contact with these people—I just do not understand it. No amount of rhetoric—most of it empty, meaningless phrases, citing all the old aphorisms, and the tired euphemisms, hackneyed expressions of the Minister—is going to justify this shabby treatment of this very valuable pluralistic group in our community, the John Howard and the Elizabeth Fry society, which function best in the large urban centres where they can establish contact with people who come out on the street, in the parlance of the trade, and find it difficult to become adjusted.

In many ways you cannot call Canadian society human—or humanistic, is a better word—you cannot call it humanistic because there are narrow prejudices that have no basis in rationality: The policeman, who still exists, seeing the former inmate of the penal institution working, gainfully employed, and walking in to his employer and deliberately telling him that the man is an ex-con. That still goes on and that is the type of thing we cannot prevent except by education and enlightenment. But it is the kind of thing the John Howard society has to contend with, getting that man placed who is fired. The most enlightened group, if they are that, in the financial community, are the bonding people, and they will not bond ex-prisoners, so they cannot get employment that involves the necessity of suretyship. And there are many other instances.

That is the wrinkle in the social order that the John Howard society endeavours to work out and if we are among the highest recidivist rates in the western world, then $24,500 is, as my friend from Downsview says, nothing, nothing at all; it would not pay a portion of the administrative costs. Yet, in a few weeks time we will vote $1.8 million for horse racing. Nothing is too good for E. P. Taylor, resident of Nassau who thinks so little of his Canadian citizenship that he gives it up—that is how great a Canadian he is—but we are going to give him $1.8 million of the public money.

It is a defection from justice, ordinary justice. If we were progressive and enlightened and really meant what we said and said what we meant, $250,000 would not be too much if we saved ten people a year from recidivism; $250,000 would not be too much.

I am no particular agent of the John Howard society; I am entirely objective and independent of mind about this. I only speak on the basis of having seen the work that they do and the selfless devotion that they give to this type of thing. Believe you me, Mr. Chairman, in the world of charity there are a good many more prestigious organizations which society will laud the individual for being involved in—hospitals and that type of thing. But if you are involved with the John Howard society you will be an unsung hero because it is not the type of organization that attracts attention as having particularly high prestige. So I say to the Minister, spare us from the rhetoric about it; you might as well give them nothing as give them the small, niggardly amount that you are giving them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think I should make this quite clear, lest the impression get around that the John Howard society is operating on this grant alone. In the first place I point out to the hon. member we have raised their grant this year 12.5 per cent. I should also point out they received a great deal of money from other sources—the United Appeal fund, the federal government, and other persons—so they are not just operating on this. I have just been handed a note that the letter they sent us was that they would like to meet with me to discuss an increase for next year and we will meet with them on it. They are quite happy with the progress they are making here.

Might I also add that I have the Elizabeth Fry letter before me and I am afraid to read it for fear the hon. member will say the only reason I read that is because it says something complimentary about my department.

Mr. Sopha: They are intelligent people, they are buttering you up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The John Howard society does the same thing. The Elizabeth Fry writes:

> On behalf of the board of directors of the Elizabeth Fry society I sincerely thank you and The Department of Reform Institutions for our grant of $11,000. This

grant is a very substantial aid to our budget and allows us to provide service to many girls who would otherwise go unassisted upon release of custody.

May I take this opportunity to say that the staff and board and volunteers find working relations with your staff at the Mercer reformatory and the woman's guidance centre very cordial and co-operative, and The Department of Reform Institutions should take great pride in the strides they have taken towards establishing a philosophy of treatment for the offender in the province of Ontario.

This progress makes our work far easier and more effective. Combination of the wonderful co-operation and the receiving of a grant for $11,000 contribute greatly to the success and continuation of our services.

Yours sincerely,
Mrs. J. P. Bruce,
President.

I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Elizabeth Fry society has not necessarily always heaped paeans of praise upon our department. They are quite outspoken. I would say this is a sincere tribute to the work of my staff and the department.

Mr. Sopha: Of course, the province of Ontario is one of the toughest to get money from.

Any applications, so far as I am aware, for a position of responsibility and the province of Ontario pokes its nose into the previous history of the person, asking if he has a criminal record, so it is one of the employers the Elizabeth Fry society is talking about.

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park is next.

Mr. Shulman: I just want to associate myself with the member for Sudbury. I agree completely with what he said, but I want to point out one statistic which might bring this home. There were some 60,000 committals in this province last year. With a budget of $40 million we are spending approximately $700 a year for each incarcerated person. For each committed person, of that $700, the princely sum of 60 cents is going toward rehabilitation through grants for the Salvation Army, the John Howard society and the Elizabeth Fry society.

This really sums up what is wrong with the whole department. The Minister gets up and outrageously says "we gave a 12.5 per cent increase," which works out to something less than $3,000 this year, in a $40 million budget. Their emphasis is incarceration; it should be in rehabilitation.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Chairman, I specifically wanted to ask, what is the criterion for selection for after care agencies, which are in receipt of grants made under this section? Why are some of the agencies mentioned on page 61 of the report dismissed with a mere vote of thanks?

Of course, what I was thinking of is the half-way house. This is not just a local organization; it now has active groups formed in Toronto, Brantford, Bramalea, Hamilton and Ottawa. I understand that this organization has been flatly turned down.

I agree with some of the other members with regard to the John Howard society and Elizabeth Fry society. I had occasion, when I was on tour of the jails and reformatories, that I ran across them while they were interviewing inmates. I am sure they are doing a good job.

I have a copy of a letter that the hon. Minister sent to the half-way house in Windsor, with regard to not allowing them the grant, and I was wondering if you care to enlarge on that now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the half-way house. The term "half-way house" is abused so often, and is used by so many different people and means so many different things.

I would point out to the hon. member that half-way houses do get grants. They get grants from The Department of Social and Family Services on a *per diem* basis; they do not get grants from our department. This is in respect of having to get some capital as well, and on a *per diem* basis, and this comes from The Department of Social and Family Services. If the hon. member will look up that department's estimates, he can see it there.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Has the hon. Minister any philosophy or background, or approach to that particular problem? My colleague, the member for Sandwich-Riverside, raised a considerable point in Guelph, at some length

on St. Leonard's house, in Windsor, and its rehabilitative services, and the role that it plays in the community.

I missed the Minister's opening statement, regrettably, but I wonder if he would care to make a statement to this House as to how he feels about these places like St. Leonard's house? What are the future prospects, as far as his department is concerned, with respect to the benefit of such institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt about it, there is a place in this system for half-way houses. I might also add that one of the problems we have had—although it does not directly concern my department insofar as the grants are concerned, it, of course, is an adjunct of our work. One of our problems is that we have had a great number of people, in the last couple of years, who want to get into this business. They want to go into the business of half-way houses.

A great number of them have been approaching us lately, some of whom we feel are not qualified. You can do as much harm in a half-way house, as you can do good. I am not suggesting St. Leonard's house is not doing a good job, but there are many others who are doing a good job as well. There is the Harold King farm, Santa Maria house, Beverley lodge—many of them, and they deserve a lot of encouragement.

Our problem is to find out just how far we should allow half-way houses to expand without knowing what value you are getting for the taxpayer's dollar.

There have been a lot of figures quoted—a lot of figures which, by and large, have not been proven. The hon. member for Sudbury, for example, talked about the high rate of recidivism. Nobody really knows. Nobody knows, any place in the world. We have not been able to establish what the rate of recidivism is in a particular jurisdiction. It is an almost impossible task, as the situation exists today.

I could go into the reasons why it exists in Kent. It also is an impossible task, and a fruitless one, to attempt to compare rate of recidivism in one jurisdiction as against another, because they compile their rates in different ways. I found that to be an exercise in frustration.

One of the difficulties in attempting to get the rates of recidivism in the province of Ontario, for example, is that unless you commit an indictable offence, you have no way of controlling your figures, insofar as a person using an alias is concerned. Because your fingerprints are not taken, unless you have committed an indictable offence, and you can use all sorts of aliases and your figures would not be authentic.

One of the problems is that we have been trying to arrange—and I think it looks like we are in sight of success—with the federal government to have an overall system. We envisage an IBM system, every other province can send a punch card on every inmate to headquarters in Ottawa, and in return they will do the same thing. So that every provincial department will know what the figures are, and the people with whom they are dealing. We are ready for it. We set up this system two or three years ago, and we are ready.

Whether they have trouble with one or two other provinces is another matter, although I am rather hopeful of this. But insofar as this specific question about half-way houses, I only mention the question of success rates in this sort of thing, because it was mentioned by the hon. member.

No one really knows what success rate any institution has. It is an almost impossible task, which is one of the reasons we may some day get to a compulsory probation at the end of a sentence, so that you can control, you can have the legal right to follow a person, and find out what has happened to him for at least five or ten years after he leaves the institution.

This may have implications insofar as human rights are concerned. Otherwise, how are you going to find out how succcessful you are?

There are some agencies, private agencies, who, in order to get a lot of financial support for their work, have used—I do not want to use the term inflated figures—but have used optimistic figures. There was one organization, I will not mention its name, which, after it was in business less than two years, started to issue figures on its success ratio.

This is ridiculous. How can anybody in this world give you figures on a success ratio in a matter of two years? Any researcher will tell you this is impossible.

As a result of this, the government is now discussing setting up research. As a matter of fact, I am not just sure where it stands in Treasury at the moment. Some research on half-way houses has been accomplished. However, how much success we are having with these half-way houses; which type of half-way house is a better type; which one should

get support; or whether the government itself should go into the half-way house business, is not known.

I think that until that report comes, we would rather see the half-way houses that are in existence carry on their work, so that rather than expanding on a rapid clip without having any guarantee that a great portion of the work is not wasted. I do not know what I can add to that.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions. I thank the Minister for that fairly elaborate answer.

Does the Minister exercise any advisory control at all over the moneys granted to the various institutions mentioned in his estimates?

Let us take, for example, the Salvation Army—to whom, incidentally, I wish to give high praise, as to the role that they play, particularly around the magistrates' courts in this province. And the work that they do among young people, assisting them in a way that no other institution, so far as I know, in the jails, in the county jails, and in the courts —that no other institution even attempts to do. They deserve the highest praise.

But, again, the amount of money. I know that they get money from other sources, but there is $33,000 for the kind of work that I think that anyone of us that are lawyers know that these people do—in the courts, day after day, keeping an officer in every court in the city, practically. I am not aware of their position elsewhere in the province, but they certainly do yeoman service in this regard. But in whatever it may be, I would like to know whether you investigate, or have any control, or exercise an information service, whereby you receive reports from them. Or is it that they asked for a certain sum, you have confidence in them, and you simply give it to them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I would say that it is a combination of both. We have a great deal of confidence in the Salvation Army and we work very closely with the Salvation Army.

I would confirm wholly what the hon. member has stated in respect to the work of the Salvation Army. They are one of the groups doing a great deal of work without too much fanfare and without too much publicity. We are very happy with the work they do, right in our institutions.

Insofar as the grant that they are getting from us is concerned, again this is not the sole money that they depend upon, they get money from other sources as well. What is the point; shall we just say: Let us give them another $5,000 or $10,000 just because we like their work? I mean there is no point in that.

Mr. Lawlor: I know; but how much can they do on $33,000?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not just the $33,000, they are getting money from other sources. They get it from the United Fund and other sources such as their own appeal.

Of course they could use more money; we could all use more money, my department could use more money. But the point is that if the Salvation Army is happy with the amount they are getting, which does not mean when they read this in *Hansard* they are not going to send me a letter and say, "Well now, we heard that you said we were quite happy with the money; do not get the idea that we want more."

But, really, there is no point in putting more money in the estimates unless they come before us and put up a good case for more and, having regard for our commitments in other areas, we are able to give it to them.

So as far as we are concerned, all of the organizations are fairly content with the way we have been treating them in the past, and this year as well.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, returning to the business of the grants to the county and city jails. My friend from Peterborough read a couple of columns, but there is the third column. Again, I do not know how the answer of the Minister—that with the regional detention centres and with an averaging or an accumulation of prisoners the cost can be brought down—how it would particularly affect the daily per capita dietary costs and the enormous discrepancy, which incidentally does not fall within the same county units as the figures cited by the member for Peterborough under other headings.

For instance, Bruce has 41 cents per day, whereas it has a fairly high figure on the average costs situation. On the other side of the fence, you come down to $1.14 for Prescott and Russell. Are the bacon and eggs of Prescott and Russell particularly appetizing? Why would the Minister argue that with these regional detention centres he would feel that he could in any way really alter the discrepancies of these dietary costs throughout the province?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the answer is the same as I gave in respect of the average daily costs. The hon. member will note that those jails which have the least number of prisoners will generally have a higher per capita cost for food. There are certain built-in basic costs in any operation.

Mr. Lawlor: Only up to a point.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I think that you could look at page 104. I think that the hon. member mentioned Prescott and Russell. Prescott and Russell have an average of 9.7 daily jail population and Toronto has 702. You will notice the difference there; the one with the largest population has the lowest per capita cost for food. Obviously you are dealing in larger amounts and you can buy and serve the food cheaper.

Mr. Lawlor: Take a look at Bruce, with 15.5. It just does not seem to jibe, that is all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It may be that the purchasing agent in Bruce, or the cook at Bruce, decides that he can buy more expensive food, or that he does not know how to buy food as cheaply; or perhaps he is treating his prisoners a little better than they do in other jails. We hope to standardize this when we take over the jails.

Mr. Lawlor: You have a French cook up there, you had better tell the hon. member for the riding about him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course there will still be some imbalance because of other factors, but we will standardize it as much as we can.

Mr. Lawlor: On the business of your menus, arising out of food in these institutions: You know I have been around to quite a number of them in the past few months and I have very severe doubts as to whether those menus represent the facts of the case. There is a lot of stew given and a lot of pretty shallow watery soup served at these meals, which go under another nomenclature. We will check that out in the near future and see whether this is a true representation. It is all right to stand up in this House and pretend—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member referring to the jails?

Mr. Lawlor: I am referring to food in the reformatories.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Are you referring to the reformatories?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, I am referring to food.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now that is a different thing.

Mr. Lawlor: I have said what I want to say about the matter; I have got it off my chest.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member wants to tell me there is any particular reformatory that does not serve at least the diet and the menu as laid out by our head office, then we would like to know which it is.

On the other hand, if he is referring to jails I will agree that there is a great possibility that among these 35 jails there are some which might not, at a particular time, be following the diet as approved of by the department. But they certainly shall once we are able to take them over and control them.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is stunning me with his fairness tonight.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I happen to be a fair man; can I help it?

Mr. Lawlor: One last question arising out of the centre of criminology: Could you give us a bit of an outline on the work they are doing for your department, or what their service is going to be?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The centre of criminology actually was set up with a grant from our department, of $30,000. At that time I do not think there was any understanding that they would provide a service for our department. It was to help set up a centre for criminology at the University of Toronto. But I could tell the hon. member that since that time we have been able to get a great deal of information when we require it.

Mr. Lawlor: For instance?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They help us with staff training. Some of our staff are using the centre of criminology for staff training, and this work will be expanding. But this is the way it started and this is the grant they are receiving. I hope that I am not leaving the hon. member with the impression that they are living on $30,000 a year. This is only the grant from our department.

Mr. Lawlor: Arising out of that, Mr. Chairman, this staff training, I would take it the hon. Minister means that people within his

own department, that is within the Queen's Park arena, have been subjected to or exposed, thank heavens, to a little penology and contemporary sociological thought? Have any of the staff at your various reform institutions been exposed to any type of modern thinking at all?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think there was some mention made of that. There is a whole chapter on that in the annual report. Was the hon. member not satisfied with what he read in that report?

Mr. Lawlor: I think when we get to Guelph we will come to it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I should tell the hon. member that there is an increase of $100,000 in the estimates this year for increased staff training.

Mr. Lawlor: They sure need it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I would say they—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to go back to the item concerning the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry society of Thunder Bay. On the general principle, of course, I support the eloquent remarks of my hon. colleague from Sudbury, but more specifically the Lakehead cities, the hon. Minister will immediately recognize, is what you might call a collecting screen for transients with records from both east and west. We lie in the middle of a 1,000 mile stretch.

The man who leaves from Winnipeg and heads to the east will go 1,000 miles. The only city he will see in that area of any real size that will attract him to stay for a while will be the Lakehead; and the same for those coming from the east and travelling west.

The result is that the incidence of break and entry at the Lakehead is extremely high every year and in many cases, these are transient people with records.

A lot of these people stay around the Lakehead looking for a job and usually, as soon as it is found out that they have a record or that their past is somewhat shady, they have a lot of difficulty. Ultimately, they wind up in the hands of the John Howard society. The John Howard society at the Lakehead is made up of volunteers primarily. Just people who are interested, who want to protect their city and who have a sincere, genuine human interest in helping these people to rehabilitate.

But their hands have been tied financially because, besides this $2,000 grant and whatever they get from the federal government, which is not that sizeable from what I can understand, they are at the whim and fancy of the Thunder Bay United Appeal and if the appeal succeeds they will get more money. But if it does not succeed, then of course they will not get more money.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, that this $2,000 grant has been unchanged in approximately the last eight years and yet the number of transients —the number of people who need help and service in the Lakehead area—has increased and the need is greater. It only stands to reason that if the cost for everyone else is going up then, of course, the John Howard society at the Lakehead is going up too.

I do not know how much of this increased 12.5 per cent to the John Howard society of Ontario is going to rub off on the Lakehead area. I have no idea. But I do know that the type of jobs that most of these needy men are channelled into are labouring jobs. Jobs in the bush or in the grain elevator; and these jobs require special gear, special clothing, special boots and so forth. That is what costs money. The society can get a new suit for a man but when it comes to getting the necessary work clothing, this is when it begins to cost money. Besides that, a man is not going to be paid unless he has put in a couple of weeks' work.

So, naturally, John Howard has to sustain him for his board and his keep and his meals and so on until he gets his first pay cheque. What is happening is that a lot of private citizens have got to reach into their pockets and pay for these fellows.

Inasmuch as the John Howard society of Thunder Bay is taking care of boys from all across Ontario and all across Canada, it seems to me that the province should pitch in more —because we are taking care of the province's boys. It is those boys who come through our area and we are not rejecting them. The kind of people I am talking about at the Lakehead are extremely dedicated people and this is why I feel so sincerely about this right now.

I have been closely associated with several cases of boys they have tried to rehabilitate. They have been successful with some and they have been unsuccessful with others. But I would say for even those with whom they are not successful, for every day that one of

these boys is kept out of the courts, kept from returning to the courts, returning to a jail or the reformatory, this society, through its efforts, is saving this department and the people of Ontario money.

Let us face it. It is a great work of human mercy that they are carrying out and at the same time, they are saving us all money. They are doing a job that a lot of us would not want to have to do and for that reason, I respectfully ask the Minister to consider an increase.

It has been eight years, approximately, since this grant has been revised.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member heard me earlier when I said that John Howard society at the Lakehead was now become part of the provincial John Howard society. Therefore, they will be getting their funds directly from the provincial headquarters and we will be dealing with provincial headquarters. That should ease their problems somewhat because they will be able to present their budget to the provincial headquarters of the John Howard society. They do good work up there. There is not any doubt about it. But I think this would probably go a great distance toward solving their problem.

Incidentally, perhaps I should take this opportunity to point out that all of this discussion may lead some of the new members, at least, to have the impression that the only people doing any rehabilitation work are the private agencies. Our department does a tremendous amount of this work and we have an office in the Lakehead.

As a matter of fact, in some of the work the John Howard society does, when they run short of clothing and things of that nature, when working with a releasee who has not gone to our rehabilitation officer, when they need things of that nature, they get help from our own rehabilitation officer as well, because we provide these things in addition to the John Howard society.

Mr. Bullbrook: What is your total—

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, if I may—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You will find this comes under another vote.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is $187,000.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will discuss this.

Mr. Bullbrook: Less than 5 per cent of your total.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, now the Minister is talking my language. I think that he should relieve the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry society and take this matter over completely.

Mr. Bullbrook: Right. Why should these people be volunteering for an effort that they think the province of Ontario cannot do or has not been doing? I really think that you should take over their work completely. Their hands are tied. They can only do so much with a limited amount and even if the province takes over the John Howard society of Thunder Bay, there is still no guarantee to me that we, in our area, are going to get sufficient financial assistance. This is just going to be another channel to go through to get it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Again, I know I am repeating some of these things which other members have heard in other years, but there are new members here.

As far as we are concerned, we would like to do all of the work in the half-way house area. One of the reasons being, as is usual in areas of government where some of the work is done by government departments and some is done by private agencies, the private agencies are usually given all the kudos where the government agencies are given all the brickbats.

We would like this very much except that we find the privately operated, after-care agencies have a place for this reason—there are a considerable number of releasees that want nothing to do with the agency which kept them incarcerated. There is a certain amount of hostility on the part of some of them and they want no part of the institution when they leave. They want no part of those squares who had anything to do with keeping them in the institution, and they will sometimes accept help from a private agency like John Howard or Elizabeth Fry or some of the other agencies and, therefore, they have their place. So long as they are able to help some of these people who will not accept help from us, that suits us fine.

So, there is room for both and there is room for that organization up there. I am sure if the hon. member would suggest this to the John Howard society of Thunder Bay, they would tell him, "No, they would rather stay in the business", and so would we.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that as long as they are going to stay in existence then they should be assisted

to the hilt and just one more thing. I wonder whether the department, through you, Mr. Chairman, keeps any specific statistics not only on how many men with records are kept out of the prisons and are assisted by John Howard, but how many dollars this represents in savings to the people of Ontario? Is there any such record available, say on the Thunder Bay district?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, that I am afraid, with our present knowledge, would be an impossible task. It is an impossible task.

We are faced in a free society with the philosophy, and I am not too sure it is not correct, that once a person has paid his debt to society you cannot insist that he report to you. Now a person may go to an after-care—to a half-way agency. The minute that person accepts its help or apparently accepts its help, then disappears from that agency, you would not really know whether, in fact, he has been helped or not. It may appear that he has been helped.

This is one of the problems we have in corrections generally, that it is easier to document your failures because they come back into the institutions. But it is almost an impossible task to document your successes. All you can presume is that those who do not come back, you have done something to help them. The half-way houses, by and large, are in this same position, although some of them do use some figures which are not really based on scientific evidence.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, I would submit that if even tentative figures along these lines could be accumulated, people like the member for Sudbury and myself would not have to be on our feet tonight to ask for more money on their behalf. This would come automatically, because I think it would be somewhere in the phenomena.

Mr. Singer: Before the Minister expends too much energy and sprains his right arm by patting himself on the back, I thought it might be worthwhile bringing him back to Metropolitan Toronto, and asking him a few questions about that institution on the east side of the Don river.

You know, Mr. Chairman, there was a man named Alexandre Dumas who wrote about the Count of Monte Cristo—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I suggest if the hon. member is going to talk about the jails there is a special—

Mr. Singer: Well, yes, there is, I read vote 1901, item 9. In the second line from the bottom it talks about county and city jails and the jail on the east side of the Don river in Metropolitan Toronto is the Don jail, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is only a book-keeping item to pick up the grant from last year. I think the hon. member would be more in order discussing it under 1903 and 1904.

Mr. Singer: It is not an institution, it is a jail.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is a special item, provincial jails, if the hon. member will notice.

Mr. Singer: But it is not a provincial jail, it is a municipal jail now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To all intents and purposes, there are no municipal jails.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is pettifogging, he is splitting hairs; it is a county or municipal jail.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if the hon. member will give me a chance to explain it to him, perhaps I can convince him.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I ask for your ruling.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I explain, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Singer: No.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On a point of order, insofar as these estimates are concerned, all of the jails now are under the item of provincial jails. Because we presumed by the time these estimates are through, the bill making them provincial jails will have been passed. So it is in the estimates under provincial jails. I was merely suggesting for an orderly procession in these estimates that the hon. member bring it up under provincial jails.

Mr. Chairman: I believe there has been considerable discussion so far on vote 1901 regarding item 9, county and city jails. I believe the Minister pointed out previously that there was a special provision in vote 1904 for provincial jails as such.

Mr. Singer: Vote 1904 is industrial operations.

Mr. Chairman: In the middle of page 119, the member will notice an item in bold type "provincial jails".

Mr. Singer: I was not aware, Mr. Chairman—there may be something new that has happened—that there was a county called Metropolitan Toronto. To the best of my knowledge, no such county exists in the province of Ontario. There is a county of York, but there is no county of Metropolitan Toronto, unless something new has been created.

An hon. member: Oh, stop pettifogging!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand what the hon. member is referring to. Where is there a reference to the Metropolitan jail here?

Mr. Singer: Oh, now we get down to it!

Obviously the Minister does not want to discuss it at all. Either, Mr. Chairman, it is a municipal jail or it is some other kind of jail. What kind of jail is it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I explained earlier that the item under—

Mr. Singer: I do not care!

Mr. Chairman, I am asking for your ruling.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am trying to help the speaker—

Mr. Singer: On a point of order, I have the floor at the moment. I would appreciate the Minister sitting down.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member state clearly, if he can, his point of order?

Mr. Singer: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wish to address myself to the problem of the Don jail, which is situated in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, which I suggest is not a county jail.

Mr. Chairman: Therefore, it should not come under vote 1901.

Mr. Singer: It does indeed; under 1901, item 9, the fifth or sixth—the second heading from the bottom, county or municipal jails.

Mr. Chairman: County and city jails.

Mr. Singer: That is right, it is a city jail.

Mr. Sargent: He is right, it is a city jail.

Mr. Sopha: If it is not a city jail, what is it?

Mr. Chairman: I want to hear more before I can make a ruling on that point.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the item the hon. member is referring to is the $600,000 which we now owe to the county jails for last year's operations, so that is in under county and city jails. As a matter of fact, to all intents and purposes as of January 1, 1968, they are all provincial jails and therefore, if the hon. member will look—

Mr. MacDonald: It was a little illegal, but the Minister is right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not a little illegal; the staff is in there. We do not own the buildings as yet unless the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) has made his agreement with the Toronto jail; I do not know.

Mr. Singer: Do you own the Toronto jail?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is page 119. The figures involved for the operation of all of the jails in the ensuing year is there under provincial jails, $9,044,000, and all the jails should be discussed under that item.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it is a very simple point. Some of the $660,000 goes to the Don jail and therefore it is in order under this vote.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Some of the $9 million will also go to the Don jail.

Mr. Singer: And it is here in this estimate at this time and I am entitled to debate it, and I ask for your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: It seems to me that the item under vote 1901, item 9, grants to the county and city jails, as the Minister has said, constitutes only a 10 per cent contribution.

Mr. Singer: Let me debate only about the 10 per cent of the Don jail.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It has nothing to do with the upcoming estimates.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, you should bear in mind that the hon. member for Downsview cannot be here tomorrow and that is why he wants to speak tonight. Maybe you should take that into account.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. member for York South is impugning motives to me and I ask that that remark be withdrawn.

Mr. MacDonald: I was not, I was just delineating the member's inability.

Mr. Sopha: We do not need a breakthrough in Quebec, we have one.

Mr. Chairman: It seems to me if the member wants to discuss the Don jail and the operation thereof, that this vote 1901, item 9, is only the 10 per cent portion of the grants for last year. The estimates for the new provincial jails, which will include the Don jail as I understand it, are on page 119, provincial jails.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, surely I can discuss the 10 per cent of the amount that is there, otherwise why is the Minister asking for it? So let me only confine all the point of my remarks to 10 per cent of the Don jail. Let the Minister choose whichever 10 per cent he wants.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, as I started to say, there was a man named Alexandre Dumas, who wrote a book called the Count of Monte Cristo, wherein he described—

An hon. member: What has that to do with the vote?

Another hon. member: Was it the Don?

Mr. Singer: No, he described a person called the Count of Monte Cristo, who was imprisoned in a jail called the Château D'If. I am sure my erudite friend, the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), Mr. Chairman, would know this book well because he is a scholar and he reads classics such as this.

As bad as the description by Dumas of the Château D'If was, he could have related it in all its aspects to the Don jail or the 10 per cent of it that I am allowed to discuss.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Don jail is a palace compared to most of the other county jails.

Mr. Singer: It may be a palace, Mr. Chairman, in the view of the Minister of Reform Institutions, but I would ask the Minister if he is aware of how old the substantial portion of that building is. It is well over 100 years of age.

Mr. MacDonald: Put your reply in the remaining 90 per cent tomorrow.

Mr. Singer: Only 10 per cent!

The old portion, the substantial portion of which I can only talk about, Mr. Chairman, is very old, it is well over 100 years old. It lacks in sanitary facilities, it lacks in segregation facilities, and it is one of the busiest institutions of its kind in the province of Ontario. The Minister was referring to the figures in regard to that building just a few moments ago.

In the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, because of the fantastic traffic throughout magistrates' courts, because of the inadequacy of our bail system, and because of the inadequacy generally of the administration of justice in our lower courts, that jail has fantastic traffic out of all proportion to any other institution of a similar kind within the province of Ontario.

That jail, Mr. Chairman, demands attention far over and above any other priority to my mind insofar as reconstitution of jails in Ontario—far and above even the one in London. And I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what justification the Minister has in allowing that institution to continue in its present form even one more day. I have been there on several occasions to visit clients of mine. I have been there on several other occasions as a member of the legislative assembly to investigate the conditions there and believe me, Mr. Chairman, a proper description of it defies my powers of oratory. It is a horrible place, it is a disgrace to the people of the province of Ontario.

An hon. member: About 12 per cent now?

Mr. Singer: Some of the rest of it, the most newly built part of it is better, and there was an addition put on in about 1953 or 1954, I have forgotten the year. However, it bespeaks well of the whole system of administration of justice in Ontario. Unfortunately it bespeaks it far too well. The Minister, as I say, strains his arm to pat himself on the back and tell us how fond he is of the fact that we are quoting his speeches back to him and of the advanced steps that he has taken. I wonder what plans he has made for the rehabilitation of that horrible institution which is a disgrace to all citizens of the community of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: I would limit the Minister to 10 per cent of a reply.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member keeps saying that I am patting myself on the back for making speeches about this, and he claimed earlier that I was repeating his speeches. So, I am patting myself on the back for having repeated the speeches for

which he was patting himself on the back for repeating what he said.

Mr. Shulman: That has nothing to do with the Don jail.

Mr. Singer: Let us stay with that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As far as the Don jail is concerned, Mr. Chairman, the old part of the Don jail, of course, is a very bad situation. But if we are talking about priorities, as I said to the hon. member if he thinks that even the old part of the Don jail is bad, he ought to visit some of the other county jails, and there are many of them in worse condition than that, which does not justify the continued existence of the old part of the Don jail. But at least there is a very large portion which has been recently built. As I mentioned earlier, there is a task force out examining all of the jails with a view to setting up some kind of priority, and there is no use prejudging what that report will be. When the report comes back we will examine it and see where we will put some money for renovations and where we will establish—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I suspect that the Minister is misleading the House. In this House in 1965, on page 2028 of *Hansard*, talking about the new regional detention centres we are all talking about, he said: "We will pay 50 per cent of the cost of construction and the other 50 per cent will be shared by the municipalities entering into an agreement on a use basis." That was in 1965. He has been doing this whole thing since 1965, and now he tells me that he has a task force doing it now.

Mr. Chairman: Order, in what way is the Minister misleading the House?

Mr. Sargent: He is giving us all this nonsense about a task force and he has had this going on since 1965, and still he has not built one jail.

Mr. Chairman: No, he is not misleading the House at all on that issue.

Mr. Sargent: I suspect that he is.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the point that I want to make is this. From the Minister's own statistics, I am sure that he will agree with me that because of the density of the population in the metropolitan area in this province and because of the traffic through our courts here in Metropolitan Toronto, that notwithstanding the age of various buildings, such as the age of the building in Quinte that he referred to earlier, the traffic through the Don jail and the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto from his own figures is far and above, by any standard that he wished to apply, to the traffic through any other similar institution in the whole province.

How many thousands of people are lodged in that institution every year? The Minister can supply us with those figures, but I say without any fear of contradiction at all that it exceeds in great proportion, and you could multiply it by a substantial number, the use of any other similar institution in the province of Ontario. It sits badly in the Minister's mouth to say that we have to look at great length to see how we accommodate thousands and thousands of prisoners who go through that institution in a reasonable and modern, and sensible, and sanitary way.

I am just asking the Minister to provide reasonable accommodation for the institution that has the largest traffic through it in the province of Ontario, and that now comes under his aegis. The substantial part—and it is far more than 10 per cent, and perhaps to that extent I am out of order, Mr. Chairman—the substantial part of that institution is a disgrace to every person in the province of Ontario, and it is used to capacity and over capacity.

The situation is unsanitary, unhealthy, unreasonable, and it flies in the face of every modern theory of penology that the Minister has been trying to enunciate to us in the years that he has been in that portfolio.

Mr. Sargent: That is a palace compared to county jails, as you said yourself.

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire about staff training and development under this vote.

Mr. Chairman: We are on item 9.

Mr. Shulman: Is this not on item 9? I have a sheet in front of me and there does not seem to be another number after 9?

Mr. Chairman: I would point out to the member that item 9 is grants only, and I believe that there was some discussion on staff training previously under item 1, salaries.

Mr. Shulman: Staff training is at the bottom of the sheet; what number is it?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, well I would point out to the member that this is a breakdown. If

he will take the administration and the staff training, and total them, he will find that they equal the total of vote 1901, so that it has been discussed.

Mr. Shulman: It has not been discussed at all.

Mr. Chairman: I put it to the Minister. Has there been discussion of staff training? There has been discussion of staff training.

Mr. Pitman: The most important item—

Mr. Chairman: This was discussed.

Mr. Shulman: There is no item above for it, Mr. Chairman. Under what item are you suggesting it has been discussed?

Mr. Chairman: It has been discussed under the general discussion under item 1. There was quite a considerable amount of discussion under this.

Mr. Pitman: Staff training is more than salaries, and we have no way of knowing that this item was included in item 1901-1. It is the most important item of this entire estimate, I would suggest to you, sir. No matter how you change the name of the department and no matter how the Minister indicates his progressivism in terms of rehabilitation instead of isolation.

Mr. Chairman: There is no item specifically for staff training, and it has been discussed under item 1, and also I believe that there was mention under items 2 and 3.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order again, the Minister did mention this whole question of staff training under item 9, under the centre of criminology in the University of Toronto.

Mr. Chairman: Only to the extent that they give them advice in staff training.

Mr. Pitman: Well, I suggest that if the member for Downsview is going to discuss 10 per cent of the Don jail, then perhaps we will be able to present or discuss a percentage of staff training and development.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Surely the Minister would not want to restrict discussion on this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I will be gracious enough to be entirely guided by the Chairman. If you wish to discuss staff training now, I will discuss it now. I leave it up to the chair to keep proper order.

Mr. Sopha: And further, Mr. Chairman, surely on this point, notwithstanding that you take them item by item, it is the vote that carries. And after you finish the item before the vote carried, any member ought to have the liberty to raise any matter that has not been raised before. I submit that to you.

Mr. Chairman: No, this has not been the procedure at all. Even at the beginning of the estimates, it was suggested by members of the Opposition parties that we take it item for item. We tried that on several of the departmental estimates and it worked out well. In some of the various votes, the votes did not lend themselves to item by item discussion, and we took them as a total vote by general agreement. We have taken this item for item as the Chairman mentioned right at the beginning of the debate. We have covered items 1 to 8; there is only item 9, on grants.

Mr. MacDonald: Does that include staff training?

Mr. Chairman: No, it does not.

Mr. MacDonald: We have not discussed staff training anywhere, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: It was mentioned under item 1.

Mr. MacDonald: I think you are being a bit restrictive to say that staff training is included in salaries and salaries alone.

Mr. Chairman: No, I said travelling and maintenance, and if the member will look—

Mr. MacDonald: Then take travelling and maintenance alone.

Mr. Chairman: The $232,000 is listed as 1, 2 and 3; salaries, travelling and maintenance, and that is exactly where they were discussed.

Mr. MacDonald: That does not add up to $232,000.

Mr. Chairman: That is a portion of the total, I must point out to the member.

Mr. MacDonald: We want to discuss the other portion of it.

Mr. Chairman: That is under administration which you have already discussed.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, look, Mr. Chairman, if you want to be legalistic, we have not discussed staff training at any point. We

have not discussed it and the Minister has no objection to discussing it. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we tried when we were on Social and Family Services to get a seriatim discussion, and for some reason or other that mystified me, we suddenly got into the whole bag of issues at once. Now we are back to it with this restrictive approach—if perchance something is hidden, like "staff training", in salaries and travelling and expenses it is excluded. My colleague is correct, it is the most important issue in the department, which is going to change its name to live up to some modern standards.

Mr. Sargent: You were asleep at the switch.

Mr. MacDonald: I was not asleep at the switch. If you do not want to debate this, fine.

Mr. Sargent: You cannot now, it is passed.

Mr. MacDonald: It is not passed.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to all members of the committee that we can stick to one procedure, if this is what they wish.

We can take every vote in every department item for item and restrict it to the discussion on that particular item. Or we can take it a little broader—we can take a total vote.

Are we going to have it two ways? If the Chairman puts it to the members before we start the discussion, surely we can resolve it in that manner, which we attempted to do tonight.

Mr. MacDonald: Except this, Mr. Chairman. If you are going to take salaries and travelling expenses and then maintenance and to include that as staff training, then I think it is your responsibility to indicate that it includes staff training.

Mr. Chairman: Surely the members can read the estimate page.

Mr. MacDonald: How can you? You cannot tell. Staff training and development—

Mr. Chairman: It is obvious to the Chairman. The first item, administration, plus staff training, equals the total of the vote 1901.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I do not want to prolong this, but I want to point out that if you are going to say that staff training is in 1, 2 or 3, then I say to you the obligation is upon the Minister to remove that item, staff training, and put it up in one of the seriatim items. That is his obligation, so that we would be able to see the specific item.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I would say that as far as the government side is concerned you can debate it now, or any time you like. We are quite content.

I understand the position of the Chairman; he is trying to run the estimates on an orderly basis. The printing of this particular estimate, as I interpret it, has caused the trouble—the way it is set up on the page. Let us debate it and we will consent to this. There is no problem, but you can still, I hope, stay with your endeavour to keep the subject matter of the estimates within reasonable control.

This problem is caused by the way it is printed on the page. We are not trying to prevent a discussion of staff training, we are trying to conduct the estimates in an orderly fashion, and believe me, it is not simple for the Chairman to attempt to do this. So why do we not, by agreement, debate this particular question? You may still, Mr. Chairman, follow your procedure in dealing with the estimates.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, it should surely be your experience, sir, that once the clock indicates 11 in the evening after a full day of debate, there is a tendency for us to grind to a halt in the orderly discussion of this business. It happened last week and it appears to be happening again.

There is every reason that good sense would indicate that we have discussed the matter sufficiently for today and we can continue another day.

Mr. Chairman: I must point out to the leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Nixon: It happens night after night—11 o'clock.

Mr. Chairman: I am sure the leader of the Opposition was not specifically speaking to the Chairman, because he knows right well the Chairman has no authority to rise and report without a motion.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the whole point of the leader of the Opposition is, but if he was protesting the prolongation after 11 o'clock, I join him. I have no objection to lengthening the hours of this House, but common sense enters into it, and I suggest that common sense suggests

that at 11 o'clock we adjourn and go home so that we can come back tomorrow and do a decent day's business in a condition to do it.

We just waste our time. We have had classic proof of it for the last half hour. We wasted our time last Thursday. Now I thought we had a—

Mr. Chairman: Order! May I say the member for York South is discussing matters of vital importance to the entire committee.

Mr. MacDonald: I thought a part of the agreement that we had made, in trying to get an orderly approach, was a general agreement that 11 o'clock was an adjournment hour and I am a little disappointed that, with the Prime Minister—we have had this experience when the Provincial Treasurer and others have been in direction of the House—but with the Prime Minister here, I am puzzled as to why this is going on.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have a couple of comments to make. In the first place the lack of sense in this debate occurred before 11 o'clock. I think that this would be fair to state. And I would say further you asked why we have come past 11 o'clock. I think it is quite important to settle this question; we are in the middle of a procedural discussion. I do not think any agreement to adjourn at 11 o'clock means that as soon as 11 o'clock is reached, regardless of whether a man is in the middle of a sentence, or when we are in the middle of a discussion, that we discontinue. That is just nonsense.

Mr. MacDonald: The House leader cut debate off in mid-sentence last night. Why did he do this?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The other point, if you are going to raise this—I did not necessarily want to mention it—but there were several parts to the agreement to adjourn at 11 o'clock.

Mr. MacDonald: What was that?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: One of them was that we would limit the opening speeches to 20 minutes, and we listened over an hour to one this afternoon.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, there has to be some flexibility in the matter. We have limited some of the marathon sessions since we made this agreement, and we will continue to do so, but I can only say that I wanted to settle this procedural matter as to whether this is going to be debated.

Mr. MacDonald: I thought we had settled it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Actually we have settled it, but you have been so busy talking ever since I have not had a chance to move that the committee rise and report, which I now do.

Mr. Nixon: Why does the Prime Minister not move the adjournment while he is up on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just at the next election, do not let those two young Liberal NDP candidates say that I am old and tired. I can stay up longer than they and work longer than both those men.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister is used to patting himself on the back.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am just raring to go.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will deal with bills on the order paper, and if we complete those that are ready to be dealt with I would like to call order No. 2 and order No. 3. When that is completed, if there is still time tomorrow evening we will return to these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:25 o'clock, p.m.

No. 98



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, May 29, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 29, 1968

Presenting report, Mr. Welch 3549

Pension Benefits Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 3549

Statement re appointment of committee on uniform building standards, Mr. McKeough 3549

Questions to Mr. Wishart re campaign signs placed on police buildings, Mr. MacDonald 3550

Questions to Mr. Simonett re the Ontario-Minnesota Paper Company, Mr. Sopha 3551

Question to Mr. McKeough re fence on La Cloche Island, Mr. Martel 3552

Questions to Mr. Randall re placement of OHC applicants, Mrs. M. Renwick 3552

Jurors Act, bill to amend, reported 3554

Crown Witnesses Act, bill to amend, reported 3554

Division Courts Act, bill to amend, reported 3554

Justices of the Peace Act, bill to amend, reported 3555

Land Titles Act, bill to amend, reported 3556

Partnerships Registration Act, bill to amend, reported 3556

Judicature Act, bill to amend, reported 3556

Probation Act, bill to amend, reported 3556

Sheriffs Act, bill to amend, reported 3556

Fire Marshals Act, bill to amend, reported 3556

Registry Act, bill to amend, reported 3556

Hospital Services Commission Act, bill to amend, reported 3556

Pharmacy Act, bill to amend, in committee 3557

Medical Act, bill to amend, in committee 3557

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, reported 3557

Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welch, second reading 3557

Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1964, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 3557

Training Schools Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, held on second reading 3557

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman, continued 3559

Recess, 6 o'clock 3593

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today we have in the Speaker's gallery the Olinda United Church ladies' group from Olinda, which I am informed is in the great county of Essex; and something unusual this afternoon, both galleries are filled with students from the same school—the General Vanier senior public school in Welland. We welcome these visitors from a distance.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the Ontario northland transportation commission's 67th annual report for the year ended December 31, 1967.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE PENSIONS BENEFITS ACT, 1965

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Pensions Benefits Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, section 1 of the bill is intended to clarify the rules applicable pertaining to the deferred life annuity prescribed in subsection 1 of section 21 of the Act when the pension plan is wound up or terminated.

Section 2 provides that where an employer appears to be discontinuing his business, the commission may deem the pension plan wound up. The amendment also provides the employer with the right to appeal from the commission's decision and provision for this is made in section 3.

Section 5 makes provision to allow the Lieutenant-Governor in council to make regulations specifying service that shall be deemed not to be a service in a designated province, or more simply, in specific situations to facilitate portability.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Municipal Affairs has a statement.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in February of this year, in response to a question from a member opposite, I stated in this House my support of the principle of uniform building standards throughout Ontario. I also outlined the support that the staff of The Department of Municipal Affairs has given to the use of the national building code of Canada, or the shorter form, as a guide in the preparation of municipal building bylaws.

I always hesitate to admit, Mr. Speaker, that we do not always move as quickly or as expeditiously as we should. On the other hand, in this particular instance, I freely concede and admit to the House that the hon. member for Halton East (Mr. Snow) contributed greatly towards the expediting of this matter. You undoubtedly are aware that the hon. member brought a resolution before this House on March 4 of this year on this very subject. It was his efforts at that time that helped to bring this matter closer to the surface.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It is a good quote for the local paper.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): That is all it is.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

The member for Sudbury will please give the Minister the courtesy of a hearing.

Mr. Sopha: Well, ask him not to be so political.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the member for Sudbury please to show courtesy to the Minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Through you, Mr. Speaker, may I assure the hon. member for Sudbury, that if he introduces a resolution which is as helpful to my department as the resolution was from the hon. member for—

Mr. MacDonald: It will never get mentioned.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —from the hon. member for Halton East, I will give him due credit as well.

Mr. Sopha: I have had several adopted in nine years. I have had several.

An hon. member: You have got credit.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): How much credit did the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) get for the motorcycle law?

Mr. Sopha: I did not need a press release.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The national building code is known internationally as the best advisory document that municipalities can use as a basis for building bylaws. It has been prepared by voluntary commitees of experts selected from all parts of the Canadian construction industry. Contractors, house builders, union officials, material suppliers, public officials, architects and engineers have given, and continue to give freely, their time and talents to ensure that the national building code remains currently useful. Considering the rate of technological change, this is no small task.

Much has been said about the adoption of the national building code by all municipalities in the province. There are many who support the principle of uniform building standards, as I do. It is encouraging to note that the boroughs of North York, Etobicoke and Scarborough have just recently brought into force uniform building bylaws and that the city of Toronto hopes to accomplish this by the end of June. I am sure that the boroughs of York and East York cannot be too far behind in doing the same, so that Metropolitan Toronto will have achieved the goal of uniform building standards towards which much effort has been exerted.

However, it is evident from the correspondence and discussions I have had that there is no unanimity about how, when and to what extent the principle can be fully realized. Should the national building code be made mandatory? Would it be better only to consider similar standards for similar buildings—recognizing the lesser needs and capabilities of small municipalities? The ability of local municipalities to administer the sound principle of performance type bylaws, such as the national building code, cannot be ignored. The availability of qualified building inspectors is but one of the keys to successful achievement of the desirable goal of uniform building standards. How quickly can they be qualified?

About these questions and about others pertaining to approval of new building materials and products, factory inspection of prefabricated components and to amendment procedures, there are differences of opinion amongst those in support of the concept of uniformity.

It is therefore my intention to establish a small committee of persons, knowledgeable and experienced about buildings and building bylaws in the province, to examine, report and comment to government within six to eight months, about uniform building standards.

The members of the committee will represent the manufacturers of building materials and components, the building construction industry, municipal building officials and the professions closely associated with building design and construction. It is our intention to invite representation from the national research council.

The scope of the committee will be broad enough to permit an examination of all essential facets of the subject but not so broad that the task is too great. There are important associated issues, some of which I have already mentioned, and not the least of which should be the adequacy of existing enabling legislation.

The general authority for local councils to pass building bylaws is in The Planning Act. Authority for specific aspects of buildings, such as electrical and plumbing installations, elevators and lifts, and so on, is contained in other Acts. The general authority for passing building bylaws needs to be rewritten. Perhaps now is the time to consider all enabling legislation pertaining to buildings in one perspective view.

The committee will receive briefs from all who have an interest in uniform building standards. Its report should provide a base from which to decide the merits of uniform standards, the extent to which they should apply, and the means whereby such an end may be achieved.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General, in three parts.

1. Is the Attorney General aware of the fact that the local police headquarters building on Prince Street, in Hearst, was this morning displaying a large campaign sign of the Liberal candidate Stewart?

2. Is such an action in violation of The Police Act?

3. Would the Attorney General refer this public involvement of the local law enforcement in partisan politics for investigation by the Ontario police commission?

Mr. Sopha: Was it a picture of Pierre Elliott Trudeau?

Mr. MacDonald: I hope not; oh, I hope not.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, it seems apparent that the official Opposition does not find this nearly so offensive as the hon. member for York South. I have checked the matter. I was not aware of the situation, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): They have professors going out and checking signs. I found that out in my campaign.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I cannot find that what has happened in the placing of the sign on this building is contrary to anything in The Police Act. The building is the property of the local municipality of the town of Hearst. It was the former municipal building and the police force in Hearst is administered by a committee of council. I would think it perhaps reasonable to say that the building would be available for all parties to display their signs on.

An hon. member: We will try Tommy's picture tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: To answer the latter part of the question, Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is a matter that needs to be referred to the Ontario police commission for investigation. I did consult them to get some of the facts, and found there is a four-man police force operated under a committee of council. Possibly by this time this sign has fallen down.

Mr. MacDonald: Did the Attorney General say fallen down? Mr. Speaker, on a point of information, I would like to inform the Attorney General that pictures of it are available if it has fallen down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: The NDP always run third in Cochrane, of course.

Mr. MacDonald: You just wait until June 25. We ran second last time and we will run first this time.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sopha: I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, which is very helpful and constructive.

Was a charge laid earlier this year, and perhaps in the month of January, 1968, against the Ontario-Minnesota Paper Company at Kenora, for polluting waters with industrial wastes? What was the specific charge? Was the charge later withdrawn? Why?

Has the situation of pollution to which the charge related been corrected, and if not, why?

Mr. MacDonald: That sounds like a familiar story.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, information against the Ontario-Minnesota Paper Company at Kenora was laid in Toronto, December 20, 1967. A summons was delivered to the company in Kenora January 11, 1968. The company was charged that it did unlawfully discharge material, namely, wood and chemical wastes, during the period of eight months commencing April 1, 1967, into the Winnipeg River, contrary to section 27, subsection 1 of The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act.

The company subsequently advised me they had recently received a report from a consultant they had retained to advise them on this subject, and were on the point of presenting proposals to the Ontario water resources commission for a programme of pollution abatement. This being the case, I agreed to withhold prosecution to give the company time to submit its report, which it did on April 13, 1968. This report was discussed with the Ontario water resources commission at a meeting in Toronto on April 30, 1968.

In answer to the fifth and sixth parts of the question, the situation of pollution to which the charge related has not been corrected, simply because although progress has been made on plans the physical facilities have not yet been installed.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask a supplementary question? Would the Minister explain to us, if the serious step of laying a charge in a court was taken, then why has the situation not been corrected by the end of May?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I would think the hon. members know that after a plan is received and approved you do not build the remedial measures overnight; it takes time. I would expect if it is remedied 18 months or two years from now, they will be making very good headway.

Mr. MacDonald: They have been procrastinating for so long, they—

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme).

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member will notice the Minister of Highways is not in his seat. He will please use one of his other questions.

Mr. Martel: A question for the Minister of Labour: Does The Employment Standards Act, 1968, spell out clearly whether or not a man can refuse to work overtime on a day on which he has already worked eight hours?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, this is a question which concerns Bill 130. It will be discussed on second reading along with other matters. I think it should be dealt with at that time.

Mr. Martel: I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs: Did the government contribute financially to the fence constructed on La Cloche Island on Manitoulin Island? If so, how much and why?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this question is a little bit on the vague side. My answer is no, not to my knowledge. We have no record of contributing to a fence as far as The Department of Municipal Affairs is concerned, either directly or through some centennial project grant.

We have checked with The Department of Highways, and they have no knowledge of this. We also checked with the Indian development branch of The Department of Social and Family Services and they have no such knowledge. It may well be that the federal government or the municipality has contributed, but without more information I cannot supply anything more than a, "no, to the best of my knowledge."

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough Centre has a question.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Development. Can the Minister advise the House whether intervention by the Toronto *Telegram's* Action Line or the Toronto *Daily Star's* Help Wanted, or other news media, has a softening effect on the stringent disciplines referred to on May 14, on page 2898 of *Hansard,* with regard to the placement of OHC applicants?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I can answer that very briefly with a "no." But as the hon. member is undoubtedly aware, the Ontario housing corporation receives representation from a wide range of agencies and other interests with respect to families requiring accommodation. Frequently these families are in "emergency" circumstances, which have not been brought to the attention of OHC by the family itself. There may have been fire or other abnormal circumstances.

In certain circumstances, the emergency has arisen so suddenly that the family has not even applied for accommodation. For example, last year the corporation housed in Metropolitan Toronto alone, a total of 1,272 families which were in emergency circumstances of one form or another, and many of these cases were brought to our attention by elected representatives, social agencies, and other interests.

Help Wanted and Action Line are just two of these. It so happens, however, that where these two papers do bring a problem to our attention, and the family ultimately receives housing, there may be some comment about it in the paper concerned.

To give the hon. member some indication of the volume of representation on behalf of applicants, in 1967 the tenant placement branch handled approximately 38,000 telephone calls concerning applicants, in addition to calls received from the applicants themselves.

To reply specifically to the hon. member's question, representation by outside interests which bring to light an additional fact concerning an application, may have the effect of giving a family a greater degree of priority. This has nothing to do with the source of representation or the degree of pressure applied. It is a simple matter of additional information which had not been brought to Ontario housing corporation's attention by the applicant.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if he would accept a supplementary question. I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister agrees that

this is good procedure—that people do indeed find places to live through Action Line, and through Help Wanted. Would he table in the House exactly what these emergency cases are? Not the specific ones, Mr. Speaker, but what qualifies at Ontario housing corporation as being the kind of emergency that hastens the placing of applicants such as this?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I think that it is obvious. I said emergency cases. As to this family that you are talking about, as I understand it, under the building codes of Toronto, the inspector walked in and found 18 people living in one house, and the inspector ordered 11 people to get out. That is this family that we are talking about. The moment that they did, they applied to Ontario housing corporation for assistance. That is what we call an emergency—or they could be burned out.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Could I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Do you consider that an eviction would fall under this category?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, we have had many evictions that have been looked after immediately, too.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, my last question for the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps in future—I certainly will allow the member to ask this further supplementary question, but perhaps in future, she might incorporate these several questions in her original one?

Mrs. M. Renwick: They are based on the answer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: They may be based on the answer, but they are obviously prepared ahead of time, and I would respectfully request that the member do that in the future. The member has the floor.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would just like to state that my questions following this one—I had no idea what they would be, except according to the Minister's answer—

Mr. Speaker: Would the member please place her supplementary question?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Yes. My supplementary question is, Mr. Speaker: Is the Minister aware that recently, of two eviction cases which appeared at the Ontario housing corporation offices, one was accommodated by threatening from the newspapers, and one was turned away.

I think if we are going to handle this kind of case in an emergency, I would like to have it clearly stated by the Minister what emergencies are; if eviction falls under it I would like to know—I would like it tabled in the House that it is one of the emergencies.

Mr. Speaker: Before the Minister takes the floor I would like to point out to the member that it would have been very simple to have asked the Minister in her original question, if eviction and these other matters she has mentioned were the type of emergency which would come within the regulations.

It would require no answer from the Minister to enable her to so phrase her question, and I point out again that supplementary questions must be questions based on the answer and not questions which would flow from an answer.

The Minister had the floor; if he cares to reply to that supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would be specific—

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, this point of order—may I rise before the Minister or not—on a point of order?

Mr. Speaker: You may rise at any time on a point of order.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to point out that I did not know, nor have any indication, that the cases I am referring to were emergencies. They could have been old applications which, through this particular publicity, got accommodation. I did not know they were emergencies, so therefore, I did not know that I would be questioning the Minister, today, of what an emergency actually is in the placement bureau at Ontario housing corporation.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker still considers that his original remarks with respect to this matter were quite proper, and in line, and again respectfully requests that members put their supplementary questions, as far as possible, into their original questions.

The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I just suggest that the hon. member for Scarborough Centre gives me the names of these two evicted cases and I will try and get the

details. I do not know who they are, but if I have the details, I will look it up. I might say that it is my intention, and that of my people, not to bow to pressure in these cases. We will bow to need any time, but not pressure.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 4th order, House in committee of the whole House; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

THE JURORS ACT

House in committee on Bill 74, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Sections 1 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 74 reported.

THE CROWN WITNESSES ACT

House in committee on Bill 75, An Act to amend The Crown Witnesses Act.

On section 1:

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): In section 1, Mr. Chairman, it said that it switched over to the director of public prosecutions from the Attorney General, then it said, "May increase the sum ordered to be paid so that the witness will be reasonably compensated." Under the present system re indictable offences, experts get $15 and all other witnesses get $6. For summary conviction cases, they are getting $4 plus ten cents a mile for their travelling.

Is the hon. Minister taking into consideration the review of the fees that would be considered reasonable fees, in accordance with page 862 of the McRuer commission report wherein, among his recommendations he says that all witnesses, other than qualified experts, should be paid $15 a day?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Before the Minister replies, I would point out to the House that there are several private conversations taking place in the chamber which makes it very difficult to hear the proceedings of the House. I would ask for a little more quiet please. The Minister.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, we have noted the views set forth by Mr. McRuer and I think they have a good deal of merit and certainly deserve consideration. I would point out that the only change in this section is a substitution of the director of public prosecutions, who is an officer of The Department of the Attorney General, for the Attorney General.

The language of the section, which is unchanged otherwise, permits the increase in fees and, in our study of the recommendations, if we will find it possible to carry them out, we may make such increases as may be merited.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 75 reported.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I will try this again if I may?

Mr. Chairman: Is the member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Sargent: No, sir, I am on this bill that is coming up.

Mr. Chairman: The bill has been carried.

Mr. Sargent: But all these bills here—

Mr. Chairman: Order! The bill has been carried.

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry.

THE DIVISION COURTS ACT

House in committee on Bill 76, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, respectfully, all these bills, 76 to 85 inclusive, are enabling legislation in the transferring of the costs here. I think if the chair were to ask anyone if they have any points to bring up we could pass these bills in total—these ten bills, at once—saving going through all this.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): We are going to do the estimates now.

Mr. Sargent: On these eight or nine bills, I think it is 75 to 84 inclusive, if the chair were to ask anyone who has any interest in any of these bills, then the chair could pass all these bills at once.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I have very many questions regarding the bills and the hon. member is quite right. There is no question at all about the bill coming up, but as to 77, the bill dealing with justices of the peace, I may have a few questions on that.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps I could call each bill in its entirety.

Mr. Lawlor: There are a number of bills on which I do not want to ask any question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Would the committee concur that it would be acceptable if the Chairman were to call each bill, ask if there were any questions and if there were no questions then pass the bill?

Bill 76, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act. Are there any questions pertaining to this Act?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry, I did not see the member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): I wonder if the Minister could explain this section 1 where it says:

> The provision repeal requires municipalities to provide accommodation for division courts.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is simply a part of the whole proposal to take over the cost of the administration of justice and also the responsibility which, under the present legislation, rests upon the municipality. Now the responsibility is on the province of Ontario. The municipality is relieved by the repeal of that section of the responsibility to provide the facilities. The province must now do so,

Bill 76 reported.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Just a brief question. In the situation where municipalities are not actually providing physical space within their own municipal buildings, but are providing rented accommodation, is it the intention of the department to eventually provide accommodation for division courts within provincial government buildings, or will the present system of using some rented accommodation be allowed to continue?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would expect that we will work out arrangements. Certainly, we have the responsibility now as a province to provide all the costs of the administration of justice, administration and facilities, and we are moving, as I think we discussed in this House before the session, to complete the provision of facilities for all our courts. It may take a little time to do this and we are making arrangements with all municipalities to cover this whole area.

Bill 76 reported.

THE JUSTICES OF THE PEACE ACT

House in committee on Bill 77, An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act.

Mr. Chairman: Are there questions pertaining to this bill? The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: A question with respect to section 1 of the amendment—it is a minor point, but I would like to know. Section 6 of The Justices of the Peace Act says:

> A justice of the peace may use any courtroom or hall for the hearing of cases brought before him but not so as to interfere with its ordinary use.

Why are you repealing the section? Are the justices of the peace being tossed out, in effect?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, Mr. Chairman, again if we are to go, as we have undertaken to go, to the assumption of the responsibility of the costs of administration of justice which, as I point out, includes not only the administration, salaries of personnel and so on, but also the provision of the buildings, we have to relieve the municipality, I think, to be consistent, of the responsibility or the obligation to allow people who are engaged in the administration of justice to use municipal facilities—unless we compensate them or make some arrangements.

So, therefore, we remove in this particular section, by the repeal of the section, that obligation from the municipality and it will be incumbent upon the provincial government to find a facility which the justice of the peace may use, or to make an arrangement with the municipality so that the justice of the peace may be accommodated. Again, of course, I am sure we will have in mind arrangements which will not interfere with the municipal government itself.

That is simply all it means—that we are going the complete distance to say, "You have no obligation to supply facilities or to look after persons who are engaged in the administration of justice; this is the obligation of the province of Ontario."

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, that is not precisely what the section says, but as I say, it says, "to use any courtroom at all." In any event, within the context of the old situation, I suppose the section and the explanation given does make sense.

As to section 2, Mr. Chairman, particularly with 9 and 10, and particularly 10:

The Lieutenant Governor may authorize the payment of a salary to a justice of the peace.

This is very much in line with the presentations of McRuer, quite apart from anything contained in the Smith report. I refer you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of this House, to pages 518 and 519 of volume 2 of McRuer, where he inveighs against the justice of the peace and against the system that has grown up in the province—the political hocus-pocus, as my friend from Grey-Bruce might say.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: With great respect to your ruling about the procedure, Mr. Chairman, by adopting this overall procedure, you are permitting a debate to take place which should properly take place on second reading. This is the danger of the procedure which you have adopted. Any comment or debate must be directed to the sections of the bill which are contained in the amendment and which are only those sections which are now before the House. This is not a second reading debate.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, the Chairman concurs with the Minister and I would ask the member for Lakeshore to confine his remarks specifically to any particular section and the operation thereof.

Mr. Lawlor: I would ask the Chairman again to read page 518 and 519. Thank you.

Bill 77 reported.

THE LAND TITLES ACT

House in committee on Bill 78, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Bill 78 reported.

THE PARTNERSHIPS REGISTRATION ACT

House in committee on Bill 79, An Act to amend The Partnerships Registration Act.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any questions pertaining to this particular bill? If not, shall the bill be reported?

Bill 79 reported.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

House in committee on Bill 80, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any questions pertaining to this particular bill? If not, shall the bill be reported?

Bill 80 reported.

THE PROBATION ACT

House in committee on Bill 81, An Act to amend The Probation Act.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any questions pertaining to this bill? If not, shall the bill be reported?

Bill 81 reported.

THE SHERIFFS ACT

House in committee on Bill 82, An Act to amend The Sheriffs Act.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any questions pertaining to this bill? If not, shall the bill be reported?

Bill 82 reported.

THE FIRE MARSHALS ACT

House in committee on Bill 83, An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any questions pertaining to this bill? If not, shall the bill be reported?

Bill 83 reported.

THE REGISTRY ACT

House in committee on Bill 84, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any questions pertaining to this bill? If not, shall the bill be reported?

Bill 84 reported.

THE HOSPITAL SERVICES COMMISSION ACT

House in committee on Bill 121, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 121 reported.

THE PHARMACY ACT

House in committee on Bill 122, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): What is the net effect of that amendment? I would like to ask if that is entirely new legislation or—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We will hold that bill until the Minister is here. We will proceed with Bill 123.

THE MEDICAL ACT

House in committee on Bill 123, An Act to amend The Medical Act.

Mr. Sopha: Perhaps you will hold that one too.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

House in committee on Bill 119, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 form part of the bill?

The member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, I just have one question on section 1, subsections 1 and 2, where it says, "but does not include the cars of electric or steam railroads" and goes on to say "or a motorized snow vehicle". By doing this, it takes the snow vehicles out of The Highway Traffic Act and eliminates them from coverage under section 105, which is insurance coverage. I was wondering if the Minister would care to comment on this?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Chairman, the matter of insurance coverage on the motorized snow vehicle is cared for in The Motorized Snow Vehicles Act itself.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think it would be better for the House if we get back to the usual procedure of starting the bill and reading clause by clause. It is sort of—

Mr. Chairman: May I point out to the member that is exactly what the Chairman has done. I called section 1. We are debating section 1.

Any further comments on section 1?

Sections 1 to 28, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 119 reported.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain bills without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THE CORPORATIONS ACT

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary) moves second reading of Bill 107, An Act to amend The Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES CAPITAL AID CORPORATION ACT, 1964

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) moves second reading of Bill 127, An Act to amend The Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1964.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TRAINING SCHOOLS ACT, 1965

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions) moves second reading of Bill 128, An Act to amend The Training Schools Act, 1965.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the bill is not—

Mr. Speaker: On my order paper, it is so marked. I might advise the House leader it has been printed but has not arrived from the printers yet.

Mr. Sopha: That is right, they are not in the book.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We will call order No. 2.

Clerk of the House: The 2nd order, consideration of the reports of the liquor control

board of Ontario and the liquor licence board of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I am sure the Opposition does not question the right of the government to call the business of the House. However, I am sure that when the Prime Minister announced last night that the second order would be dealt with today, that he thought that the report of the liquor control board and the report of the liquor licence board would be in the hands of the members of the House.

That is not so, and at least two of us, my hon. friend from Waterloo North (Mr. Good) and myself, on specific request—which incidentally was directed through the Provincial Auditor this morning and passed by him to the liquor control board—received about seven minutes ago, for the first time, the report of the liquor control board.

The report of the liquor licence board is one of the sessional papers, I believe number 4, part of the proceedings of the House. However, it has not been received. Last week at the meeting of the standing committee on government commissions, we were informed that it would not be received until the month of July. The explanation given was that apparently the tabling of the report by the Provincial Secretary in this House—I paraphrase, actually—the tabling by him triggers the mechanism to get it printed. They have to wait for the words to fall from the lips of the Provincial Secretary here and then the order can be transmitted to the printers to print it.

It was said by the president of the liquor licence board that it would not be received until July. I add that my friend from Waterloo North has very assiduously pursued this matter in an endeavour to get the report. We could, of course, have looked at the sessional paper, but that is scarcely practical for all the members of the Opposition. Accordingly I am glad to see that my leader has arrived here, I did not want to say that he will, of course, exercising his initiative I am sure, but I just wanted to report to you that it is rather difficult. I was to be the lead-off speaker, and it is very difficult to deal with a report that one has received only minutes ago.

Mr. Speaker: Before the Prime Minister remarks on the matter, I have been advised by the Clerk that the liquor control board report was tabled on February 22 of this year, and the liquor licence board report on March 26 of this year, so that both reports have been tabled and are available.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if we are going to wait for the most recent report of these various bodies to be available, it may be that we will eliminate the possibility of debate on these subjects. Now with regard to the second order, which is the report of the workmen's compensation board, it operates on a calendar year, not a fiscal year basis, and therefore its most recent report might not be available for some time. I would say this, that the device of the listing of these reports is simply to have means whereby the policies and functioning of these boards may be discussed.

The debate very seldom bears much relationship to what is in the report, although I realize that the most recent report would be helpful to those who might want to take part in the debate. If however, we are to wait until the most recent report is available, it might very well be that we will defeat our own purpose and there will be no opportunity for debate on the function of these boards. This is why we use this device of tabling the report, and the reports on the order paper in both these instances, and the most recent available.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think that we on this side have some difficulty in both these circumstances, and in the estimates of some departments, when the most recent report is not available for the support of certain arguments and discussions that we would like to initiate. But certainly we would have no objection to proceeding with the debate as it was originally scheduled. It is unfortunate that although the reports have been sessional reports for some time, it has not been possible to get them reproduced in sufficient numbers so that all members would be able to use them individually.

Mr. Sopha: I would say further that the workmen's compensation board report was tabled just a few days ago; was that not the most recent one?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, but I do not think it has the most recent information you might want, because of the way that the compensation board operates. As I say, it is not so much the report itself that is the subject of the debate as it is the function of the board. We use this device which was started some years ago to permit a debate on the func-

tion of the board or commission from which the report comes. It is immaterial to me, but all I can say it that you might eliminate your own chance of debate.

Mr. Nixon: Since the Premier has risen again on that, I am sure that he will agree that since the papers have been tabled for some weeks, the most recent ones at least, it would be in the interest of an orderly debate at this time if they had been reproduced and we had a chance to peruse them. Certainly we want to take advantage of this occasion, and I have no doubt that we are prepared to proceed.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Without further ado, I will see if I can get them reproduced in the next couple of weeks. We are going to be here for a while, and maybe I can get them into your hands in quantity. So I would suggest that we proceed with the estimates.

Clerk of the House: The 16th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would just like to point out that this is the second occasion on which we have been promised that we could debate the compensation board, and a number of members here have prepared all their material and I think that it is rather petulant on the part of the Premier to now say that—

Mr. Speaker: Order! If there is any point of policy or principle with respect to that matter, I would be certainly glad to have it placed before the House by the leader of the third party or his deputy leader, because it is a matter which has been dealt with between the leader of the government and the leader of the Opposition. If the member for High Park wishes then to speak on behalf of his group, and is the official spokesman for them, I am sure that the House would be glad to hear his submission.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, when you refer to the third party, you mean the New Democratic Party?

Interjections by hon. members.

Clerk of the House: The 16th order; House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, our leader is not here and our deputy is unable to speak, as you know.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS
(Continued)

Mr. Chairman: Before we proceed with these estimates, in view of the discussions and the misunderstandings that had arisen last evening, the Chairman would like to take the occasion to inform the members of the committee that we will deal henceforth with the estimates vote by vote, rather than item by item.

I would also inform the members at this time that the practice of retaining or maintaining of list of speakers will be discontinued by the Chairman. I would refer the members to rule 14, in which, when they wish to participate in the debates, they will rise and address the chair.

On vote 1901:

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to direct some remarks to this item. At the end of the list of grants there is the centre of criminology, University of Toronto, $30,000. I wanted to say—and I hope the Minister (Mr. Grossman) will not consider it an unfair allegation—that I infer from his remarks that there may be some confusion in his own mind about his place in the structure of things. I rather infer that the Minister in his thinking goes beyond the strict confines of that which his department is set up to do.

We on this side have for many years taken the position, sometimes more vigorously than others, that in the order of things there is a good argument that this department ought to be a branch of The Department of the Attorney General. I really believe that in the Minister's mind he has a feeling that he goes beyond custodial care. As I see it, a court sentences a man and he comes under the care of the Minister, and that is where his work begins.

He keeps him incarcerated for that period that the law determines and you add the parole board and so on, and then he is released and properly the Minister should be responsible for after-care. But looking at this grant to the centre of criminology, a person can readily believe that the science or the art or the humanist discipline of criminology really deals with the whole compass of anti-social behaviour.

The criminologists, I would say, would start with those factors in human living that stimulate a person to a life of anti-social activity. It starts well before any individuals come into the hands of this Minister.

So then, my question really is, what has The Department of Reform Institutions got to do with criminology? This is the function of the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart).

The Attorney General and his staff, if they saw themselves—and we sometimes doubt whether they so see themselves—as something more than mere prosecutors of offenders against the laws of Ontario and/or Canada, if they really evinced an interest in the causes of crime, the stimuli that start a person on an anti-social road, if they felt that way, it would be the Minister of Justice and Attorney General who would be establishing the contact with the department of criminology.

I have very little idea of what they do over in the centre of criminology. I would suspect —and I have read some of the brochures, and I read some of the agenda for their conferences that they hold from time to time—that that centre is far more interested in the causes of crime than it is in the after-care of offenders as they are released from the institutions supervised by the Minister of Reform Institutions.

Seeing this vote here indicates to me that the government as a whole is to be suspected. It does not have a very accurate conception of what this criminology business is all about. And rather, it looks like this is a grab bag, catch-all, sort of place to put this grant in.

As we said last night in respect of the John Howard society, and perhaps rationally the remarks are equally germane here, if the government had a serious interest in this business and if, on the other hand, the centre of criminology was doing very deep and penetrating and valuable work in the field of criminology, one would expect that the grant would be much more than the $30,000 allocated. So in view of that I would like to hear from the Minister, if he will grant my premise to begin with, if he agrees with me. I am not really seeking to cross-examine him, but if my premise is correct that he, as a Minister of the Crown in charge of his department, has nothing whatever to do with the causes of crime or how people are processed through the courts. And, in fact, I doubt if the Minister has little to do with the sentences that are imposed upon them for anti-social behaviour.

I must hastily qualify that and say that for many years consistently on this side we have advocated that the present system of sentencing people to jail is completely wrong.

It may well be, as experience has shown in other jurisdictions, some people, more enlightened than ours, think that sentencing should be a function of somebody quite independent of the courts. And in line with the modern philosophy of penology, that being that the sentence must fit the offender, not the crime, any longer.

So, if my premise, as I say, is correct—and I do not want to obscure too greatly that at least a major portion of the work of the centre of criminology does not fall within this department—I hastily say in that regard that the centre of criminology, no doubt, would see their work and their researches, their studies, their evaluation, to be a total composite picture. That is very fine. That is the way they should approach it.

But we are dealing with governmental structure here, and it is the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the Treasury board that determine that we shall have a separate Department of Reform Institutions to care for those who have been sentenced to imprisonment. That is purely an artificial structure within the total government picture, but my point being that the jurisdiction of this department is far too limited for a meaningful contact with the centre of criminology.

The thesis I make is that if the government is interested in rehabilitation, then the place that this should reside is in The Department of the Attorney General, where we would be striking at the root of crime and focusing on the preventive measures which this Minister has nothing whatever to do.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member finished up by giving a good reason as to why The Department of Reform Institutions is involved, because the hon. member did state the centre of criminology concerns itself with a total spectrum of crime, its effect and its treatment.

Yesterday, I pointed out that the centre of criminology started off with a grant from our department because of the concern of our department with the lack of research in this field. I would like to point out, of course, that I do not want to miss the opportunity of making a comment on the hon. member's suggestion that really reform institutions should come under The Attorney General's Department. I think it was one of the greatest advances in Canadian penology when the government saw fit 21 years ago to set up a department especially designed to look after corrections.

As a matter of fact, I think the hon. member will recall my making appeals to the

federal government to do precisely the same thing. It is recognized in correctional circles that so long as a Minister has within his department corrections as only a branch of his department, this will, generally speaking, be the last branch which gets any attention. Because, as has been stated on frequent occasions, and I agree with it, corrections is not by any means the most glamorous branch of any governmental operation. So the tendency of Ministers who have this as merely a branch of a much larger department, is to neglect corrections to a larger extent than they might otherwise.

As a matter of fact, the federal government has already recognized this, because it was only a year or two ago that they assigned to the Solicitor General the duties, which formerly came under the huge branch of the Ministry of Justice, of looking after the federal penal system. Now the Solicitor General's ministry has the jurisdiction of penal institutions, and the RCMP.

Incidentally, I still do not think this is an ideal situation. I think that the hon. member for Sudbury, with his high regard for keeping everything in its proper place, will agree that they really do not belong together—the police and the rehabilitation branch of correction.

However, having said that, let me add that criminology does not, as the members pointed out, take in just the causes outside the correctional institution—but also is concerned about what happens, what is the effect on crime, of the manner in which the person is treated inside a correctional institution. This is important to them too.

As a matter of fact, there have been some suggestions that criminals are made in correctional institutions. I think there is some degree of truth in this. There are some who would be, I think, and probably do become greater criminals by the fact that they have spent much time in institutions.

So it all comes, really, within the purview of the centre of criminology, but our interest is that we shall have a place where we can go to get some research done. There is now also a centre of criminology at Carleton University, and we are now able to use Carleton University to do some of the research for us.

I should also point out to the hon. members that they do not, of course, exist on the $30,000 grant. He will note, in the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General, there is also a figure of more than twice this. There is a grant, under vote 206 in the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General, $74,000 for the same centre, and we know that they are in receipt of funds from other areas. It is really an academic question.

They deal with matters which concern the department under the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General, and The Department of Reform Institutions, and one could argue that for tidiness of operation it should be in one branch. I really have no strong views on this. It just started this way, and when they asked for more money, they went to the Attorney General. For reasons which the Attorney General will explain when his estimates are called, they are providing for grants.

As a matter of fact, as far as I am concerned, I think eventually, all grants, to anybody, will hopefully—I am giving you a personal view which, perhaps, I should not—come from The Department of the Treasury. So all the grants will come through one source, rather than from different places.

Mr. Sopha: Is the Minister saying to us that he is ordering $30,000 worth of research projects? Is that what he is doing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, it is not. No, not from the centre of criminology. As I tried to point out, and I, perhaps, did not make myself clear, they started off with a grant from our department. We are able to use their facilities, but we are not purchasing necessarily $30,000 of research from the centre of criminology. Their very existence is helpful for anyone else who is doing research. Their very existence is very helpful to people in our department who are seeking information which otherwise might not be available.

Mr. Sopha: Will the Minister relieve my mind? You are giving them $30,000, and you are not imposing any terms or conditions as to how they spend it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: None at all.

Mr. Sopha: So it leaves me to ask the Attorney General when we vote—how much do you say?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: $74,000.

Mr. Sopha: Would you ask him whether he imposes any terms on how they spend it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would not think so.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Humber.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise to speak on this item. I have a statement that the hon. Minister of

Reform Institutions and of correctional services has made, stating that the setting up of a separate department to handle what he calls, corrections, was the greatest step forward ever taken by any government of this province, or anywhere else.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say anywhere else, I said in Canada.

Mr. Ben: Oh, in Canada. To me, it was the most retrograde step that was ever taken. Because it would follow, from my point of view, sir, that the passing of laws; the sanctions that are imposed by those laws; the apprehension of miscreants or criminals; the bringing of them before a bar of justice; the prosecution of the offences; a trial of the offenders, the conviction of the accused, the incarceration, the reformation, and rehabilitation of the individual should be under one department, run by one individual, because all those are a series of events, concerning one individual. Yet we have a number of departments that are sometimes acting at cross purposes. Furthermore, I can hardly accept the Minister's statement, when he talks about having set up a correction department 20 years ago, because we have had no correction.

The rate of recidivism has remained consistent for generations, Mr. Chairman, whether it was under this Minister, or the previous Minister. The fact remains that our system of reformation, if that is what it is to be called, or a system of prisons, is completely archaic. No one has stopped to build up a new system from the bottom, they keep on trying to add to an already old, derelict and useless system.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, we put people in prison, for one of three reasons. We put them in there either to punish them, to isolate them, or to reform them.

In the first category would be what we would call "habitual criminals". There is no hope of reforming them, and a select committee of this Legislature, if my memory serves me correctly—the year may be 1957—decided that you should not concentrate so much money on trying to reform people who are completely beyond reformation, but should try to use this money you have to reform those who are capable of reformation. But there are certain people, certain elements of society, whom we put in prison because they are beyond reformation, and we put them in there to punish them.

There is another category we put into prisons to isolate them. Now they may have some quirk in nature, they may be pedophiles, they may be alcoholics, they may be drug addicts, they may have some other illness which requires their removal from society, either for their own protection, or for the protection of society, or for both.

The third category, which we have all referred to as "first offenders", we put in there to reform.

Now prisons should be designed to accept these three different categories. We should not just have maximum security, medium security, and minimum security prisons as we have at the present time, but prisons should be geared to the purpose for which they are supposed to serve. The prisons in the middle, the ones for accommodating people who are put there for isolation, should have comprehensive and intensive treatment available to the inmates, so that whatever quirk they have of nature, or whatever illness they have, it could be cured, or at least an endeavour made to make the cure.

As far as the people they put into the so-called reformatories are concerned, there we ought to concentrate on making sure that they come out reformed, or, at least, and here I should digress. I asked the Minister if he would send me a copy of the statement he made yesterday, and he did.

At least here it is not necessary to keep them in prison during the whole of the period of their reformation. But if it is obvious to the Minister's staff that the person is capable of being reformed, he could complete his reformation on the street, so to speak, under the aegis or under the guidance of the department, and I compliment the Minister for suggesting such a system take place.

There is another aspect that goes together with reformation, and that is rehabilitation. This also should come under one department. We have parole for instance—last year I was ruled out of order when I found I was discussing parole instead of probation or vice-versa.

They fell under two different department heads, and I was told that one comes under The Attorney General's Department, and the other under this department, and the Chairman was quite right.

If my memory serves me correctly, you, Mr. Chairman, were the chairman who brought that to my attention.

Mr. Chairman: I must point out that that is in the next vote.

Mr. Ben: The fact is that you brought to my attention that there was a distinction between parole and probation, and they came under two different departments, headed by two different Ministers of the Crown, although they are to be discussed at the same time—dealing with the offences committed by citizens.

Now, we are talking about what the hon. member for Sudbury was speaking of—the centre of criminology.

At the centre of criminology, or the criminology department at Carleton—to which the Minister refers, now headed by Professor Taduesz Grygier, who was the chief research director, I believe, or one of the chief research—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Director of research.

Mr. Ben: Director of research for the hon. Minister's department. I am sorry the Minister lost the services of this individual, because to me he was one of the most enlightened men who had come into the services of this province in almost any department.

He came with an open mind and did not accept a lot of old cliches that had been battered around for generations and generations. He went out to find out for himself. He carried out an empirical study and I believe that he used grants as a source of his figures.

According to his paper, putting a person in prison, as the Minister just intimated, does not necessarily reform him or make him a better citizen. In fact, Professor Grygier discovered, or at least his findings led him to believe, that if you put a bad person into a prison he will come out worse, and if you put a good person into prison, he will come out better. Rather than converging towards the norm, there was a divergence.

If we accept this finding, we have to question about putting people into jail at all, because obviously we are not interested in making good people better, we are happy they are good. We do not want everybody to be perfect, we just want them to be good. Simply putting them into prison and making them better people does not benefit society that much

The other aspect of it, making bad people worse, should bother us. What we are trying to do is to make bad people better, not worse, and if we follow the findings of Professor Grygier, we ought not to be putting bad people into prison. I am not suggesting that is a system that we have to follow, but this is the conclusion that one is led to by Professor Grygier's findings.

I am sorry that I have taken up so much of the time of the House, Mr. Chairman, but I had to in light of what the Minister said about the centre for criminology and also about his so-called correction system. I hope that the name will lead to a refinement of the system and that the system will become what the name suggests. It is obvious the previous name—the name that is still being used at the present time—reform institutions—and the department did not live up to its name. Let us hope that under the new title there will be more success.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say flatly, in respect of the hon. member's opinion, that The Department of Reform Institutions should not exist as a separate department, that there is no person that I know of in correctional service who would agree with him. They not only would disagree with him but they would do everything possible to see that every jurisdiction in Canada has a department dealing with correctional institutions. As a matter of fact, we have been asked by the Canadian correction association to permit our Deputy Minister to accompany that association to the western provinces to help them revamp their system along the same line that it is in Ontario.

Mr. Ben: Every bird likes to feather its own nest.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I do not know how we are feathering our nests. As a matter of fact, the fewer people who come into our institutions, the happier it will make us. The fact remains that any place that I went where there was no separate correctional branch under its own aegis, but just a branch of some other department, they were most envious of the fact that not only was there a branch, or department for this with no other duties, but they were very much and pleasantly surprised that some jurisdictions thought well enough of it to have a Minister for it. For many reasons—and I have mentioned this in the House before and there is no use repeating things which are already in *Hansard*—it was a great encouragement to people to know, in a department, that they have at the head of it, a Minister who is concerned with nothing else but the job that they are doing, and they do not have to compete with 15 or 20 other civil servants for the time of the Minister in respect of

dealing with matters of correction. This is one of the problems.

The members also mentioned something about the rates of recidivism, and this is constantly referred to. I am afraid that so long as it is constantly referred to I am going to have to find it my duty to constantly refute it because of the misunderstanding that is spread across the country, and that is that the rate of recidivism has remained constant in Canada. In the first place it is a confusion between Canada and the system of Ontario, and there is a vast difference. Nobody knows what the rates of recidivism are. I mentioned this last night—

Mr. Sopha: May I ask you a question? If individual "A" goes through the doors of Guelph, can it be ascertained if he was ever in an institution before? And if he was, he is a recidivist.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Up to a point.

Mr. Sopha: What do you mean, up to a point? He either was or he was not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I mentioned this last night.

Mr. Sopha: Stop giving me a snow job.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I mentioned to the hon. member that there was no way of getting the correct rate of recidivism.

Mr. Sopha: These things here—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will recall last night, I mentioned to him that only those people who are convicted of indictable offences are fingerprinted.

Mr. Sopha: Those are the only ones who go to jail, except for the drunks.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh come on, there are many others.

Mr. Sopha: I earn my living in the criminal courts; what do you mean "come on"? The only people who go to jail are those people who are convicted of indictable offences, and the drunks, nobody else.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For the hon. member's consideration, I will get reports from Professor Grygier and others who attend to the problems of the rates of recidivism.

Mr. Sopha: I will give you some information—most of the people in jail are the drunks.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will agree with the hon. member on that.

Mr. Sopha: I have the figures right here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would just like to add for the hon. member's knowledge that while we have lost Professor Grygier as the director of research of this department, we still have his services available as a consultant and we are continuing to use them.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1901, the member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, under vote 901, I noticed that there is no specific item set out here under any of the headings, or items, specifically dealing with research. Adverting to "the statement of purpose," which is a very high-minded and edifying statement of purpose issued in the annual report by the Minister, in the third paragraph he says that the department lays great stress on research. Its principles should be guided by research findings and assessed regularly for efficiency.

He goes on: "The development of an operations research and assessment unit is necessary for this approach." But I would suggest to the Minister that that sort of thing is a computer analysis, which could be done in Public Works—all this business during these estimates of operations branches. Why can they not be centralized, and why can the computer units of this government not be taken into a focus, instead of every department talking about research and this sort of context?

The Minister goes on later in his section to deal with research that is purportedly going on. He has got a few pamphlets published. The White Oaks clinic is mentioned as to the study of children who were returned either to their parental or to their foster homes, and that would be my second question. Dealing with the White Oaks study in the statement here it says the expected completion date of this study is 1968. Apart from that, what does not appear obvious on the surface is that despite all the protestations of wishing to look deep into the problems of the criminal mind, and the rehabilitative problems that arise out of that, not much is being done in Ontario, despite the extensive research going on at the present time throughout many jurisdictions, particularly in the United States, and in the world at large. For instance, I will refer to the department of correction for New York state, in their annual report of 1966, where they say that

the trend towards diversity of experimental programmes is continuing, "as the pendulum of theory and concept of diagnosis and treatment of offenders swings through the psychiatric to the sociological schools of thought"; and it goes on in that vein.

Where is work being done here? If your emphasis falls anywhere, it seems to be on group therapy now. That concept, which has been around for a considerable time elsewhere in the world such as Sweden and California, is a dawning piece of business here in Ontario, which you seem to think puts you in the pro forefront of criminal reform. I suggest it does not at all. It is, of course, crucial and necessary but, nevertheless, the true role is that of the criminal in the community, and the reflecting role of that community upon him.

Some of our best people, I suggest, tend to be criminals. These people are unique individuals who break the conformist laws of this society and who do not subscribe to the mealy-mouthed and bourgeois concepts as to how people should conduct their lives. They may be highly creative individuals.

In any event, what is your department doing with respect to research into these various matters? I want to know to the dollar, to the cent, precisely what your department, at this time, is actually spending on research?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, first I should point out that our Training Schools Act —brought in, I believe, in 1965—was an Act based, I think, completely on research. A great deal of research was done.

Presently, we have the position of director of research vacant because of Dr. Grygier's moving to Ottawa and we are presently interviewing potential prospects for this job. In the meantime, we have been purchasing research and doing research in our own department. The amount that we spent for research last year—research which we purchased—I believe was $50,000, and in addition to that, there was about $150,000 research being done by the department itself, to places like Galt training school and so on.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, is that centre of criminology included within that figure, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1901. The member for Dovercourt.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): May I ask the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, what type of research these funds paid for?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The research varies. We have some research done, for example, as to the efficacy of a particular programme in effect at a particular institution or institutions.

There is a study being done now as to the success of our programme at Hagersville—Galt; a study on parole, what effect this has on the recidivism. That sort of thing; it is quite lengthy. We have quite a list of research on which we have had reports.

I mentioned yesterday that we had done a survey on half-way houses. As a result of the survey—which is in the nature of research, but is not what is known as scientific research —we have now requested a scientific research project.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, is there any preventive research being done? In other words, research that would prevent even the offender coming back or being in the courts for the first time by this department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member should appreciate the fact that any research we are doing which will help guide us as to the best programme to undertake to keep people from coming back into institutional life, or keep them from becoming offenders again, is preventative. It is all preventative.

Mr. De Monte: In view of the recent statistics, Mr. Chairman, that crime is on the increase—and serious crime in particular—I am wondering whether the Minister has considered that type of research down in our cities here, where we could do research among the groups and the gangs as to what motivates these people to go out and commit crime or commit petty offences. I would suggest that with the minuscule amount of research that is allotted here, that type of research cannot be done, but should be done.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Perhaps this would come under the heading of what the hon. member is referring to. There are two studies being conducted now concerning personality changes and correctional treatment and another one is associated with recidivism after release from our Ontario Brampton training centre. The latter study has been developing new methodology for prediction and evaluation and a new classification of offences integrating legal, social, psychological and statistical data.

I hope that will assure the hon. member that we are concerned in any aspect of research which will help us make a decision in respect of the best type of treatment to provide in our system, to help these people from becoming repeaters.

Mr. De Monte: Well, I agree with the hon. Minister and I commend his department for going into the reciditive aspect of criminology. But I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps the Minister might consider the preventive prior to being in a correctional institution or a jail or a penitentiary and that perhaps he might consider this when he sets down his research programme for the years to come.

I have another question of the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman. What type of staff training is given to the guards of the Ontario reformatories—

Mr. Sopha: Before you start that—

Mr. De Monte: All right, fine. I will yield to my friend from Sudbury.

Mr. Chairman: If the member wants to yield, all right.

Mr. Sopha: My friend from Lakeshore, very usefully following the lead given by the Minister, began to examine some of the aims and obejctives of this department. The Minister talks about the research programmes and his difficulty in defining the rate of recidivism and, as is his veritable infection on that side, he also talks about being in the forefront of all of Canada.

Out of curiosity, as I have a pretty good idea what the response would show, I would like to see a little study by that department, that centre of criminology to determine whether there is any province in Canada that shows more proclivity than Ontario for putting people in jail. I would like to find that out.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Well, that bothers you, does it not? That gets you up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The only thing that bothers me about it, is that the hon. member for Sudbury—

Mr. Sopha: That gets you up!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The only thing that bothers me about it is that the hon. member for Sudbury was at great pains just a few moments ago to tell me that we were moving into an area that does not belong to us, and that is, those people—

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Those people who—

Mr. Sopha: That bothers you. Why do you not sit down and let me make my speech?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the hon. member must appreciate the fact that our department cannot deal with that. I agree with him wholeheartedly that there are too many people in this province being put into penal institutions and he did not have to wait until today. I have said so publicly. There are too many people, particularly those who are convicted of such things as drunkenness, who should not be put in institutions. I have said so publicly. And hopefully this is what we are working towards. The detoxification centre pilot programme will hopefully lead to this.

Mr. Sopha: All right. Fine, fine. Let me continue what I was going to say, because according to the statistics I have you would be out of business.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Good!

Mr. Sopha: If there was ever a major reform in the attitude toward infractions against The Liquor Control Act, then your department would disappear or become an adjunct of The Department of the Attorney General simply for want of something to do.

Now I suppose we need Professor Parkinson to come over and conduct an inverted study of the reactions of a government department when it is threatened with going out of business, instead of the other way that he speaks of; it is in the process of empire building.

According to the statistics furnished me by the Deputy Minister this morning for the Sudbury district jail, which is an institution, of course, completely under the jurisdiction of the department, out of a total of 1,479 people in the jail in 1967, all except 209 of them were in jail for liquor offences. I can give you, Mr. Chairman, some very clean figures.

Out of 1,479 people incarcerated in that jail, 1,270 of them, that is, all except 209, were in for violations of The Liquor Control Act. What are you running there? The Sudbury district jail is then nothing more than a Salvation Army hostel with a little more stringent incarcerative characteristics. In other words, the department is a drying out institution for drunks.

In order to correct that and to demonstrate, as the Minister says, something other than the proclivity of Ontario to put people in jail —I say to the Attorney General that there were 56,000 out of seven million in jail last year and a rate for 100,000 of population could easily be calculated. I would like to see that rate compared to the other provinces of Canada, to ascertain how many people per 100,000 of population in the other provinces are incarcerated. And I will bet you a nickel that Ontario's rate is either the highest, or right next to the highest, of people in jail. Whether that is called recidivism or whatever it is called, I say it demonstrates a great proclivity to lock people up.

I want now to introduce this reminder. A few years ago another Attorney General sat over there. It was probably four or five years ago; my friend from Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) will remember it, as indeed will my friend from Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator). One day he came in and made a great grandiose announcement that hereafter all drunks were going to go to farms. The government was going to go into the agricultural business apparently, and hereafter there would be way stations for these people to do their drying out process, amid an atmosphere of constructive labour and they would no longer be incarcerated in the classic institutions.

I do not know what happened to that programme. I suspect, though, that it was a matter of conscience bothering the government which is in the liquor business in a big way and there ought to be a little finger of conscience about the liquor business and what happens to people who drink too much of the stuff, because it is the government that gives it to them—they give it to them.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Gives?

Mr. Sopha: Well, hardly gives—makes it available to them and controls its supply and then picks them up—always the lower economic orders, the poorest people. You do not see many well-heeled drunks in magistrate's court on a Monday morning.

Mr. R. M. Johston: What do you suggest?

Mr. Sopha: What do I suggest? I will tell you what I suggest. The revolving door, in the words of Professor Martin, starts at the magistrate's court. That is where it is, not at the district jail next door. Dry them out and let them go. No fine. No punishment. No social aspersion whatsoever. You dry them out and let them go. That is the human way, that is the enlightened way.

I do not see how any society can call itself civilized that adopts the methods that this government adopts, I really do not. How it can mark itself as being a civilized society by picking those wretched creatures up, as they do over the week end, and hauling them into the magistrate's court and imposing that silly fine on them and giving the alternative of the time in jail? What is it in Sudbury? According to the figures the Deputy Minister gave me, it is 1,270 people out of 1,479.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, please.

Mr. Sopha: Are those figures wrong? Those are the ones I got.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I think your secretary got them a little wrong.

Mr. Sopha: Well, it came by telephone.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not that it is important, really, for my estimates. It is an important matter, but with all due respect, Mr. Chairman, I think what the hon. member has been discussing quite properly comes under the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, it embarrasses you. Now you want to bail out, do you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I mean this department can do nothing about the fact that people are committeed to our institutions. When a judge says a person is to go to one of our institutions we have to accept the committal order. It does not make any difference whether we agree with the judge or not.

But just so the hon. member's figures are correct, there was a total of 2,252 committed to Sudbury. Of these, 1,479 were in the nature of liquor offences—although 12 of them were for drunk driving, and so on—about 66 per cent. But I should tell the hon. member—

Mr. Sopha: I doubt very much if there are 800 people—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Perhaps I should not have gotten involved in that. Perhaps I should tell the hon. member anyway, that all of these figures—and that is the problem with figures, you can do anything you like with them — the trouble with these figures — the situation is bad enough without making it appear that all of these are individual people who are being committed. Actually, of this number, a very large number of them are

shown as if they had been in there only once. In other words, this figure of 1,479 would give the impression that 1,479 people—

Mr. Sopha: I did not mean that at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —were incarcerated. Many of these are in two, three, ten, and sometimes 20 and 25 times the same year and show here as if there were 1,479 different human beings being convicted.

Mr. Sopha: I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just wanted to get the record straight so people will understand; this is what it shows on the record. By and large, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that should be discussed under the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Just a moment on this, if that is a point of order.

The Minister wants to wear two hats, you see. He wants the best of both possible worlds. He comes in here and he wants to call his department The Department of Correctional Services and, as soon as you start talking in the realm of correction, he gets up and says, "Oh, I have nothing to do with the way people get into jail. I look after them only. I am only concerned with their care once they are in." Well you cannot have it both ways and, if correctional services means what I think it means—that it envelopes the concept of whether the people should be in jail in the first place—that is part of correction.

Mr. Chairman: I think—

Mr. Sopha: Do you know those people you sit with? Do you know them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I cannot discuss the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I think the Minister is right in that, dealing with sentence, this is within the purview of The Attorney General's Department. If the member wishes to concentrate on remedy and treatment in the actual institution itself, this is within this department.

Mr. Sopha: My complaint, Mr. Chairman, is simply this. It can be baldly stated in this way. No one emphasizes more than the Minister himself—I do not use that phrase "patting himself on the back," I leave it to others to use that—no one more than him emphasizes the grandiose nature of his ideas in the realm of criminology, so far as it pertains to recidivism. But the moment one of us gets into the realm of recidivism and really questions what the Minister is doing in respect of people incarcerated in this province, then up gets the Minister—do you see what he is doing—up he gets and he says, "I have nothing to do with that."

He reads me a lecture—did you notice the lecture he read me about the meaning of the figures—that it is not necessarily 1,479 different people? In invisible ink he is saying, "Poor old stupid Sopha over there, I am going to straighten him out on this." Of course, I know it is not 1,479 people. I have been in magistrates' courts when those people have been convicted and sent to the Sudbury jail for the sixth or seventh time during the course of a year, but I do not want you to give him too much leeway to monkey with us in a way that he wants to do.

My point is simply this, that this $30,000 to the centre of criminology—I would welcome the spending of the whole $30,000 by that branch to see whether it is not more sensible not to put the drunks under his care at all—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have agreed with the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: —to let them go.

An hon. member: What care?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, what care? As I have said, the care is drying them out, giving them some—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I agree with the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: All right, if you wish.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And that is what the government is considering.

Mr. Sopha: If you wish. I have made the point that 56,000 people a year in jail in Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: 56,000 convictions.

Mr. Sopha: All right, 56,000 different circumstances where a person comes through the clanging door and the door bangs shut behind them—56,000 incidents, most of them, I say, for violations under The Liquor Control Act.

We have also, I say finally, in respect of the aims and objectives of this department—and I want to make the point that for many years—this maybe is brought on by the

unctuousness of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) today—for many years we consistently said here that we question the division of jurisdiction between the federal and provincial governments in this area. Myself, after looking at it, I can see no reason why, in respect of violations of the criminal code of Canada, of which the Attorney General by the constitution happens to have jurisdiction in respect of its enforcement, but I see no logic at the other end of the process that government should divide jurisdiction in respect of incarceration and rehabilitation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I agree.

Mr. Sopha: I would prefer to see the one government advancing on an enlightened programme.

Now, a Canadian who has tried to keep aware of what is going on, has to be very discouraged about the attitude of the federal government in this area. Ever since the Archambault report and the Fauteux, they have not shown very much of a progressive nature in the realm of rehabilitation.

But what has happened, I ask the Minister? For years we protested on this side that all offenders incarcerated for a year ought to come under the jurisdiction of the federal government—the penitentiaries branch. What progress has been made in that area?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to tell the hon. member about all that is happening is that another committee has been set up, called the Quimet committee, and we are hopeful that more will result from this committee. As a matter of fact, some things have already come about as a result of the work of this committee.

As far as this department is concerned and this government, I mentioned yesterday in introducing the bill, we hope they will reintroduce the bill which died with the dissolution of Parliament and upon which much of our legislation will depend. We hope that they will go even farther.

I will tell the hon. member that what we are asking for is, in fact, that at least all of those inmates which, according to present laws, come within the jurisdiction of provincial institutions, shall be handled completely by the province. So that there will not be all of this confusion in the minds, not only of the public, but the inmates, and even some of the legal profession. There will be no such thing as definite and indefinite sentences, and all of the confusion and injustices that occur because of it.

We have asked the federal government to give us the right to look after those people, but, of course, this would still just include those who are subject to terms of less than two years. What the federal government will do about this we do not know. We will pursue this.

Insofar as taking all prisoners—I do not know whether the hon. member was referring to those who presently go to a penitentiary—I think this would be a constitutional question. But insofar as we are able to get a uniform system—as closely as possibly a uniform system—we have been pressing for it. I have already seen every Minister of Justice since the hon. the late Mr. Favreau, and unfortunately, the last interview we had was with the hon. Mr. Pennell, and we happened to be there just at the time the crisis occurred.

Mr. Sopha: What crisis?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You know, the crisis that caused the election.

Mr. Sopha: I was not aware of any crisis.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The constitutional crisis which caused an election, presumably.

In any case, I would say this, in all fairness and to the credit of Mr. Justice Pennell, that we were getting some action from him, and we were really getting places. Unfortunately, these bills were allowed to die and, as far as this department is concerned, we think that those bills they were bringing forward were important enough to get through and enacted before Parliament dissolved. Perhaps that is expecting too much.

Mr. Sopha: I just make the additional comment that I do not know how this is. I have been discouraged over the years, but it has not come to any point of fruition. We just talk perennially about it. Everyone agrees that the federal government should assume jurisdiction over a greater number of these people than it does, so costly to the people of Ontario.

I am even more concerned about a uniform programme and, with respect to the co-operation of the federal government, it is very opportune and relevant to comment that you cannot expect to win their co-operation as long as the Premier of this province plays the dangerous game that he is playing, in respect to intervention in this election.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, there has been some discussion of recidivism under

this vote, so I will pursue this matter. Has a study been made in any of the institutions under the Minister's department of the rate of return?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, we made a study —I think it was between the years 1960 and 1965—we made a five-year study, in co-operation with the RCMP. As far as it was humanly possible to follow through with those who had been in Brampton training centre—which is, of course, picking the most likely candidates for this open institution from Guelph—we found in following through that, for a period of five years after they left, 66 point something per cent had committed no further offences within that five-year period.

Mr. Shulman: And has another study been done on the rates of return of the boys sent to training schools?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, no such study has been made. There are many implications to attempting to do this because of the lack of authority to follow these people through after they have left the jurisdiction of the training schools.

There has been what I suppose one could call a study—although it is really not based on a scientific research—which we made at one of the schools. A survey was done by the staff at Brookside school some years ago. It was done for the school's own use and it really was inconclusive. It is not the kind of study—we do not like to speak about research unless it is based on scientific study, and this could hardly be called a scientific study, unless it was based on scientific methodology. When this was done it was an informal one and therefore we considered it inconclusive.

It was a survey only and because, as I say, it was not a piece of scientific research, its results and methods were never validated. It attempted to assess placements, that is placement over a very short period of time in one school, and could not possibly be considered indicative of the effect of this on the training school programme.

That is all I can tell the hon. member. As to the results of it, I do not have it here.

Mr. Shulman: Well, perhaps I can enlighten the Minister then, and also the rest of the House, because I inquired about this particular study. I had the pleasure of visiting Brookside and speaking to the staff there, and I am informed that 58 per cent of the boys who had been to Brookside subsequently were returned to the custody of the institution.

I would suggest to the Minister that if 58 per cent have returned to this institution —and there will be others who got into trouble elsewhere—there is something very wrong with the methods being used.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, as I said, this is not a scientific study. It would be very difficult—there are many factors involved, and many of these youngsters are placed back in their own homes. Because of the reluctance of the department to place them in a foster home, unless they are positively convinced that it is better to take them out of their own homes, they go back to their own homes. And, because of some of these home conditions, they have to be brought back. Some of them are only brought back for a month or two and then they are placed in foster homes.

I do not know from where the hon. member got his information, or whatever it is, but it would not be the kind of conclusive information that one could make a decision on. As a matter of fact, if we were satisfied that we could guarantee 42 per cent—to use the hon. member's figures—were rehabilitated to the extent that they would never become offenders again within the reasonable future, this in itself would be a tremendous amount of success. I hope that we are successful.

We must keep in mind that the training school rarely gets the child until everything else in the community has been tried and by the time a judge decides to send the youngster to training school, he has pretty well given up hope that anything else will do that youngster, in the outside community, any good. If we can, after the community has skimmed off all those who can be helped along the line, the residue admitted to training schools, if we can save 42 or 50 per cent of those, we will have done a very good job for the taxpayer.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that if we only save 50 per cent of those boys who come to training schools, we are going to save a lot less of those who wind up in reformatories or penitentiaries because, by that time, their habits are more formed and even more difficult to change.

So if we are going to save only 50 per cent of the boys at training school, we are going to have a pretty bad show when we get up to the higher levels. May I suggest to the Minister that he should try for a little better ratio. Perhaps there is a better system and way of

training the boys. Perhaps they should be kept longer, if it is necessary, so that we do not have such a high rate of return?

I would like to go on to another matter, if the Minister has no further comment there. This is that in today's press, there appears a release on St. Leonard's house about which we heard so much yesterday. It is a brief on prisons and corrections which I received today and which I believe was presented to the department last month. There are two quotes here. The first is that our current methods of treatment are a gross failure, and second, I quote:

> We are informed by reliable sources, by both the professional people in corrections, and many offenders, that prison is the single most important contributing factor in crime today. Our country is imprisoning the greatest proportionate number of its population in the free world today, and at the same time has one of the most deplorable prison systems in the western civilization.

In the light of these comments by people—the list of which I am sure the Minister is aware of—fine people who are involved in running St. Leonard's house, would he have any comment to make or any changes to be made in the present system in connection with the brief that has been presented to him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, this is generally the criticism that has been directed at correctional systems from time immemorial, that you should not incarcerate people. There are a number of people, right across the world, who say that there is no use putting people in correctional institutions, because it is not going to do any good. They have never really given us an alternative. They just say that the present system is failing because you do not reform everybody. Now, I do not know whether in the foreseeable future we will ever get to any kind of system that will reform anyone and everyone.

The fact remains that society, for its own protection, has decided that some people must be taken out of circulation. If we do that, it means that they have to be institutionalized. You have to put them in an institution. Now, we, as well as anyone else, are quite familiar with the fact that the very institutionalization of those people makes it difficult to treat them because, at the same time as you are attempting to be their doctor, you are their custodian, and it is very difficult.

I am a little disappointed, quite frankly, at some of the statements that do emanate from St. Leonard's house. I think that Father Libby and his people are doing a wonderful job but I think that in order to make their case, sometimes they use some rather startling and unnecessary language. What is the point in saying that the present system does not work without telling you what they would replace it with?

I read this, and I cannot recall it in detail, but my recollection is that he suggests that you have some sort of system outside of correctional institutions. Well, what does that mean? It means that you will have a system outside of a correctional institution which will not be called an institution, but which will be one. If a person needs security, and the public needs to be protected against some of these people, obviously you are going to have to place them in a secure place.

I do not want to use any terms because some places may be called this, and I would not want to give the wrong impression as to my opinion of them. What is the use of saying put them in "A" institution because it is not called a penal institution rather than putting them into a penal institution that is called that?

Mr. Shulman: That is not what they say.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What in fact do they say? In the first place, they say that the single most important factor contributing to crime is really the penal institution. I do not know how they come to that conclusion. In the first place, somebody comes into an institution, at some stage, for the first time, and he has committed a crime. Now, how anyone can make a sweeping statement that it is because of his having committed a crime and been incarcerated in an institution, that the institution itself was the single most contributing factor to this man's criminal record, I do not know.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): There is plenty of evidence—look at your recidivist figures.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, let us check that. It is possible. We have never denied that it is most difficult, by the time a person reaches a correctional institution, to do something about reforming that person. As a matter of fact, the select committee of this Legislature in 1954, which was referred to by the hon. member for Humber, by unanimous decision including representatives of the NDP and the Liberals and our party, decided that 75 per cent of those people who came into our institutions are not reformable.

If the hon. member will check the select committee's report, of 1954—

Mr. Shulman: I have it right here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, you will find that that is the statement that they made. As a matter of fact, that was the point that the hon. member for Humber was attempting to make. We should concentrate on the 25 per cent, and in fact, write the others off. Now, of course, how one does this, I do not know, but this is what the select committee reports.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to know on what page the select committee said that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know that.

Mr. Shulman: Would you look it up, because I would like to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is in the select committee report. The hon. member can take my word for it that they said 75 per cent are not reformable.

Mr. Shulman: I have read the report and it does not say that at any point.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will take the terminology for the hon. member. I am advised that they said, "Send them to Burwash and do not worry about treating them; just keep them incarcerated for the period of their sentence".

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps the hon. Minister would get me the reference?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will get that for the hon. member. Now, in the first place, of course, that is another sweeping statement in respect to the select committee. How do you decide which are the 25 per cent that are reformable? In the second place, even if you have decided that, it would presume that the judges should use the law on 75 per cent of habitual criminals, because if they are going to keep coming back, and we cannot reform them, they should not be allowed out. As a matter of fact, the judge should sentence them—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is surely the implication in that—if these people are going to go in and out of penal institutions, having committed serious crimes—which they would have done, or else they would not be getting these sentences—what is the point in having them go out for two months and in for two years? And then out for two months and in again for two or three years?

We take the view that we have to do everything we can with everyone who comes within our jurisdiction, because we just do not have the wisdom of Solomon to decide which are reformable and which are not. Now, to a point; our classification and review system helps us to bring on those who appear to be more likely to benefit from our help—for instance, the Brampton training centre. We have accommodation at the Brampton training centre for about 200. I think usually there are about 150 at the Brampton training centre.

After they have gone to Guelph, after sentence, our review board and our classification board decides, after looking at the history of these people, that they are more likely to benefit from an open institution like Brampton, where they take up vocational training and academic training. I just pointed out, a few moments ago, that it appears that about 66 per cent of these do not get into trouble for at least five years or after. So that is a measure of the success.

We cannot even fill this institution. There is room for 50 more, but in order not to destroy the effectiveness of the work we are doing with the 150-odd that we have there, we have to be very careful about sending more there just because we think we might be able to help more. We have set up training centres across the province where we send others who also appear that there is a greater likelihood of helping them. But it is all a matter of degree.

How can we decide which 75 per cent are not reformable? I suppose, all I am doing here, is admitting—and there is no reason why I should not, I do not apologize for it—we wish we could reform everyone and I am sure there is no one in this House that feels that that is possible with the knowledge—

Mr. Sopha: What you are really admitting is failure—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, let us say this; that we are all failures in respect of a great number of people who get into trouble in respect of our norms and in respect of our laws—in respect of the society generally. The only thing is, I do not want to give encouragement to those people in the institutions who blame society for everything. So I must be careful about making this statement as well.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, to come back to the question I originally asked. I find my-

self now in the position where I must defend St. Leonard's house because, obviously, the Minister has not understood the brief which was presented to him.

St. Leonard's house most certainly is not suggesting that these people be institutionalized elsewhere. In fact, what they are suggesting is increased use of fines, suspended sentences and probation, an increased number of parolees, a pre-release programme, conjugal visiting, leaves of absence, and a work release programme. Finally, and most basic, what they are suggesting is a half-way house movement which is a form of foster home. In this the person who would otherwise be in a jail of reformatory, will be in a home in the community, going about his business, but with the support of the people in that home. This is their whole point. I am a little disturbed that the Minister has not understood what they were saying.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right. If this is what the hon. member wants to talk about in the first place. As far as all these matters are concerned, the more people that are put on probation, the more people that are put on parole, the more people who are fined rather than incarcerated, will make us very happy. The fewer people we have to deal with, the better, and the more attention and the more concentration we can give to the ones whom we have in our care.

But it is not as simple in the suggestion about half-way houses. Let us not get so imbued with this idea that we think this is going to be the salvation of these people. The half-way house movement is, by no means, a new movement. It has been going on for a very long time and I have seen it in many other jurisdictions. As a matter of fact, in the United Kingdom—I have been there and have seen these places. They not only have half-way houses, but now they have found it necessary in many instances, to have what they call a second half-way house. In fact—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): A quarter-way house.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is most difficult. What you are trying to do is solve this problem of the difficulty of a man to readjust to society after he gets out of an institution. It is most difficult. We could get into a philosophical discussion here for two or three hours on this one subject alone.

Half-way houses have their place. All of these things have their place but they are, by no means, a panacea. They will not solve the problem. You could argue about more fines and yet somebody—and I suppose the hon. member for High Park might be the first one to get up—if you start a system of more fines—and say that this is the law for the rich because the man that can afford to pay his fine will not go to jail.

Mr. Sopha: Oh no. They will not give them time to pay, and the Attorney General defends that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If you argue for more parole—and, incidentally, if I am wrong I will be corrected by my officials here—

Mr. Sopha: Do not worry about it, they could not pay the fines.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think about 64 per cent of the people eligible for parole in our system are paroled. That is about the figure, I am told—about 64 per cent of people who are eligible according to their sentence—eligible for parole in Ontario are paroled.

How much higher than that you can go without paroling everybody, I do not know. Of course, there are those who think that we are too easy with our parole. We have heard something about that in this session here today—about being too easy with parole.

We agree with all of this, and the legislation I brought in this House the other day, as a matter of fact, has dealt with some of the matters this report deals with—the matter of live-in, work-out, pay for prisoners, this sort of thing.

We are moving towards this, but we are very hopeful that it be helpful. We think it will be helpful. But if anyone thinks it is going to solve the problem of institutionalizing people, then they have more knowledge than I have been able to acquire from anyone in this field.

Mr. Shulman: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Is the member going to pursue the same point?

Mr. Shulman: I wish to pursue the same point as I have been doing.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, no one is suggesting that these methods—half-way houses—are a panacea. What St. Leonard's house has been suggesting, what many members here have suggested and what I would like to suggest to the Minister, is that they will cut down the number of people who are behind bars, which is what we are trying to do. They will, as a result, remove your training schools.

And I am not referring to training schools as the Minister refers to them. I am referring to training schools involving penitentiaries and reformatories and jails—training schools for crime, because this is what you have. You have people going into Guelph who got into trouble by stealing a radio and they are learning all the techniques of forging a cheque. They are learning new forms of criminality.

The half-way house, of course, is an old idea. But it is a good idea and it should be pushed, because anything that we can do to reduce the number of people that are in jail is a progressive move and should be encouraged by the department, far more than the department now encourages it.

The Minister pointed out that 64 per cent of the people who are eligible for parole get their parole. I find this is a shockingly low figure. You have men incarcerated, under the complete control, really, of the system which has them there. I find it very difficult to believe that 36 per cent of those people who are serving their sentence do not behave properly in the jail. I have brought this matter up—I do not wish to get into parole at length, because that will be coming up under the next vote. But there is a great deal to be said on that subject, because there are many people who are not getting parole who should be getting parole.

I would like to second the remarks of the member for Sudbury. For the Minister to suggest he would be very happy if we had more probation and if the government would do something is rather ridiculous, because sitting right next to him, if he would just turn his head, is the Attorney General who, if he was willing, would be responsible for these things. For the Minister to suggest, as he did a few minutes ago, that if we brought in more fines, I, as the member for High Park—

Mr. Sopha: The Attorney General only puts them in—they keep them in.

Mr. Shulman: —I, as the member for High Park, would suggest that this is not bringing in one rule for the rich and one rule for the poor and is begging the question. These people should be allowed time to pay. Fines should not just be for everybody on the same level, but according to ability to pay, to make a truly, if I may use the term, just society. If a Mrs. MacMillan is being fined, she should be fined far more than a girl who is up for a marijuana offence.

And, may I suggest that the fines system, used more intelligently than the present government is using it, would not provide a law for the rich and a law for the poor. It would provide a law which would allow people to stay out of jail. The fine should be according to means and time should be allowed for people to pay those fines, if they cannot just write a cheque, as the rich people in this country can.

I received a letter today. This is a place where the judge should use his common sense, and I direct this to the Minister—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, it has nothing to do with my department. The hon. member, with all due respect, Mr. Chairman—I mean a lot of this—

Mr. Shulman: Is this a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —a lot of this is going to be repeated again.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, is—

Mr. Chairman: Is the Minister rising on a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I am, Mr. Chairman. It will all be repeated again and I think it is most unfair for hon. members to attempt to draw me out to giving an opinion which the Attorney General may, during his estimates, disagree with, because he is more learned in these matters than I am and they may have some implications in respect of law of which I am not familiar.

Once a man is committed to our institutions then that is when we have to deal with him. I have given the blanket statement before, that the fewer people that are sent to our institutions the better.

The hon. member mentioned about parole —that he would like more. Why are there 36 per cent or 37 per cent not eligible for parole? He suggested that the reason for this certainly could not be just because of their behaviour in the institutions. He is quite right. That is not the only factor. Many of these people have been tried on parole in the past and have broken parole.

May I also, while I am on my feet, point out this statement, which I said was a ridiculous one, in the brief—with all due respect —from St. Leonard's house, if that was where it was from, that the institutions are themselves the single greatest factor. The fact remains that, if the hon. member will look at page 86 of the annual report—this is one of the reasons we put this graph in for the first time, so that hon. members would get

a better picture of what is going on—60 per cent of those who were sent to the reformatory from April 1, 1967, to September 30, 1967—six months—60 per cent of them had no reformatory record at all.

So where did they learn their crime, in a penal institution?

Mr. Sopha: In the district jail.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, no, just a moment now. The point is this. The hon. member said: Why should you send a man to a penal institution because he stole a radio?

Mr. MacDonald: This is a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is an implication that a man is usually sent by a magistrate—of course, I suppose I should leave this to the hon. Attorney General—very rarely is a man sent to an institution the first time he is up on a charge.

Mr. Shulman: What is the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Sopha: Are you finished?

Mr. Shulman: No, I was involved in a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Have you ruled on the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: No.

Mr. Shulman: Well, Mr. Chairman, to continue, the purpose of the reformatory, we presume, is to reform. Now in our travels about the province, the member for Lakeshore and I have made some rather disturbing discoveries about reformatories. Surely, if the purpose of the reformatory is to reform, then the majority of people in the reformatory should be receiving education or training, or classes.

Mr. Chairman: With respect to the member for High Park, we have votes 1903-4 which deal with institutions—Ontario reformatories—I wonder if the discussion would not be better placed under those votes.

Mr. Shulman: I would be glad to leave that for those two votes if you prefer.

Mr. Chairman: We will take the two votes together so there will be no confusion—1903-4.

Mr. Shulman: Very well, Mr. Chairman. In that case, I would like to come back to the general matter which has been discussed earlier—of who goes to jail and what happens to them and the whole system. This should come under this vote. Just today, in fact, just a few minutes ago, I had a man come upstairs who has been in trouble with this particular department and he wrote this letter out just a few minutes ago. I would like to just read two paragraphs of it because it really sums up the whole problem.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: What a shame the Minister has so little interest in the problem of reformation, but I will continue.

Mr. Chairman: What point is the member trying to make in connection with vote 1901?

Mr. Shulman: The point I am trying to make is that the $2.8 million is not being spent in the correct direction, and if directed a little more wisely, we would have less need for this particular department and less need to be spending these millions of dollars. May I continue, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you. I will quote this letter. This is a man who got into trouble:

> For some information about myself, it all began in 1964, in October. I had been depressed and one night I was drinking very heavily and I became very drunk and later that same night I broke into a TV repair store, stealing a colour TV and a black and white TV portable. I left then and went home. I seemed to sober up quite fast lying there in bed and I got scared. I got dressed again, took the small portable in my car and drove to the Pape Avenue police station and gave myself up.
>
> Going to court, the policeman in the car said not to worry—"Giving yourself up was the best thing you ever did and the judge will certainly take this into consideration."
>
> I obtained probation and I will say I had one swell man for a probation officer, Mr. Ken Mitchell. Time after time, I tried to land a job but when asked if I had a record I was then refused a job—job after job. I finally landed a job with Canada Packers and I was set to stay there for a good long time.
>
> The money was good. The work was very tough, lugging meats, fronts and

hinds, around is not easy work, but I was happy. One day after working there roughly seven weeks, Mr. Westlake, the superintendent of drivers, came up to my truck and asked my name. He then told me to see him when I had cashed in my route.

My normal cash-in was roughly over $1,000 a day. I was never in all the time employed there one cent over or one cent short. Upon going in to see Mr. Westlake he informed me he would have to let me go. I asked why. He stated because I was on probation and unable to be bonded.

Well, he goes on at some length explaining how he could not get a job and finally was forced to get back into crime.

Mr. De Monte: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is this specifically related to the estimates? This has to do with sentence, not with correctional institutions.

Mr. Chairman: On a point of order, it seems to me the member stated the point he was trying to make. He has pointed out that we have $2.8 million in this estimate. In the opinion of the chair, he is dealing with the method of operation. This is the main office vote and the Chairman cannot see that he is out of order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Except, Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order, the hon. member is dealing with probation which is not in my department.

Mr. Shulman: I beg your pardon, I am not dealing with probation.

Mr. Chairman: May I just say that probation has been discussed for some time during the past hour, and other members have spoken about it too. I do not see why we should cut the one member off the debate when it has been discussed previously by other members.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, actually I do not wish to discuss probation at all. The point I wish to discuss here is the fact that—

Mr. Sopha: I thought you explained for Viola MacMillan?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is parole.

Mr. Sopha: That is parole? What is the difference?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Surely the hon. member knows the difference between probation and parole?

Mr. Chairman: May I ask the Minister if he has—order please!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where probation comes under The Department of the Attorney General, because it is in place of a sentence to an institution, he is put on probation and the staff of the probation department is under The Department of the Attorney General. Those who are on parole, after having served time in an institution, come under my department.

Mr. Chairman: All right. Then if the member will restrict his remarks to—

Mr. Shulman: I do not wish to discuss probation at all, or parole. What I wish to discuss is the fact that these people get into trouble because they cannot get a job, and the reason they cannot get a job is because they cannot be bonded. Now let me come to the point of my remarks.

I suggest to you, sir, that a great deal of your time should be directed towards efforts to see that these people do not come back into your institutions—or come into your institutions the first time. This is what happened to this man because he could not be bonded. Now this is one of the major problems, this is something about which, as far as I have been able to find, nothing has been done. Now I am asking the Minister if any efforts are being made in this regard, and if so, what?

Mr. Chairman: With respect, is this not parole and rehabilitation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member has made a legitimate point in this area. First, the hon. member has read a letter and he said as far as he can ascertain no effort was made to help this man obtain a bond. Can we take it, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member has discussed this matter with the probation branch of The Department of the Attorney General, and given them the name of this man to ascertain whether, in fact, an effort was made to get this man bonded, or whether in fact there were other reasons why this man lost his job.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, as the Minister knows, I stated here I just received this letter—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well then, all right.

Mr. Shulman: What I am talking about is not this specific man. I am talking about the general problem that bonding companies will

not bond ex-convicts. This is what the problem is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, Mr. Chairman, I was going to follow up on that. In the first place, if the hon. member just got a letter—with all due respect—I do not think he should jump to his feet and read it. There is a great responsibility that devolves upon the members of this Legislature. As a matter of fact, many times—

Mr. Shulman: The Minister is missing the point as usual.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not missing the point. I will talk about bonding.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is a responsibility upon members of the Legislature not just to get up and read letters which could be of a damaging nature. In the first place—

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, nonsense, of a damaging nature!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course it could. We tell our people in our institutions—

Mr. MacDonald: Deal with the issue.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I will deal with the issue if the hon. member will give me a chance and he does not have the floor. I am dealing with bonding.

Mr. MacDonald: Deal with the point of order on which you rose.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am dealing with bonding. I am not dealing with a point of order at all. The hon. member read a letter.

Mr. MacDonald: Right!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And he said he has not had even a chance to do any research to find out whether in the first place—

Mr. MacDonald: Deal with the point which you said was—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, do I get —well, I will not bother explaining it if he does not want me to.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Shulman: I would like to say something, Mr. Chairman.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: We hear the same story from this Minister time and time again; he tries to avoid the point and gives us a sermon. The point is very simply this, and if the Minister does not understand it, let me say it to him again—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You do not have to say it again.

Mr. Shulman: Ex-convicts cannot be bonded! What is he going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is this a point of order Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Shulman: That was the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I asked the question as to whether he had investigated this letter because it is my understanding that the probation people are doing a very good job in respect of bonding, and I have asked my own rehabilitation officers, in respect of this matter, whether in fact they had found that there were any great number of cases, which could not get jobs because of the lack of bonding.

They said, generally speaking, they had no difficulty getting bonding where this was the only factor involved. And I said, "Now, are you sure about that?" They said they are quite positive about that; they think some more could be done, but, generally speaking, a man who was well-motivated, was looking for a job, and had the kind of a record which would convince the rehabilitation officer as well as the potential employer, that he was a good risk, had no difficulty in getting a bond.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, why did you not say that instead of preaching another sermon?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will just listen.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member for York South please remain out of this: the Minister has the floor and I would ask him to respect the rules of the House and stop interrupting.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest appreciation for your fairness, but at the moment I think you have strayed, if I may say so. The Minister was asked a question, and he got up and he preached a sermon, and now he has gone on to give the answer to the question. And what we are objecting to is that he is never asked a question but he then goes on to deliver a little lecture to people on this side of the House as to what they should do and should not do. If he would give that answer which he has just

given, then perhaps we would have been enlightened on the question of bonding.

Mr. Chairman: I say to the member for York South that if he objects and if there are any faults within the area of the Minister's remarks, the member for York South could easily rise on a point of order and point it out to the Chairman. But the member for York South has carried the full conversation.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if you want to get tough, that Minister got up a few moments ago on a point of order and rambled on for five minutes. Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect—let me say this and emphasize it—for the job you are doing, but when a Minister gets up on a point of order and rambles on for five minutes, sir, you have let him abuse the rules of the House. And if five minutes later, you then get up and start to chop the Opposition down, that is an uneven application of the rules of the House.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, I think that this question of lecturing each other in the House has gone far too far.

Mr. MacDonald: You are right!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not appreciate it, I do not think any of our members do, and I am quite sure that the members of the other parties do not appreciate it. And when I use the word "appreciate," I just mean that. I do not think it is proper. Now, if somebody wants to question the Chairman's ruling, there is a proper procedure for it. I do not think we ought to jump the established rules to deliver these outbursts.

I do not think that any one side can lay the finger on the other successfully because I would think in all fairness that there is a precedent on all sides for pointing the finger if you wanted to look at that approach. I do not think that is the proper approach. I think, Mr. Chairman, you have been elected to sit as the Chairman of the committee, and as far as we on this side of the House are concerned, we would like to follow your rulings whether we agree with them or not.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, just let me repeat this again—and I do it in the context of saying I have the greatest respect, for the Chairman and he will have our support—but I am not going to sit in face of what I am convinced deep down is an uneven application of the rules in this House, and it happens too often.

An hon. member: That is what you are always saying.

Mr MacDonald: Just let me finish. If you want to interrupt again, that is fine; just let me finish. The hon. Minister got up on a point of order, and abused the rules of the House and was rambling on.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): You said that before!

Mr. MacDonald: I know I said it but I want to make another point, Mr. Chairman.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Because I interjected, the Chairman became indignant and he rose and uncharacteristically—I will say this in fairness to him—angrily said, "Will the member for York South sit down!" If we had had somewhat of the same display of anger on the abuse of the rules of the House by the Minister, we would have felt that it was even. This is the kind of thing I am disturbed about. I agree with the House leader that we quit preaching at each other. But we will quit preaching when we become convinced deep down that there is an even application of the rules of the House.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: On that point then, I would only add this—I think that it lies as part of the responsibility of every member of this House not to be provocative in a deliberate way. And I say that deliberately.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! May I say to the members, and specifically the member for York South, that when the member for High Park was trying to make his point after he had read the letter into the record, the Minister did rise in his place and there were objections from several members of the New Democratic Party as to whether the Minister was on the floor on a point of order.

I asked the Minister if he was on a point of order and he said he was, after he had made a few remarks. I was following it carefully and the Minister was bringing out a very valid point in connection with the remarks made by the member for High Park. And it took the Minister several sentences or paragraphs to make his point of order, and he convinced me that he was properly on a point of order.

Now, by comparison, I say to the member for York South, that the member for York South did not even have the floor. And I say to him that he was entirely out of order. And I resent very much any implication that I

have been unfair in dealing with any members of the Opposition because I have bent over backwards to be fair, and to be impartial; and perhaps part of the difficulties we are having in this House is simply because I have bent over backwards.

Now I have no intention of strictly enforcing the rules in committee debates, which are supposed to be free and to promote free discussion. It is my intention to continue with this attitude. But, surely to goodness, this assembly should display a much better degree of respect for parliamentary procedure than has been the display taking place in these chambers for the past several weeks. And I say this to all members of the committee, not just members of the Opposition, but to members of the government side too.

It is a difficult job to rule people out of order when you are not sure if they are out of order. It is difficult to listen to them sometimes and to follow the entire remarks to determine whether they are in order or not. But this Chairman has endeavoured to be very fair and impartial; I will continue to do that.

But I ask the members if they do not think in their own interests—the public is reading the press, the public is here observing the proceedings. Surely to goodness, there should be more dignity, more respect for the chair, more attention to the rules of this House than there has been displayed. And I ask the members please to observe these rules. The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Just to get this point straight in my own mind then. Some of the bonding companies—I am sure the Minister knows—will not bond ex-convicts. Am I to understand that if a man gets into difficulty, he may then go to the probation officer and the probation officer will arrange a bond for him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I do not really know how to go into some of these matters which concern us very much, without being considered as lecturing people. I do not know; I have been accused of this a number of times, and I am beginning to wonder whether—

Mr. Shulman: Here we go again, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —there is some truth in it. The fact remains that it is important, for the work of our department, to make sure that no wrong impression goes out of this House because thousands of inmates are listening.

Mr. Shulman: That is why we are asking.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me please make my point—it is important to the work of our department, Mr. Chairman. Thousands of inmates are listening; they get the newspapers; they read all of these things; and I am very anxious that they do not get the impression, to reinforce their feeling of hostility to society, that it is not their fault because no matter how hard they try they cannot go any place; they cannot get bonding or anything else.

And that is the reason, I am most anxious to make this point. And I asked then, the hon. member, I remember, if he has a particular case, if he would bring it to our attention, and get the facts; and if, in fact, some man who really should be bonded cannot get bonded, we will do everything possible to do it. In answer to the specific question—

Mr. MacDonald: Now we get the answer, after we have a lecture.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He has again, Mr. Chairman, used the word "probation". I am not responsible for probation but I will take it upon myself, knowing the probation people as I do, to say that they will do everything possible to help the man get bonding. But not only that, I am sure that the probationee knows this. As far as the rehabilitation officers in our department are concerned, they know this.

The rehabilitation officer is working closely with the parolee. He is under supervision. He could not be out on parole unless he were under supervision, and the parole officer and the rehabilitation officers are dealing with him, and where he needs to get bonding to get his job—and where, in the view of the rehabilitation officer, this man should get bonded—he will do everything under heaven and earth to get him the bonding, and generally does.

I do not want to put myself in the position where the hon. member can find one man, or two perhaps, who might, and should have been bonded, and were not. I will say that, generally speaking, as I have said before, a person who is well motivated, who wants to work, should get bonded under normal circumstances, even having regard for his record. He will get it with the help of our rehabilitation officers.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that the Minister could have answered the question simply by saying "yes"! It would have saved us a lot of time.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any other remarks on vote 1901?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I have—staff training development.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, is there anything further in connection with the topic that has been discussed?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I want to make one last comment. Listen very carefully to what the Minister said.

At one point in his remarks, he implied, though he did not actually articulate, that one of the difficulties he encounters in the rehabilitation field, and correctional services, is the numbers that he has to deal with, the numbers of people in his institutions.

I am absolutely sold on the idea that if the Minister had fewer people incarcerated in his institutions, by reason of the diminishing numbers, he and his staff could do more effective work with the reduced number.

So then I say to you, Mr. Chairman, because it made no headway with the Minister at all, that here we are asked to spend $40 million of public money in running this department, and time, and I think to a good many citizens outside this House, it is no answer at all.

It is no search for absolution on the part of the Minister to say, "It is not my fault that I have so many, I just happen to have them". He is part of the ministry. He sits with the rest of the 22 around the common table, and what is wrong is a matter of rationality of this Minister, in turning to his colleague, the Attorney General, and saying, "Look, Mr. Wishart, I wish you would stop enforcing those laws with such draconian diligence as you do, and putting 60 per cent, I calculate, of the people of the population in the institution who are offenders against The Liquor Control Act".

That is my own calculation. Sixty per cent in a year, three out of every five are there for violation of The Liquor Control Act. I will not accept this Minister's easy and facile explanation—do not blame me, because: (a) I do not put them there, somebody else does; (b) I have too many to be really effective. It is part, Mr. Chairman, of the whole process.

Finally, that is the point I mean, and I hope it gets home. I hope the germ starts from Reform Institutions and the $40 million. That is all I can hope for, that the Minister—who can say he is not articulate, persuasive, capable of well-developed use of the language?—would be the seed in the government to say, "Let us call a halt to this method, let us diminish the numbers for which I have responsibility, and let me do more effective work with the balance that I have got".

The Attorney General made a comment, he made an interjection this afternoon. I say in regard to that interjection, I do public penance here, I do public penance and I apologize to the drunks in Sudbury.

On Thursday, May 23, perhaps I was not as guarded in my speech as I should have been. I said I am happy to report the drunks get time to pay in Sudbury. My friend from Downsview said, "treated like people." Both the comments were reported in the Sudbury papers. On Friday, May 24, with a spartan diligence in the magistrate's court, no drunks in Sudbury got time to pay. Who does that hurt? It hurts the drunks. They had to go over to the Crowbar hotel next door, that is true; they did not get time to pay. I want to suggest to you that it hurts the conscience of thoughtful people in the community more.

Mr. MacDonald: Sounds vindictive.

Mr. Sopha: I want to suggest to you that thoughtful people picking that paper up and reading about no time to pay on Friday in Sudbury, they have got to say, "Well, there is the measure of our failure." There is the measure of society's failure, because if you are a high class drunk, and you have got the money in your pocket to pay the fine, you go free. But if you have not got the money, into the hoosegow you go—a discriminatory law. I say to this Minister that he would so better work for the people of Ontario, if he were deluged by the large numbers of offenders under The Liquor Control Act that the Attorney General sends you, and he is the one. He is the man that stood in this House and justified that spartan code of justice, that mark of inhumanity to man, for drinking the stuff that the government sells.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Along this line, the Minister, last night did not have the recidivism rate in Ontario; he could not quote a rate for

Ontario. Last year in the estimates he quoted the rate of 35 to 40 per cent. The fact is that—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would the hon. member care to mention from what he is quoting?

Mr. Sargent: I think last year, in Brampton, you quoted 34 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just quoted that a few moments ago. That is not for Ontario, that is for that one particular institution.

Mr. Sargent: As the member for Sudbury has pointed out, I think the fantastic return of the people to your institutions is your baby. At times we brought forward patterns of handling this subject, of an intelligent approach to the parole boards—such as in other areas of the United States they use a medical doctor on the parole board; they use a polygraph man skilled in lie detectors; a man skilled in the use of hypnotism; a man skilled in the use of sodium pentathol, and in every other technological advance within the human mind.

I do not know in this amount of money that you are asking us for in this particular vote, how much money you have insofar as equipping these people, when they go out in the world, not to come back. In the county jails, we have people in there up to maybe 60 to 90 days. They have absolutely no programme at all. They just sit around there. No wonder they go crazy. There is nothing for them to do, and I think that there is a great area for you to stop repeating this recidivism by getting a more skilled approach to handling these people.

I would like to ask you, first of all, the thing that is very important to me and I am told this by authorities. In these institutions, in your jails, in the interviewing room, do you have wire tapping? Do you have hidden microphones in your interviewing rooms?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I will take the Minister's word for it, but I am told repeatedly, by staff in these jails, that this happens. Now, I think the Minister had better—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we are back again where we were last night, we are talking about jails. Now we have not taken over the jails yet. If the member is referring to reformatories, the answer is, "no". If he is referring to the jails, as far as we know this does not exist in jails. And I would have to qualify it that way.

I would doubt it very much. When we take over the jails physically, then we would be in a better position to assure them that this does not exist in jails, and I could be fairly certain now that it does not.

Mr. Sargent: One more thing then on this line, Mr. Chairman. Will the Minister advise —I should know this but I do not think I am clear on it—how does the policy so far as the Ontario parole board differ from the national parole board?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, could we keep this in order? In the first place, we have been talking about rehabilitation and I have not risen to a point of order—but it really belongs, I think, in the next vote. I hope we will not have to repeat the rehabilitation thing all over again. Parole also comes under another vote.

Mr. De Monte: I have a question of the Minister. Could the Minister inform the House what educational requirements are required for jail guards under the reformatories system?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Grade 10 or the writing of a grade 10 equivalency test.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, what type of training do the guards take after? I understand they have a training period.

Mr. Chairman: Might I interrupt the member for just a moment? Is he on staff training and development now?

Mr. De Monte: Yes, I am.

Mr. Chairman: There was not anything further on the other aspect? Staff training and development.

Mr. De Monte: Thank you. What type of training and how long a training do they take before they become full-time guards?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I suppose there will be many questions asked about this, so we might as well read into the record all of the staff training the correctional officer undergoes.

Mr. Chairman: This would be something that has not been included in the opening remarks? It relates to the staff training?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I presume the hon. member wants to know the details of the kind of training they get.

Mr. De Monte: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is this agreeable to the members, to have a statement read into the record regarding staff training? The Minister may proceed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is an introductory training, Mr. Chairman, of up to three weeks, which is provided at each institution to give new employees sufficient knowledge of the correctional process to permit them to progress to training on the job under direct supervision by experienced officers.

There is an in-job training up to ten months, after they have been working for a while—employment with experienced officers who guide and instruct the new employee. His mistakes are pointed out and he is shown the correct methods. It must be clearly understood that no correctional officer is placed in direct charge of inmates until his superiors consider him ready for this responsibility.

There is a staff training course of five weeks. This course must be successfully completed by all correctional officers within the first year of service. It is conducted at the staff training school, which is located on the grounds of the Ontario reformatory at Guelph.

There is a continuation of training; refresher training is conducted by institutions to meet their specific needs. Supervision is exercised over correctional officers at all times to insure that the purpose of the department is achieved. This represents a continuing process.

There are conferences, seminars and workshops for the more senior staff—that is, captains, chief supervisors, deputy superintendents, assistant superintendents and superintendents. They are held at least once each year and are designed to provide a forum for discussion of common problems, dissemination of information concerning advancements and trends in the field of corrections, and to hear the views of specialists in relevant fields.

A conference for superintendents of adult institutions was held in 1967 on November 15, 16 and 17. A conference of training school superintendents was held February 26, 27 and 28, 1968. Conferences of jail governors were held May 23 to May 26, 1967, and February 12 to 16, 1968. Seminars for assistant superintendents were held in April, 1967 and 1968. Every effort, Mr. Chairman, has been made and will continue to be made to insure that our staff is kept abreast of the latest of trends and developments.

If the hon. member would like to know the topics which are discussed and taken up at the session, the topic of human behaviour has an allotted time of 14 hours and 45 minutes. This is to provide some knowledge about what social scientists have found out about people. Specificially selected to be pertinent to the correctional field—no intention of attempting to make psychologists of these people, of course.

The DRI organization—that is training in what the oganizational structure is—three hours and 20 minutes, to inform trainees as to the organization and function of the civil service and the regulations under which it is operated. Purpose and philosophy of The Department of Reform Institutions, is given one hour, to ensure that trainees understand and appreciate the statement of purpose. The roles of the chaplain, the social worker, the officer manager, the parole and rehabilitation services, the probation services and the public relations, get ten hours and 50 minutes, to inform the trainee as to the roles of institutional staff and how they contribute to the correctional process.

There are tours of various institutions—to the training centre at Brampton, to the training school at Guelph, and to the reformatory at Guelph, 12 hours, to study firsthand correctional methods at a variety of institutions from medium security to minimum.

First-aid: 20 hours and 40 minutes; successful trainees receive a St. John ambulance society certificate. We feel this training is important since many of our operations are some distance from the main institutions, as in the case of forestry camps.

Training schools: one hour and 15 minutes, to inform trainees as to the function and operation of training schools. There are others such as defence training, weapon training and public speaking. I think this will give a fairly good rundown of the kind of thing they get.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to hear that there is—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will just forgive me for one moment, I meant to mention that our budget for this time has increased from the year 1963-1964 from some $33,000, to $232,000, in these upcoming estimates.

Mr. De Monte: May I also ask the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, how many psychologists are in his department and how many social workers are employed by his department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The psychologists and psychometrists, 21 full-time and 22 part-time.

I am sorry, 21 full-time last year and 22 full-time this year. One psychiatrist. Part-time psychologists, six. Part-time psychiatrists, 21.

Mr. De Monte: What institutions under the care of the Minister, Mr. Chairman, have a psychologist available?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not all of them have a full-time psychologist, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps this would be more relevant when we take up the various institutions and the hon. member could enquire as to what staff is on hand at particular institutions.

Mr. De Monte: I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, how the principle of group therapy is being applied in various institutions, with a view of preventive detention. In other words, if we could use the modern psychological approach to penology and for the treatment of offenders, we would most necessarily require, in my opinion, perhaps one psychologist and perhaps a number of social workers in each institution, so that we could apply the group therapy system which, I understand, is bringing forward certain, fairly good results in other countries and in other jurisdictions, and perhaps the use of social workers to help the inmate solve his family and other problems on the outside.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that 20 part-time psychologists—if I got that right. Did the Minister state 20 part-time psychologists? Twenty-one, I think. I am wondering whether these are sufficient to carry out these modern techniques in the reform of convicted people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I have no objections to answering this. It really comes under vote 1903, and I think that the hon. member has a suggestion, but as for particular institutions or how we handle this, to get a clear picture of it I should tell him that we, of course, have this and do carry out these various types of therapy. We have group therapy and other types as well, but I think it would be more appropriate under each institution.

Some of them require more than others, and I can tell him generally, if he wants to know whether we have sufficient for this staff, the answer is, "no". There are vacancies in the complement. We would like to have them filled, but it is just impossible to get them.

Mr. De Monte: I agree with the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that if it comes up under another vote, that we should discuss it there, but I would like to ask the Minister generally, in how many institutions is this type of therapy and work being carried on?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, it would be a lot easier for my officials to give me this information as we come to each institution.

Mr. De Monte: I will wait for the appropriate item, but one more question there, Mr. Chairman. Does the Minister's department have a course for social workers to enable them to learn group therapy systems?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I presume, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member means, do we have students, whom we hope will come in from the university, who will come in from the school of social work and learn to do this?

Mr. De Monte: Yes, to a degree, Mr. Chairman. I notice that there is quite an extensive course being taken by the guards in order to protect, perhaps, society from the prisoners in the particular institutions, but I would like the Minister to inform the House whether there is any special course envisaged, or is there a special course that trains people to handle the inmates other than from a protective point of view—in other words, from the point of view of psychology, from the point of view of psychiatry, from the point of view of sociology, and all those things that might assist the guards in the prisons to administer to prevent the prisoners from coming back.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I thought and I hoped that I had made it clear, if I have not I would like to make it clear now that, as far as we are concerned, every member of the staff, from the correctional officer 1, all the way up through the system, is taught in the philosophy of the department under the heading of "attitudes".

As a matter of fact, the correctional officer in our view, in the view of many professionals, is the best person to do rehabilitation work, therapy work, if you want to call it that, with the inmate.

If the hon. member has the impression that there are a great number of people in our department who are considered correctional officers, only for custodian purposes, I would like to disabuse him of that. Each member of the staff is expected to learn something about the philosophy of corrections, and as I outlined in the course on training, they are expected to learn a variety of things, and take some of these courses, and qualify themselves.

Because no matter how many psychiatrists, or how many psychologists, or how many social workers you have, none of them can do as good a job as the correctional officer who is practically living with the inmate at all times. This is why we concentrate a great deal of our attention on staff training with an approach to changing and reenforcing a good attitude on the part of staff, including correction officers.

Mr. De Monte: I agree with the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, but I notice when he read out the type of course that the guard takes—and I presume that the Minister, by correctional officer, means the guard, and perhaps I am using the wrong term—it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that a course in human behaviour for 14 hours is just not quite adequate to deal with the type of people that perhaps the guards might have to deal with.

Now my reason for arriving at this very point, Mr. Chairman, is that, from listening to the course that a correctional officer gets, perhaps we just need a further course for that type of person, so that he could, as the hon. Minister has pointed out, treat these people, and get close to them, and perhaps prevent their return to the institution. I would like to point out to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that it is all very well for the correctional officer to be close to the inmate, but it is also necessary that the inmate have available to him other people, perhaps a bit better schooled in the art of dealing with humans—inmates—so that the inmate can communicate with them, and perhaps find out what his psychological problem is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I refer, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member to page 20 of the annual report in which it points out that staff training courses were taken in the last year by 136 correctional officers and 22 training schools supervisors; and that 107 took the certificate course in corrections at McMaster University, and the University of Toronto.

Mr. Shulman: What page?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Page 20, and there are many others. There were other seminars for senior staff, and many other conferences that they attended, which in fact, are part and parcel of the training.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1901, the member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I have a few thoughts on the business of staff training which with your leave, I would like to communicate briefly to the Minister.

One of them is, that perhaps the the community colleges might be more deeply involved in a training programme, particularly in therapy. The facilities for the training of guards at Guelph is severely limited; there are 34 places for guards' training at any one time. There is a considerable number of guards throughout Ontario—900 and some odd.

After they go through this five-week course, while they may take seminars, in order to better there pay, and so on, I do not think there is anything more mandatory within the system. Why should they not be exposed to courses in psychology and human deportment—in a whole realm of things which would be highly beneficial to guards. And why should not the new community colleges —which are largely concerned with technical matters, perhaps to some extent parallel with universities—be pressed into service in this regard? There are many fields in which this can be done, but the one of the training of guards seems to me extremely sensible.

These men are men without high educational qualifications, and their pay acocrdingly, is not very great. The need then is to upgrade all the way along the line, because the rehabilitation of the offender becomes an evermore onerous burden in our society, and the ways in which it can be brought about, I think this will be agreed upon on all sides, are extremely complex and men with grade 9 to 12 educations are simply unable to cope with the inter-relationships. Commendably, throughout his report, and particularly in the section on training, the Minister talks, for instance, Mr. Chairman, about ruling out that old Victorian habit of saying that guards are not to speak to the inmates, not to have any commerce with them. He said this is atrocious.

Guards should be open and speak in humane and gentlemanly terms back and forth to set up some kind of relationship to show that these people are not total outcasts, quite the contrary and to aid in that period of rehabilitation, so that their contact with society and with ordinary decencies of civil address are not lost to them in these institutions.

Now the Minister is in favour of that. He can go a good deal further in this direction by continuing upgrading of the guards.

What is feared in these institutions, and going around again a number of them, I have not run into it in any decisive form, is that a certain kind of troubled soul seeks

out the jobs of looking after people in jails and penitentiaries. We have to beware of the sadist and in some of our institutions, there is the atmosphere and I have no doubt —and this is in the incidence of things—that some guards will be sadistic, will torture prisoners unnecessarily, will subject them to all kinds of routines and measures, perhaps behind the backs of the authorities and against their will.

I know in Millbrook they ran into a situation where numerous inmates complained about their good time being constantly under intimidation. The guard would allow one fellow through the door or allow one fellow to do a certain thing, and the next fellow he marked out for special vindictiveness. But, that was not common in that institution, if I may say so.

When we come to Guelph, may I say, I think that there is something wrong there, something deeply and profoundly wrong with Guelph reformatory. It may not be sadism. I spoke to quite a number of guards. They seem to be decent enough fellows—again, not sufficiently exposed to contemporary methods of penology, which is perfectly possible within their level.

It means just being a decent human being, which is rather a difficult thing to do at the best of times. But in any event, I would not go so much in that direction. What we have to be aware of, work against, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman and this House, is a second thing. That has to do with military regimentation.

Perhaps the trouble in that institution is precisely the spit and polish, the sense of discipline, the sense that the individuals running the place are an inheritance from the Khyber Pass days or something of that sort. Whatever it may be, there is a form of oppressiveness, a form of military tattoo that everybody has to stand up and meet.

In other institutions there is a certain air of give-and-take. At Burtch, for instance, you do not get certain formalities. They conduct themselves efficiently and well. There is not all that acrid holding back with all the rules and enforcement of rules and the constant supervision and the sense of pressure that remains in that Guelph institution.

In other words, this is good if you are not going to create terrible resentments in men, turn them in on themselves, and turn them against the whole society, so that they are aching for the day when they will emerge from the institution to take their revenge, which many of them do, and hence the high rate of recidivism, however established or not established in these institutions.

You have created within these places a festering sore. These people are deeply resentful of what has been inflicted, and the whole of our society, including this Legislature, falls under the bane as far as they are concerned. There is no place for them. They become scapegoats and they become preyers on the body politic. If these various things can be brought to the attention—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, with very great respect, is this not an address which should properly come under Throne debate or Budget debate?

Mr. Sopha: It is a very thoughtful address.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Where are the questions that had to do with the estimates, and which the Opposition should be directing its attention to? The speeches and the theories—

An hon. member: Do you not like him to?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Speeches and theories should come under another heading.

Mr. Lawlor: I am getting—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Not on the estimates.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: With respect please, may the Chairman reply to the point of order?

Mr. Lawlor: May I speak to the point of order first?

Mr. Chairman: All right.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I am getting a little tired of the Minister interrupting my discourse.

Mr. Chairman: That is no point of order—

Mr. Lawlor: In any event, my point of order is as follows—

Mr. Chairman: That is not a point of order. Will the member—

Mr. Lawlor: I want to make my point of order.

Mr. Chairman: I ask the member to resume his seat.

Mr. Lawlor: I wish to make a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: The member did not raise a point of order.

Mr. Lawlor: I am raising one now.

Mr. Chairman: All right. What is it?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Do not get angry.

Mr. MacDonald: You are asking an awful lot.

Mr. Lawlor: The Minister made a considerable statement. I think the Chairman will agree with me. We wanted him to talk about the training to which the guards and these personnel were exposed to, to make them competent to deal with the problems they have inside these institutions.

Mr. Chairman: Well, perhaps—

Mr. Lawlor: I am replying to that.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the member will let the Chairman rule on whether there is a point of order.

The Minister has pointed out that it should perhaps be a Throne debate or a Budget debate speech, and I take it from that, that he has indicated to the committee that it is irrelevant to the estimates before us. Now the Chairman has had no guidance as to whether or not a Budget debate topic or Throne debate topic can actually be brought up in the estimates or not. In my opinion, if the subject matter being discussed by the member relates to these estimates, in the absence of any rule to the contrary, it is not out of order.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and having had that little debate with you, I finish my statement.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is, holy smoke.

Mr. MacDonald: Out of order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member must have some access to information in our department. He would be pleased to know that the director of staff development in our department has already been holding discussions with the community colleges directly for the purposes as he has outlined. As a matter of fact, a member of our department is already lecturing at one of the community colleges and we expect to expand this to a great extent.

And he will also be glad to know—this is a secret we have been trying to keep and I suppose this is as good a time as any to announce it—we have been awaiting the new name for the department before instituting non-military uniforms which have already been designed. We did not want to have them tailored and then have to tear the names and lapels off them and so on, and I agree wholeheartedly with them.

We are not sure at all, we are not positive, that this is going to be helpful—we hope it is—to get away from the military approach. Even those jurisdictions in Europe in Scandinavia which are always held as being models of, for us, where I have visited—

Mr. Sargent: Anything would be a model for you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Generally, they stick to the semi-military uniforms. We are going to come away from this just as soon as the new name of the department is official and we will gradually begin to replace all the uniforms with non-military type.

Mr. Chairman: Item 9?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I would like to draw the Minister's attention to the report which has already been mentioned today a number of times, the 1954 select committee on reform institutions. One of the recommendations that was made—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I, Mr. Chairman? I promised I would have this on my desk, and have had now for 20 minutes. I promised to give the hon. member the reference in the report. It is on page 453, under the heading "recidivist and habitual criminals, section 129," and it reads—these are the recommendations:

> That sentences of confirmed recidivists belong in a penitentiary to bring real benefit to society, and that Burwash provincial prison be set aside exclusively for non-reformable recidivists.

Number 130:

> That persons who have served a previous sentence in a penitentiary or three or more sentences in a reformatory should not be readmitted to a reformatory.

Number 131:

> That confirmed derelicts be given longer indefinite sentences, segregated completely from other inmates and provided with an extensive work programme in keeping with their capabilities.

Incidentally, it has always puzzled me how we would carry out 130, because if we do not accept them in a reformatory what else can we do with them?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I must point out with some regret that the Minister has misled the House, no doubt not deliberately. The comment he made earlier was that the report says that 75 per cent of these prisoners can be written off, he said this was one of the recommendations. I have all the recommendations here. I asked him for this report, and he quoted the page, I have page 453 in front of me and there is nothing here about 75 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I wish the hon. member would not be so free with the words "misinformed the House". There is no need for that.

Mr. Sargent: Why do you not resign?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have been in public office now for, I think, 17 years. The first time anyone ever suggested that I deliberately misinformed anybody or lied, is when the hon. member entered this House.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): He said, "no doubt not deliberately".

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just recall now, think the hon. member will find the reference to this was by the then leader of the Opposition, I think it was Mr. Oliver. I think you will find this in *Hansard*, when he was giving his comments when this report was being discussed. I think he stated this as the opinion of the select committee. So it was not a matter of misinforming the House.

I think it does not help at all, Mr. Chairman. I hope I am not going to be considered as lecturing, but it does not help a proper discussion across the floor of this House if I have to weigh every word in the hope that someone would say, "Ah, that was a wrong one, I'll catch him on that one". If the hon. member wants a good debate, he should not be that sticky.

Mr. MacDonald: You are being picked on again.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think, Mr. Chairman, if he will go to *Hansard* for this particular year when it was discussed, he will find this reference.

Mr. Sopha: Well, what does the Minister mean, he has been in public office for 17 years? When I came here nine years ago, you were—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was an alderman for four years and I have been here since 1955.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister means he has been in public life. But you did not hold an office nine years ago.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said since I held public office.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): What kind of nitpicking is that?

Mr. Sopha: It is not nitpicking at all, I want to be accurate. I knew this man when he rolled his own cigarettes.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, just so there will be no misunderstanding, I pointed out when I made my comment that it was no doubt inadvertently, and I must say I was somewhat more polite than an associate of this Minister who used a much stronger word—I am referring to the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko)—and who refused to retract it.

However, the question which I wish to bring to the Minister is as follows: It has been the custom, as the Minister has outlined, to put them to work in the reformatories or prisons and at a subsequent time, some weeks or some months later, they are sent to the staff training school, where they receive their education following their job training.

What I started to point out was the select committee, away back in 1953, said this was not a good system—and I give you recommendation 24—that all guards be given instruction in the staff training school before assuming their duties. This appears to me to be common sense. We have been travelling about the province and we find that guards are put to work in charge of prisoners, admittedly in non-sensitive areas, but in charge of prisoners. For example, at Millbrook they are not put in charge of the escapees, they are not put in charge of the hard criminals, but they are put in charge of the sex deviates, and the arsonists, and this is before they get their training. This was a very sensible suggestion by the select committee, and I would like to ask the Minister why it has not been put into force.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a matter of opinion, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member thinks we ought to get these people, put them on the staff training before they begin work, and other people think it is better if they are faced with situations in the presence

of others more experienced in the institutions, and realize what they are faced with in the particular institutions that they are going to in. Quite frankly, I see no reason to disagree with this.

I do not know how lecturing and all this sort of thing is going to do anywhere near as good as doing the lecturing and the staff training while you are on the job and you are faced with the actual situation. It is a person-to-person relationship and this is the only way, it seems to me, that people are going to learn. Because you could talk until you are blue in the face to people but unless they actually live in a situation, a good portion of it might be wasted. But this is a matter of opinion and I have no strong opinions on it except to say perhaps that if we waited for this, we would even have a greater shortage of staff than we have now.

We have many vacancies now for correctional officers which we cannot fill because we cannot find qualified people for it. So if we had to wait even longer until they got training outside, this would be another factor which would mitigate against doing it that way.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, is this a point of order?

Mr. Chairman: No.

Mr. Sargent: I thought maybe we could ask some questions over here once in a while.

Mr. Shulman: The member will get his turn.

Mr. Chairman: I recognize the member for Grey-Bruce; we will give the member for High Park a chance to catch his breath.

Mr. Sargent: This is not too earth-shaking but—

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the floor, I wish to yield the floor to—

Mr. Chairman: I recognize the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Shulman: If I cannot yield the floor, Mr. Chairman, I wish to continue. Mr. Chairman, I was in the middle of a series of questions and I will not be interrupted.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, what do you rule?

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps you will allow me to explain. The member for High Park asked a question of the Minister, which he answered; I noticed that the member had risen, I recognized him. He has a question? It can be answered. It is not a matter of yielding the floor.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, what new rule is it that suddenly when a man is asking a series of questions you break it off if one is answered?

Mr. J. H. White (London South): He is trying to give the floor to his colleague.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the member for London South in the chair?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. MacDonald: What is it, if I may ask?

Mr. Chairman: I said order, please! I would ask the member to be seated. How is the chair to recognize that there is a series of questions? The one question was asked and it was answered.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Except when the member for High Park rises.

Mr. Chairman: Anybody can speak a number of times in committee. Now, the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I wanted to follow up exactly what this member was talking about.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is tough luck.

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, you are entirely correct, sir, and for the edification of the House, I quote from May's 16th edition, page 446, which reads in part as follows:

> In the Commons, when two or more members rise to speak, the Speaker calls on the member who, on rising in his place, is first observed by him. It is the Speaker's duty to watch members as they rise to speak and the decision should be left with him.

And, sir, the practice in the United States Senate, which the hon. member for High Park is trying to introduce, has never been used here and has not been used in any other parliament anywhere in the world. You just cannot do that.

Mr. Shulman: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out it has been the practice in this House, in this session, when a member is asking a series of questions, to allow him to complete his questions and not interrupt him and let another member rise. You have made an error, sir.

Mr. Chairman: Commenting upon that matter, I would like to give this my own opinion. I have noticed in this House, in this session, that there are some members who appear to believe that this is something of a courtroom and that the Minister who is giving the estimates may be examined at length. This is not parliamentary procedure in my view. Parliamentary procedure here should be in the form of debate and our rules in committee permit a member to speak more than once. Hence when one question is answered, in this instance I recognized another member, and I now ask him to proceed with his question.

Mr. Sargent: Really, it is not worth all this trouble, but can I talk about the fact that in county jails across this province, there are possibly 3,000 or 4,000 people in there for up to 60 days. May I ask the Minister, does he have any planned programme of activity or is this just a continued—

Mr. Shulman: This is a different subject.

Mr. Sargent: Maybe I should ask the member for High Park, first, should I? This man is an authority on everything, and I am trying to find out something myself.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On everything, the member is right.

Mr. Sargent: That is the first question. Second, I am trying to find out something myself. If a fellow cannot cook in a jail, no one eats because they do not have a cook in county jailhouses. Do you have any programme to have a cook in county jails?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I will again attempt to make it quite clear that we appreciate some of these problems and this is the reason we appointed the task force which is now covering every jail in this province. I do not know how far they gone, I think—

Mr. Sopha: Have they got a cook yet?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For example, you may as well understand one of the problems, if you have a jail which has an average inmate population of three—

Mr. Sargent: Oh, no. Maybe 30 people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am trying to explain to the hon. member what the problems are. It was hardly right to expect that county to hire a permanent cook to cook for three people. So the practice has been in some of those to get one of the inmates, with some of the staff—

Mr. Sargent: Most respectfully, they never have less than 15 to 20 people there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are talking about a particular jail; I realize this. I am talking about jails generally. This is one of the purposes for the task force, to go into every jail and make recommendations to us so that we can make a decision as to which jails to close up completely; which to do some renovations on; where we might necessarily, perhaps, have to hire cooks; and, where we would decide to set up a priority, which priority would come first in respect of not only renovations but new buildings.

Mr. Sargent: Well then, one final point on this. We have, all over the province, all these jails with people in there for up to 60 days. There is nothing for them to do but sit around. Do you not have a programme of planned activity where they can be educated in something?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no use attempting to have planned activity in a jail where there is not any room for planned activity. In those areas where there is, the task force will report it. If there is not, we will try and make some arrangement for it.

Mr. Sargent: What is the target date?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The target date is as soon as is possible.

Mr. Sargent: You said that years ago.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I did not say it years ago. I said yesterday that our target date for replacing all of the jails was about 12 years.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1901. The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Yes, I just want to make one point on the training aspect.

There seemed to be some difficulty as to whether we should put them in a class first or after. I was thinking you could possibly follow the example used in the teachers' colleges, where you do both at the same

time. Consequently you would be getting exposure, and the background knowledge necessary, at the same time. In other words, attend class part time and go in to act as a guard or custodial officer at the same time. In this way, you would be getting exposure in both fields at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, this is, generally speaking, what we are doing now; the man is on the job and at the same time taking his training. Is that not the same thing?

Mr. Martel: Yes, I was under the impression that this went on for possibly a couple of months before he went into the academic classes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, it could be two or three months before he gets under way in his training, that is true. Ideally, he would start on the same day. Hopefully, we will be able to do this some day, but I do not think it is that important because the man is going to be surrounded by others who have been taking the training, and would be under their influence. And it is not the ideal situation; we work towards it.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1901. The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, to come back to the question I was asking when I ran into difficulties. I would like to inquire, how are guards paid for overtime work? Do they receive bonus payments?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The correctional officers are paid overtime in accordance with civil service regulations, whichever they happen to be. I do not have them in front of me.

Mr. Shulman: Then the situation has changed whereby guards used to work overtime at the same rate of pay. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Again, may I suggest that the hon. member refer to them as correctional officers? I am advised by my deputy that this has been changed; they are paid for overtime.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1901.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire if guards now advance in salary by length of service. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They work within a salary range and they increase in their salary range in accordance with the length of service—and performance I should say.

Mr. Shulman: And performance?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And performance—merit increases.

Mr. Shulman: Well, then, I am referring to recommendation 22—has this been carried out? That guards advance in status and salary by a system that recognizes merit and capability, as well as length of service?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Theoretically, this is what merit increases are for. Merit increases are not automatic; they must be approved, and presumably on the basis that they are—

Mr. Shulman: Recommendation 23 was that employees be recognized for meritorious and faithful service by merit awards, and designated by chevrons to be worn on uniforms. Has that been done?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The merit increases—I have already referred to that—and I am told that they are wearing chevrons, but not necessarily being paid on that basis.

Mr. Shulman: Oh, no, no. This has nothing to do with payment; this was that they be recognized for meritorious and faithful service by merit awards—this has nothing to do with money—the chevrons are to show that they have excelled.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, they do not get paid, the award is the chevron.

Mr. Shulman: I am asking has this recommendation been carried out?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, in respect of the recognition for their years of service.

Mr. Shulman: No, no. This is not years of service, I am sorry. Let me read it: (23) Employees be suitably recognized for meritorious and faithful service, by merit awards, and designated by chevrons to be worn on uniforms. This does not refer to length of service, this is unusually good worker. They suggested in this report they be recognized.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Presumably this sort of person would be recognized by promotion. I cannot think of any other way. I do not think we would be permitted to do this under civil service regulations.

Mr. Shulman: Are all experienced personnel given refresher courses over a period of time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, there are refresher courses.

Mr. Shulman: I know there are refresher courses, but is it compulsory for them to take them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised not in every case.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister not agree that it might be advisable, after a period of years, for correctional officers—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is our aim; that is our aim.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you. There is one other matter I would like to bring up under staff training. I am not sure if this is the correct place, or if it should be brought up under the Guelph situation, and I will be guided by you, Mr. Chairman. There is a situation at Guelph which has received some publicity in recent days. Guards who are taking the staff training course—who are not guards at Guelph, but who were on the grounds because they were taking a course at Guelph—were involved in that.

I wish to make some remarks about that. Would you prefer I wait until we come to Guelph?

Mr. Chairman: I think it would properly come under the institutions.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1901. The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: How many psychiatrists are you short of across the province?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I suppose the easiest way to answer that for the hon. member, without even going into the detail of what we have complement for—I do not think there is even a complement. We will take all the psychiatrists who will come with us; we can always use them. We will take as many psychiatrists as will come with the department.

Mr. Sargent: You will take all you can get. What are you paying them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think it works out, on the basis we are paying them—I was going to say $25,000. It runs up to $25,000.

Mr. Sargent: Up to $25,000. One more question. All the shoes that the inmates wear, and their clothing, is that all on a low-bid basis? Is that bought collectively or is it bought individually in institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that we make a considerable amount of clothing in our own institutions, and that which is purchased is purchased on tender.

Mr. Sargent: And how often do you buy new shoes?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not suppose there is any regular—

Mr. Sargent: Why I ask is because the shoes in a lot of these places are in shocking shape, and I think—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Are you talking about jails again?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir.

Vote 1901 agreed to.

On vote 1902:

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, on parole, in contra-distinction to probation, although they pretty much end up being the same thing. I suppose the same people, to some extent, carry out both services, and they are closely allied; it is a shame they are not taken together. But leaving that aside, I had heard the hon. Minister say, Mr. Chairman, that 70 per cent of the people eligible for parole obtain parole. Now, whether that is so or not—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think I said 64 per cent—did I not say 64 per cent?

Mr. Lawlor: Sixty-four per cent, sir, I am sorry. Well, 64 per cent then. I am not really questioning the figures, I simply would like a clarification of the statistic. It appears from your report on page 84 that people discharged on the expiration of sentence—in other words people who do not get paroled, are just discharged—were about 5,900 out of a constant prison or jail population of about —it runs from year to year—about 12,300 or about half. Over against that, the two figures of the national parole board and the Ontario parole board give a sum total of 638, leaving aside the differentiation between those two—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I wonder, would the hon. member permit me, so he will not be getting a lot of figures together on a misunderstanding—he appreciates, of course, I hope, that we only deal with those in our institutions who are on indefinite sentence so when I refer to those 64 per cent who are out on parole, I am referring to those who are paroled by the Ontario parole board

who are on indefinite sentence. We cannot deal with the national parole board—there are definite sentences.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, let us discuss the terms of eligibility.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think you will find that better on page 59. I think that will help the hon. member to get a clearer picture of it.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, that was the page I was looking at here. What I had done, Mr. Chairman, is place the figure of 1,200 over against the figure of 12,700 constant inmates of the institution. Of course, that would come out at a far lower figure than anything close to 64 per cent but I am looking for light.

But before getting into that, on the eligibility business, it is two years less a day that you are interested in, and do they not have to serve a third of their definite sentence before they are eligible in any event? Is that not the first condition?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To be eligible for the Ontario parole they have to serve all of their definite sentence unless they are paroled, of course, by the national parole board.

Mr. Lawlor: Now, could you explain the inter-relationship between the two parole boards? I notice that the national board paroled about 478 last year and you paroled about three times that number—1,252. In other words, what I would like to know is would you have paroled the same people had they left it up to you, or is it a question of longer than the two year period, or is it the question of the determinate sentences being paroled, or just on what basis is this done?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, I did not get the hon. member's question. I am sorry.

Mr. Lawlor: We will make it simple. What is the inter-relationship between the two parole boards; what area does each one cover? Is there any overlapping, and if there is—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, there cannot be any overlapping. As a matter of fact, we have an arrangement with the national parole board. Strictly speaking we have to ask their permission to parole somebody on indefinite sentence, but it is an understanding we have with the national parole board that we may parole those who are on indefinite sentence. They, and they alone, can deal with a definite sentence. Where they are planning on giving a national parole they do this in co-ordination with us. We are in contact with each other so that there will not be any cross action without the other knowing.

Mr. Lawlor: Just to have that absolutely clear—are there cases where you would refuse a parole and they would grant one, or vice versa?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that the national parole board will never grant parole where their is a combination of sentences and where our parole refuses to parole in the indefinite portion.

Mr. Sargent: What do you pay the members of the parole board? What salaries do they receive?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member gets in range of $10,500 to $12,500.

Mr. Sargent: Each member of the board?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a permanent member.

Mr. Sargent: How many permanent members do you have?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Five.

Mr. Sargent: What is the occupation of the five parole board members?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The permanent members of the parole board, of course, this is their occupation. This is all on page 58—the hon. member will find a description of them. Five permanent members; this is their job.

Mr. Sargent: Is there a medical doctor there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Sargent: Is there a man trained in the use of lie detectors?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know that.

Mr. Sargent: The experts in penology in the States say that to have a good parole board you should have these different type of people on the parole board.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can tell the hon. member that as far as we are able to ascertain there is no parole board that we have ever heard of that has had any better success on parole.

Mr. Sargent: Like Viola MacMillan for instance?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would you like to talk about Viola MacMillan?

Mr. Sargent: We certainly would.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Perhaps when we get back here after 6 o'clock—the dinner hour—we can discuss Viola MacMillan, if the hon. member will ask me a specific question on it. But I just tell the hon. member in answer to a specific question that our parole board has an international reputation for being one of the best on the continent.

Mr. Sargent: How do we know that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a matter of fact, I think the hon. member read that in the paper after all this discussion about Viola MacMillan. I think the people in corrections came out with this statement.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I think we read that you said it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I think you read it from the civil liberties association and perhaps some of the others. I cannot recall.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1902?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Can the member finish his remarks before 6?

Mr. Sargent: I have a series of questions.

Mr. Chairman: You have a series of questions?

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 99



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, May 29, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 29, 1968

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman, continued 3597

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 3634

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 1968

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS
(Continued)

On vote 1902:

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, before rising for the dinner hour, you will recall that there was some discussion with myself and the hon. member for High Park—I do not know if he is around—as to the fact that I had misinformed, misled the House regarding the report of the select committee regarding the number of reformables, and the number of unreformables. At that time I said that it probably was in *Hansard* as a result of being reported.

I have now had this *Hansard* looked up for me, and with your permission, sir, I would like to quote this. At page 399—*Hansard* of March 8, 1954 when the select committee report was being discussed.

Mr. Stewart, the chairman of the committee, stated—Mr. Stewart, who, of course was the Progressive Conservative member on the committee, and the chairman—and I quote—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Former Speaker of the House.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Former mayor of Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Stewart said:

> Mr. Speaker, we made a study of this, and the ratio—

if one should recall parenthetically, Mr. Chairman, that when he says that we made a study of this, he is referring to the committee.

> —and the ratio between jail reformables is about 30 per cent as against 70 per cent who are not reformable. In our provincial institutions, about 20 per cent are reformable, while the other 80 per cent are not.

Further on, the same *Hansard*, page 403, the Liberal representative on the committee, Mr. Oliver, who was leader of the Opposition, I think; it does not make any difference, he was a member of the committee. He stated, referring to the reformatory system:

> They are dealing with 100 per cent of the institutional population. There are, I suppose, only between 20 and 25 per cent of that population whom it is possible to reform, yet our efforts are directed towards the 100 per cent—

and there was some criticism later on as to why we should really put all that work into the whole 100 per cent.

The representative from the CCF at the time, Mr. Grummett, at page 406—

Mr. Sopha: He was for keeping them in jail.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He states:

> The committee belives the institution at Burwash should be made an Ontario prison, and those who are not reformable should be sent to that institution, so that officers attempting to reform men can concentrate their efforts on the 20 or 25 per cent who are reformable.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): When was that, 18 years ago?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, that was the point that I made when the hon. member for High Park read it.

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West): Thirteen years ago.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I add to that, too? It might be interesting for the members. Further on Mr. Grummett stated:

> The committee as a whole, believes a separate institution should be constructed, preferably at Burwash, to where men who are not reformable can be sent, and there serve their terms of imprisonment. At the same time, those men could be given hard labour—

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And he added:

> In our courts, we quite often hear the convicting magistrate, or judge, sentence a prisoner to hard labour.

Mr. Chairman, there is no such thing as hard labour in our institutions today. A man may be in our county jails, and considered serving a term with hard labour. All he has to do is sweep out the corridor, and his own cell, perhaps. That is not hard labour. We think that in each institution, some industrial

plan should be set up, so these men can be given work which will keep them busy. If they are not reformable, then hard labour, and a greater degree of punishment, will not induce these men to decide that they will not come back again in the near future.

Mr. Sopha: No sympathy—

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1903?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, we have not passed vote 1902 yet. The member for Lakeshore was on his feet, but first of all I would like to—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. With great respect, the Chairman would indicate to the member that vote 1902 was called, and carried. No member was on his feet, and I had called vote 1903.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, were you in a great hurry to pass this vote?

Mr. Chairman: If the member would please remain silent for a moment. I want to point this out to the committee that I had called the vote, and I had declared it carried, and called vote 1903, and no member was in his place, on his feet, and the Minister—however, I saw the member for Lakeshore coming to his seat, then I called vote 1903. So I will permit him, if he had something to say on vote 1902, to proceed.

I want the committee to know that vote 1902 had been carried.

The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, before he goes ahead, I wish to explain, sir, that I had a great deal to say on vote 1902. The member for Lakeshore informed me that he was going to speak first, and I left my chair for that reason, and I expected to be able to make my comments on this particular vote.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have heard that there are 64 per cent of all eligible inmates who get parole. As far as the Ontario system is concerned I wonder if it is possible at all for the hon. Minister to indicate what number of all persons in custody are eligible for parole? Could you give any idea of that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: While every person who is sentenced to a provincial institution, with an indefinite sentence, is entitled to be considered for parole for that portion of or some portion of his indefinite sentence, if he does not have an indefinite portion attached to his sentence, then we cannot deal with it at all.

Mr. Lawlor: Does that apply equally to reparolling inmates? I mean is it more difficult to get a parole if you have been paroled previously?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Again, this would depend on the particular circumstances of the particular case. The parole board takes everything possible into consideration. I rather imagine that if a person has broken parole previously, this would stand against his chance of getting parole, but not necessarily.

Mr. Lawlor: I see. Mr. Chairman, I have several questions; it will not take long.

Why not the same officers, or are some of the officers the same—I am sure they are not—as between the federal government and the Ontario government? I will rephrase the question. Should not the federal government handle the whole thing, or should not your office handle the whole thing with respect to determinate and indeterminate sentences?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The parole board, the national parole board, deals with parole in all the provinces except British Columbia and Ontario, because British Columbia and Ontario have their own parole board systems. I should tell the hon. member that I think it was the Fauteux report which recommended that it all be placed in the hands of the national parole board.

Mr. Lawlor: That was in 1934.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes. There was a further report after that, the Archambault report. I should say that at that time there was some considerable opinion in favour of this, among correctional people. I think it would be fair to say that, by and large, opinion has changed now, and I hope the hon. member will not feel that I am patting myself on the back, because I have nothing to do with having instituted the Ontario parole board. It was here long before I entered the picture. I am giving credit to the parole board of Ontario for this because of the method by which the Ontario parole board works—perhaps British Columbia as well—as against the method employed by the national parole board. There is now a feeling in reverse, that the parole board should be left in the hands of those provinces which, at least, have them now.

This feeling derives from the difference in methods of handling parole. The national parole board, by and large, deals with this parole by paperwork. That is, the local representative of the national parole board will consider an application for parole from one of its inmates, and make a report to the national parole board in Ottawa, and a decision is made there. As far as the Ontario parole obard is concerned, no one need make application. Our parole board visits every institution, at regular intervals, regardless of whether there is an application made or not. Every inmate who is on indefinite sentence is reviewed for parole. It is felt that this system, particularly the fact that the parole board confronts the inmate personally, provides a better way of sizing up the situation. Because of this, our parole board in the view of correctional people—and I say this with some qualification, because I cannot speak for all correctional people, but by and large, they feel that our parole system is a better one.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the recruitment of parole officers, as to whether these men come from the system itself, as to whether they are social workers. What training or special qualifications would such people have?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member referring to the parole board or the rehabilitation officers?

Mr. Lawlor: The rehabilitation officers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no hard and fast rule. Some of them are required to have academic standard of grade 13—at least grade 13, some of them. Some are social workers. They are people who, by and large, have learned to deal with people and know something about the work, and I would think this is a better way, as a matter of fact, than setting up special academic standards because you might decide that an academic degree is a better qualification for this work. But you might get someone who does not really relate to the inmates in this particular work.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, one final question of the Minister. You have a $350,000 item here for foster parents. Could you enlighten me as to what that is all about?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is for the purpose of paying maintenance for youngsters from our training schools for placement in foster homes.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of parole. First of all, I would like to discuss the matter of not being able to find out why inmates have been refused parole. I had brought this matter up earlier in the session and the Minister, I believe, said at that time that he was not aware of the reasons. In any case, that no one looked over the decisions of the parole board.

I would like to submit to you, sir, that this can lead to very serious abuses and at least, in cases where the Minister is requested to look into the reasons for refusal of parole, he or someone in the department should be assigned to look into those reasons.

As an example, to illustrate the abuses that can occur, I am going to read the letter to you, from a girl who is now in reformatory without mentioning her name. The Minister has a copy of all this correspondence. This shows the type of frustrating situation that can occur for the inmate, which can lead only to embitterment against the system, frustration among her family and among her elected representatives; and disrepute for the whole parole system. It is only a brief letter and I would like to read it in full.

Dear Doctor Shulman,

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That ought to be syndicated.

Mr. Shulman: To continue:

Dear Doctor Shulman,

I understand you were here at Mercer a few weeks ago. I am enclosing a copy of our letter to the parole board.

On June 8, 1967, I was given an 18-month indefinite term for uttering and theft. I would be paroled by December. I am still here and the parole board has flatly refused to review my case at this late date.

I have the complete backing of the Elizabeth Fry society of Ottawa who have directly requested parole at this time for me. They know my whole history.

I have a university education, employment recommendations, my own apartment sublet until September 1, 1968, a place to stay rent free with a teacher and his wife and no financial liabilities.

Yet even with all this in my favour, the parole board turns a deaf ear. I have asked for a reason and have been told personally by Mr. Potts that a reason would be given for a refusal of review, but I am kept waiting with no results.

I have seen inmates paroled since my arrival here who cannot even pay a fine; nowhere to go, yet they are granted parole.

My job here is a responsible one, such as they go, and I have no complaints levied against me, so that my conduct here is not the factor. My discharge date is September 24, 1968, and I am most anxious to be able to have an opportunity of making concrete plans for my home before my lease expires on September 1. Is there any help you can suggest?

Sincerely,
Miss C. H.

I wrote to the Minister when I received this letter and I sent him a photostat of the letter which I received. I received this letter on—it is dated April 24, it came in on May 2. I wrote the Minister the same day:

Dear Mr. Grossman,

I am enclosing a photostat of a letter received today—

and I asked the Minister to look into the matter of why she had not received parole. I received a letter back from the Minister. I will not read the whole letter, but the last paragraph sums it—the last two paragraphs:

Your specific question in this matter is to ask why the girl had not received her parole. I can only answer that the parole board had interviewed her, considered all of the factors normally necessary and all of the points which they usually consider in such cases and in the light of their examination decided that at this time she is not suitable for parole.

Mr. Sopha: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Shulman: They do not give a reason.

Mr. Sopha: Why should they?

Mr. Shulman: To continue the letter:

I might also add that they have reviewed her case on two occasions, and of course it is still open for further consideration at an appropriate time. I am satisfied that this case is being dealt with in accordance with the general policy which must have regard for the safety of the public and the successful rehabilitation of the person concerned.

The member for Sudbury has asked what is wrong with that; let me tell you what is wrong with that, Mr. Chairman.

Here is a girl whose conduct has been good in prison, whose future prospects are good, who cannot find out, either through the parole board or through her elected member, why she is refused parole.

Mr. Sopha: Had she been convicted of paperhanging before?

Mr. Shulman: I do not know what the reason was for refusing her parole. I have asked the Minister if there is an explanation; and I bring this case up not because of this specific case, but because I have a file here of cases, I must have 20 of them, of people who have applied for parole and have been refused their parole and cannot get any reason for it. Surely Mr. Chairman, if someone is refused parole there cannot be any deep dark reason why they are not given the reason.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, in the first place—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Is this another answer to one of your advertisements?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Shulman: This is a duty of the House, Mr. Chairman. It is not necessary to advertise for them—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

The member need not reply to the interjection. It is completely out of order.

Mr. Shulman: Please tell that to the House leader.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, of course you do not have to advertise. All the inmates of our institutions respond as soon as they find out that someone is prepared to listen to that sort of thing, you get hundreds of letters.

I am not going to comment on this particular letter except to use it as an opportunity, again, to advise the hon. member, again —I know his hon. leader is going to say I am lecturing him again—about the danger of it.

I do not know whether the hon. member knows, but he is dealing in the first instance with a forged letter. I mean these are the dangers that are inherent in this thing. He has the letter, which was not signed by the inmate.

Mr. Shulman: I beg your pardon?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member should be careful. He was not there when she signed the letter; and there is no use going into that, it is not really germane except to suggest to the hon. member that he ought to be careful about taking the word of any

inmate who writes him a letter with grievances.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Why?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have mentioned before that obviously these people are unwilling guests of our institutions. They all want to get out and they all have good reasons why they want to get out.

Now as to the general policy of why the parole board does not give reasons let me cite the case that was mentioned earlier this year. This caused me a great deal of concern and I reviewed it once, twice and three times to satisfy myself that this was the only way to handle it.

Mr. Sopha: What case?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a case we may discuss in a few minutes I am sure.

Perhaps I should begin at the beginning.

When a person appears before a parole board and parole is denied some people believe that the reasons for such a denial should be explained to the person concerned in every case. This matter has received a great deal of consideration by the members of the Ontario parole board. Experience and reflection indicate that it is not always advisable or possible to do so, for the following reasons:

Information received about the person from school, church, family doctor, employer and members of the family might have to be revealed, putting the safety of the informant in jeopardy. All information that is received by the board is received in confidence. If it were not kept in confidence little would be supplied, and what was would be given in such general terms that it would probably be valueless.

Frequently when people are undergoing treatment in the institutions, their prognosis is in doubt and might be better explained by their therapist. This is particularly so with patients with emotional problems—sexual deviates, alcoholics and drug addicts.

Staff are required to submit written progress reports on each person appearing before the board. If the source of this information was revealed it could make institutional treatment very difficult and sometimes impossible, especially since one of the prime functions of the department is to change attitudes. When it is felt therapeutically desirable to reveal why parole is not granted, the chairman of the board explains the reasons to the inmate and to concerned next of kin.

In practice, we find that the majority of people who appear before the board know why their parole is being denied before they leave the parole interview. In any event, if parole is not granted a person may apply to have his case reviewed.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make sure that our practice was in keeping with the general policy of other parole boards, and I find this is the case. I asked Mr. Potts to write to the national parole board to see how they handle these things. I have before me a letter from the national parole board, dated May 9, 1968, from Ottawa. It is addressed to Mr. Frank Potts, chairman of the board of parole, Parliament Buildings, Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Frank:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 3 asking about our practice with respect to giving reasons for refusing of parole.

Generally speaking, we do not give reasons for our decisions, simply because it is not feasible to do so and because we are bound by the confidentiality of the reports which we receive. However, if an inmate cannot appreciate why he was refused parole and wants to know why, he is interviewed by one of our regional representatives who explains to him as best he can from the summary of the case which was submitted to the board.

If I receive a letter from an inmate, or someone on his behalf asking why a certain case was refused, I usually say that the reports we received about him were simply not conducive to favourable consideration for parole.

In other words, we usually answer in general terms because we are not supposed to disclose the information in the reports received from institutions and other sources. Apart from this, though, I often tell a person inquiring why he was refused parole, if it is something definite such as failure to recognize an alcoholic problem and doing something about it, or failure to do anything in the institution to help himself, such as taking training, and quite often I mention that he has a hostile, aggressive attitude. In cases like these, it is usually easy to give some fairly definite reason.

On the other hand, it is more difficult in borderline cases to explain precisely why a parole was refused especially if there has been some indication of improvement no matter how slight. Sometimes, in cases like this, I say we have noticed some slight

improvement and we hope for the inmate's own sake that he will continue to try to help himself. There is no easy answer that I know of to this problem but I hope the above remarks will be of some interest to you.

Yours sincerely,

T. G. Street (Chairman).

Mr. Chairman, I do not know what else I can add to this. It is very difficult to lay down precise guidlines because you are dealing with many different types of people, each one of whom has different problems involved in the case. You have received information from confidential sources that, as was pointed out, may not be in the best interest of the inmate to know. The parole board assures me that, generally speaking, unless it is something which it is just as well the inmate does not know about when he leaves—for example, if it is behaviour—he generally knows, through the questioning that has gone on during the interview, why his or her parole was not granted at the particular time. Aside from that, I do not know how else a parole board can operate.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make two points to the Minister. The first is, I accept the validity of much of what you said, which is common sense, but there are two points which I would like to make.

First of all the letter from Mr. Street, of the national parole board, appears to make very good sense. I understood you to say, when you were reading it, that if the inmate is not satisfied and wants to know the reason, someone of authority will meet with them and give them, from the summary of the case, general reasons for their refusal of parole. May I suggest that this is a very much more satisfactory system than just saying "we will not tell you anything". May I suggest to the Minister that this would be a good improvement for the Ontario system.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I point out to the hon. member that what he has overlooked is that the inmate he is talking about, in respect to the national parole board, has not seen really any parole board in the first place. He has been dealt with generally by paper. Our people have been sitting down in front of a parole board of three people which has discussed his case; and he generally is in the same, if not a better position, than the person the hon. member refers to, who in respect of the national parole board, then is seen by someone else. He has already been seen by three people and, as a matter of fact if, in addition to this, he does want to discuss some of these problems, he has the counsellors available at the institution. We have people at the institution level, or we have officers, who will discuss these cases with the inmate at great length. All I am asking the hon. member to keep in mind is, that the letters he is getting do not necessarily tell him the whole story.

Mr. Shulman: This is of course true, Mr. Chairman. Of course the inmates put on the best face but the point I am coming back to, before I go into my second point, is would the Minister not agree with me that the parole board should be willing to give some general reason to the inmates for refusal of parole without going into detail of confidential information which might endanger some other person?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think I covered this in the explanation of the board.

Mr. Shulman: If I may finish please. Mr. Street has said that someone who is familiar with the case will give some general reasons. Whether this person has appeared before a board or not, general reasons are given. To have the inmate in an Ontario institution appear before a counsellor who has no idea why the parole board turned the person down is extremely unsatisfactory; but the major point which I am making—and I come back to this again—it is even more important, I think, than the fact that the inmate being let known why they are refused—although this is terribly important—but even more important, I think there should be someone who is willing, when there is a request to look over the parole board's findings, to see whether they made the right decision; and that person should be a senior official in your department.

I inquire from the Minister why certain people are refused parole and he replies: "I do not know, I will look over their record". And sometimes there are a number of previous convictions. So he says, "Well it seems reasonable". This is fine in many cases but in some cases it is not. For example, this case I have just mentioned now. In a case when you have a specific request, I would expect that the Minister should assign someone in his department, some senior official, to look over the records of the parole board to see if the decision that they made was a reasonable one, because we all know, that relying on confidential information sometimes produces injustices to the people who are under judgment at the time. We are all aware of files in

this, and other, governments which have contained confidential information which was not true; and I think when a case like this comes up, which on the face of it appears to be a reasonable request for review, the Minister should be willing to review. If necessary, he should be willing to come to the elected member in this case and say: "Look, there are confidential reasons we cannot tell this girl, it may be a psychiatric thing, but I have looked into the case, I have seen that it would be to her advantage not to let her out at this time". Just to say: "the parole board is fine, we trust them", is just not good enough. There has to be a court of appeal. These people are people, even if they are locked up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I have already pointed out that any inmate can have his or her case reviewed again by the board.

Mr. Shulman: By the same board.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right. In the first place I am able to look at any file in the department that I like. If I wanted to look at the file, I can see the file, but what really does that mean? It means that I have to satisfy myself that as far as I am concerned the parole board is operating in an intelligent fashion and beyond that, I could not go anyway.

But the hon. member is suggesting that my review of such files implies that, in some instances, I will disagree and tell them otherwise. Well now, that is where the danger point is. Political influence can become involved and I want no part of it because once I am in a position where I disagree with a board, and impose my decision on the board, then the board ceases to be independent, then I am in charge of the decisions made by the board, and I do not want to put myself in that position so long as I am satisfied that the board is carrying out its job in a proper fashion. The very fact that 64 per cent of the cases who are eligible for parole are paroled—which is a very high proportion—certainly must be evidence of the fact that the parole board is anxious to parole as many people as possible.

If the hon. member wants to suggest that there may be some injustices in some cases, well, there may be some injustices in our whole system and you cannot destroy the whole system merely because by carrying on there may be a possibility somebody is being done an injustice. Aside from that, I do not know what else, what other system we can employ here, to keep the parole board out of the hands of political influence. And I want no part of it.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion here? I must agree with the Minister, of course we do not want political interference, but there should be a court of appeal and the appeal should not be back to the same people who just turned it down. If I may take as an example, and it is a terrible example to take, we will have a great deal to say about that board. The compensation board at least has different levels of appeal, so that if a workman gets turned down at a certain level then he goes to the next level, and there is not the same people judging the thing all over again.

When the appeal comes back to the same persons, it is only natural they are going to arrive at the same decision. May I say to the Minister, I was not suggesting that he should be the person who is making the final judgment, I said a senior person or persons in his department should be set up as a second court of appeal.

I am not worried about the 64 per cent who get their paroles, it is the other 36 per cent, and if only 1 per cent of them are having their parole unjustly refused—and it can happen I am sure the Minister will agree with me—mistakes do occur. Just for that one per cent there should be a second level of appeal. I think this is in all justice in this society, this applies everywhere else, surely it should apply here. You should not have to appeal back to the same judge who has already convicted you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I ask the hon. member what happens if they are not satisfied with the second?

Mr. Shulman: There should be at least a second.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You could go on *ad infinitum*. Does the hon. member realize that by the time this happens, the person would probably be out of the institution?

Mr. Shulman: I would like to believe that your department would be more efficient than that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And there is another factor here, of course. We have a difficult enough time getting some of this confidential information, as I have pointed out. There are people who may be prepared to talk to a limited number of people on this. If you add

another level, there are going to be people who want no part of it.

There are people like the psychologists who are giving psychological reports within the institution. Incidentally, over a period of years we have had a great deal of difficulty in this area. There is a feeling amongst many of the professional staff, psychiatrists and psychologists, that not even the Minister should be allowed to look at these files. This is an ongoing discussion. It also bears upon this particular matter because there may be a sociological report from a psychiatrist and a psychologist involved.

Now, if we are going to add more people who are going to be allowed to look at these reports, we will not be able to get these people to do this work. They will just refuse to do it, because obviously they could be charged for divulging confidential statements they are making in some of these reports. The hon. member being a physician, should know that very well.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting, first of all, there be another hearing. I am suggesting there be another level so that in case of appeal, just as at the board, they keep the persons involved on a confidential basis, just the same as it is now. But they should look over the file to see if the decision made was a reasonable one. It is done in every court in the country. It is done in every other board. I find it very difficult to understand why it is so—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member know of any other parole board anywhere else in the world doing other than what we are doing?

Mr. Shulman: I must confess I am not familiar with the patterns or policies of other parole boards. I will look into this gladly. May I ask the Minister if I find that other parole boards are doing this, will he then institute it in this province?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will guarantee that if he finds one, I will go and discuss it with them, find out how they operate and see if it can be carried out.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, a good start would be to put the hon. member for High Park on the parole board. It would be a good start in cleaning house there probably.

The Minister asked the advisability, Mr. Chairman, of having a look at these goings on of the parole board. He said they even object to the Minister having access to these files. Well, I think it is high time that the elected people of the province know what goes on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say—

Mr. Sargent: The Minister said they objected to him looking at the files.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. member will recall I did not say the parole board objected to my looking at the files. I said there was an ongoing discussion about the advisability of the Minister having the right to look at sociological reports from psychiatrists and psychologists generally—not the parole board itself.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I say most respectfully that we have in this country built up now a bureaucracy controlled by civil servants and they control our whole lives. Someone has to set policies, and if the Minister divorces himself from setting policy in such important things as the rights of people, then I suggest to him, Mr. Chairman, it is time that those of us who are elected by the people to see their rights are being looked after—and we have the case of Viola MacMillan, which the Minister wanted to talk about and which we are glad to talk about.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Does the member think we could get rid of the Opposition, too?

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the Minister, what did this lady have, what does Viola MacMillan have, that the other girls did not have—except a million dollars? What did she have that I do not have?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I was talking financially.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member that any attempt to completely rehash the Viola MacMillan case, in my opinion, would be out of order during the consideration of these estimates. However, the Chairman does recall that the Minister invited the member for Grey-Bruce to discuss the matter of Viola MacMillan. Proceed.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I want to make some very short remarks. I have no intention of having a witch hunt, but I think there is a very important point at issue here in that 221 women, I understand, ap-

peared for parole consideration. Before we go into that, I would like to ask the Minister at what point is a person eligible for parole?

Do you have a 75 per cent forgiveness factor involved for all inmates or is it just for a millionaire? Where do we start? You forgave 75 per cent of her sentence.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member suggesting that special consideration was given to Mrs. Viola MacMillan because she had a million dollars?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am coming through pretty clear, I guess. I think the Minister understands me.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Say it out loud.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time we laid this thing to rest. Let us find out whether Mrs. MacMillan actually received any special consideration.

Mr. Sargent: Before the Minister does, will he answer my question? Where does parole start? Where do you start giving parole, at what point?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It will soon become clear when I read this. "Parole can be given to a woman the day she starts her sentence in Mercer reformatory providing it is not a jail sentence, providing it is a reformatory sentence. She can be paroled the day she is put in the institution."

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, before he gives us this diatrabe or whitewash he has there, I would like to suggest that 221 people who appeared—

Hon. Mr Rowntree: I hope the member is not speaking for the Liberal Party when he uses that kind—

Mr. Sargent: As much as the Minister speaks for the House when he gets up and belabours us too late at night, as much as he does—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: With that kind of rot, the member is no credit to the Liberals.

Mr. Sargent: Well, the Minister is no credit to his party either sometimes, I will tell him that. They are not bragging about the Minister a lot of times.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You both have a point.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the Minister how many of the 221 people who appeared got the same treatment she is going to get by this report?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, there is only one way to deal with this, I think, and that is the way I did. I spoke to the chairman of the parole board, incidentally the parole board was really libelled by one or two members here when they made some remark about hanky-panky on the part of the parole board, a parole board which has on it some very distinguished gentlemen.

On that account, I said to the chairman of the parole board: "You had better go into your records and let me know what happened over a certain period of time and let me know the kind of parole that was given to people generally in this particular area"—that is, the length of parole. Let me read now, if I may, Mr. Chairman, a number of cases—

Mr. Chairman: Is the Minister going to review several cases?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Twenty-one; this is the only way I can make my point, Mr. Chairman—to point out, to read in this House, the kind of parole that was given to the same kind of people, over this same period of time, so as to prove that Viola MacMillan was not given any special consideration.

Mr. Chairman: With respect to the Minister, the Chairman has suggested to members of the Opposition parties that they should not come into this House and review numerous cases. I point out to the Minister, if he is going to do exactly that now, he is setting a precedent, and I do not think this should take place.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: With due respect, Mr. Chairman, if someone gets up and states that someone has been given special consideration with respect to parole, how else can one prove that she was not given special consideration except by reading out cases of a like nature to point out just what parole they were given, and the length of terms.

Mr. Chairman: Could the Minister use them on the basis of statistics—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But I would have to give you some examples. In the first place, to be fair to this thing, I would have to, to give a true picture. I would have to point out the person—not the name, of course—the occupation, to prove that we are not dealing

only with people with money. I would have to prove the length of term to which she was sentenced and the length of time she had served. I think this is the only way to prove it. If the hon. members in this House want to have this thing cleared, this is the only way I can do it.

Mr. MacDonald: You have already done that in the House; it is on the record.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I have not.

Mr. Sopha: I have another consideration that may cut down your cases. I want you to pick out—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Well we both should not be standing!

Out of your 21 I want you to pick out only those where the parolee was facing a charge on the strength of which she was liable to imprisonment for 10 years. Those are the only ones that I want you to pick out; that is to say facing a charge on the strength of which she was liable to imprisonment for 10 years.

Mr. Sargent: You have not got one case.

Mr. Sopha: If the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) ever gets around to prosecuting her!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have pages here of people who are facing outstanding charges. Now you ask me: Are they liable to imprisonment for 10 year? To go into all of that is ridiculous!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The Minister is attempting to provide an answer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I make my point?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this is not the answer to my question. He can pick out 21 cases that will make him look great.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well of course this is the point, is it not? I want to prove otherwise.

Mr. Sargent: But not, as my hon. friend from Sudbury said, on the same set of circumstances.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I take it the hon. member does not want me to prove that Mrs. MacMillan was not an exceptional case?

Mr. Sargent: There is no parallel at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am going to give you a parallel. I have some with outstanding charges, and some which had no outstanding charges.

Mr. Shulman: Let us hear the outstanding charges.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You want the outstanding charges?

Mr. Sopha: Liable to imprisonment for 10 years!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, Mr. Chairman: Case number one, a salesman—these are cases where there have been outstanding charges.

Mr. Sopha: Right!

Mr. Shulman: A woman?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Case number one: A salesman, 28 years of age, his total sentence is one year definite and one year indefinite.

Mr. Sargent: A woman or a man?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is a man.

An hon. member: It should be a woman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How tall must she be?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, he has 1,800 cases to look at dealing with males, and we are talking of a female case here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I will answer any one of these. The hon. member asked for outstanding cases. I was going to give him all of them. The hon. member wants me to talk only about the women.

Mr. Sargent: Right!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will give him those.

Mr. Sopha: I have no quarrel with my friend, but I do not care if they are men or women.

Mr. Sargent: Well I care, I am the one who asked the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will answer this the way I want.

Mr. Sargent: I do not care what he wants.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I will satisfy both hon. members.

This man who was sentenced to one year definite and one year indefinite served none of his indefinite sentence; he was paroled completely for the year of his indefinite sentence.

Mr. Sopha: How much time did he spend?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He spent one year definite, less the period of his good conduct remission.

Number two, a mortician, 12 months definite and six months indefinite, served none of his indefinite sentence.

An hon. member: He served the year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, you will have to go to the national parole board to find out what he served on his definite sentence. That is why I was going to deal originally with the women who are on totally indefinite sentences, which would give a truer picture.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order!

Mr. Chairman: Point of order!

Mr. Sargent: The motivation in my question was they were talking about an institution called Inglewood where Mrs. Viola—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I do not care what you think about it, this is the point of issue here. We have an institution—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not the question raised, Mr. Chairman. Can we deal with one question at a time? He was not talking about the way she was treated; he said she was given special consideration for parole.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if I confused the Minister. He knows what I am talking about.

We have the case of Mrs. Viola MacMillan who was in Inglewood, a very special home with television and lounges and all the accoutrements and everything that she is used to.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is also television at Mercer and Kingston.

Mr. Sargent: All these things that most people do not have. Now I am asking about Inglewood, not across the whole of the province of Ontario, I am talking about Inglewood.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we were not dealing with that, we were dealing with parole and I insist I have the right to answer this question. It was a very provocative question. We will talk then only about the women, shall we? We will talk about the indefinite sentences, complete indefinite sentences, so that the hon. member will be satisfied about how much time was actually served because—

Mr. Sopha: What was Viola's sentence?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mrs. MacMillan's sentence was nine months indefinite, of which she served 66 days, or 24 per cent of her term.

The next case was a switchboard operator, age 47, who was given nine months and served 60 days of her sentence, which is 21 per cent.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): What was the outstanding charge?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are no outstanding charges.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well I am trying to give the hon. member both. I have got two tables here, one with outstanding charges and one with none. Now look if the hon. members opposite really wanted a true picture they could let me proceed with this and give them those with outstanding charges and those without outstanding charges.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister answer a question?

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member for High Park that the Minister already has a question that he is attempting to answer.

Mr. MacDonald: Can you give the date?

Mr. Shulman: But we asked him the date.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Parole was granted to the switchboard operator, who served 60 days of a nine-month sentence, on January 21, 1966.

Case number 12: Female, 28 years of age, a bank teller, was given 18 months, and she served—that was on October 17, 1966—she served 152 days, which was 28 per cent of her sentence.

These are all non-outstanding charges. I will deal with the others later if the hon. member permits.

Case number 11: January, 1967, a housewife, age 43, was given seven months; served 48 days, 22 per cent.

Case number 10: A housewife, paroled on June 30, 1965. She was 69 years of age, a housewife and was given one year; served 42 days of her sentence, which was 11 per cent of her sentence.

Another one, paroled on May 19, 1966, age 47, a housewife; of nine months' sentence served 74 days—27 per cent of her sentence.

Now I have two pages of these, generally along the same line. The reason I gave the occupation is obvious, so that no one will feel that one is treated different from the other.

Now there is one aspect here which we all note, that age was some factor. As a matter of fact there is one case here, I notice earlier, that the party served a one-day sentence—a one-day sentence—of six months, merely because the judge, I think it was, said that he had to give this sentence, and before he actually gave the sentence he discussed it with our people and said he would hope that we would parole this woman the moment she got in because of the following reasons. There were some very good reasons for it and the parole board, after considering the matter, decided to let this woman out on the first day she was in.

There was no special consideration given to Viola MacMillan.

Mr. Sopha: You have not got a case yet.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now you want some outstanding cases; I started to give you those in the first instance.

Mr. Bullbrook: The first two served a year each.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I have not said they served a year. As far as it was within the control of our parole board I have told you what our parole board did with them, the balance of it was up to the national parole board.

Mr. Bullbrook: You are going to talk about the indefinite period of their sentence?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, that is all we have control of. Many of them serve just about the same sentence or a lot less. I think it was most unworthy to suggest that this distinguished board, which has the respect of everyone across this continent, should be accused of dealing with this woman in a special fashion merely because she happens to be a woman allegedly with money.

Mr. Sargent: Is that not too bad?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes it is too bad and we cannot get distinguished people to serve as long as they have these loose accusations made against them.

Mr. Chairman: Will the Minister please—

Mr. Sargent: As long as you are paying these handsome salaries you will still continue to get them. In no case—in all these cases you have quoted—did they have an outstanding charge still waiting when they left the jail.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They did have. I was reading them out to you and you stopped me.

Mr. Sargent: I did not hear one of them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if the hon. members will be quiet I will tell you about the outstanding cases. I started to read them. Those were in the first cases I started to read.

Mr. Shulman: We did not hear them.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It was at least conveyed to me as one member of this House that we were going to get at least one analogous situation. I put it to the Minister, sir, on this point of order: do you have one woman subject to an indefinite sentence, who was released with an outstanding charge against her? Give me one of those.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That was released with outstanding charges?

Mr. Bullbrook: Right.

Mr. Sopha: And liable to imprisonment for ten years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh now somebody adds something.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well I am starting to read, I have two pages of them if you will give me a chance.

Here—parolled, Ontario parole board, effective October 6, 1967. The superintendent's report June 22, 1967, notes:

> the board is obviously aware that this inmate faces an unresolved legal situation in Michigan as she is presently on appeal bail from that state and has been since May 19, 1966. Amount of the bail is $5,000.

This case had two years indefinite and the amount of term she served was 10 months indefinite—she served a ten months indefinite sentence.

These are people with the outstanding charges—and here is a typist, 23 years of age, who had a 15 month indefinite sentence and served 7 months. Here is two years indefinite—ten months indefinite served.

Mr. Sopha: Any outstanding charges?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: These are all outstanding charges.

Mr. Bullbrook: You do not even understand what we are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know what you are talking about.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The interjections do not add to the dignity of these proceedings.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that some of the members feel disappointed that they cannot continue with their suspicion that somebody dealt improperly with Mrs. MacMillan. They are not charging this government with anything, they are not charging this Minister with anything, because all they have to do is talk with the parole board and the chairman of the parole board.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I have arranged—I have asked the chairman of the committee on welfare and reform to have the chairman of the parole board appear before the committee as soon as possible so that the members of that committee can discuss the matter with the chairman of the parole board. It is an insult to that man to suggest that he would take any advice from anybody in the government. He would not keep his job for one day. He would resign at a moment's notice if we even attempted to do that. And may I just, Mr. Chairman, along these lines, quote what has been said by people in the field. In the *Telegram*, Phyllis Haslam, of the Elizabeth Fry society, said it is quite usual for first offenders to go to Ingleside regardless of the offence.

She said that Mrs. MacMillan was eligible at any time for parole and she does not believe that Mrs. MacMillan got any preferential treatment and I should point out to the hon. members that the Elizabeth Fry society works right in Mercer reformatory and at the Ingleside branch of the Mercer reformatory. They know what is going on.

Mr. Sargent: Well you are just giving them $12,000 in this first vote here so I mean you are getting nice letters back from them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the hon. member is now charging that the Elizabeth Fry society is being bought with $12,000.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, now let us find out. What do we pay Allan Mintz, civil liberties supporter and legal aid lawyer. He made the strongest plea for Dr. Shulman to stop trying to destroy "probably the most enlightened and progressive parole system in North America"—Ontario's parole system.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege—

Mr. Chairman: Point of privilege?

Mr. Shulman: I believe one of the privileges we are—I am sorry, maybe it is a point of order. I rather think that Mr. Mintz got me confused with another member in this particular House because the comments which he was referring to were not made by myself.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well then I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member is referring to his colleague, the hon. member for Lakeshore?

Mr. Shulman: I am not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because he also refers to him. Well I do not know who else he would be referring to. Mr. Chairman, it was the duty of the member if he was misquoted in such a manner to get up in this Legislature on a matter of privilege.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Mintz made a remark obviously mistaking me for a certain other member in this House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, are you saying that he has quoted you as saying—

Mr. Shulman: I am not misquoted—I was not quoted.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Next vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, it becomes evident that we have here the greatest coincidence then, because 221 people came before the board for parole and it is very coincidental that this person with all her wealth and connections, got this favourable treatment.

I do not care how the Minister tries to dress it up, the fact is in the minds of the people of the province of Ontario that this parole board is not serving the best interests of the people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not worth an answer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Minister—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Mr. Sopha: I want to say to the Minister, through you, just the position I do take in regard to this and my friend from Grey-Bruce was perfectly right in the last comment. He summed it up succinctly in what he said that in the minds of the people of Ontario there was certainly a very deep and anxious question about the conduct with respect to the parole of Viola MacMillan.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I agree. I agree.

Mr. Sopha: Here is the way I see it for the Minister's consideration. He said he had to assume the intelligence of the parole board.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Integrity.

Mr. Sopha: No—and the intelligence—that they were an intelligent group. I must say publicly that I cannot credit them with a good deal of intelligence in the handling of the parole. In view of the remarks made in the first place by Judge Moore when she was convicted downtown—and at the time of her sentence—and here is denotation of the flagrancy of her offence, and indeed against the background of the nationwide, if not international, publicity that the woman got at the height of the Windfall scandal—one must assume that the parole board was aware of that, that they knew about Windfall, they knew about the trial, they read what Judge Moore said. Then after such a short period, I would take it, the parole board being reasonable people, might say to themselves or one might say to another: "We are entering a very sensitive area here, in considering the parole of this woman and we must consider the impact upon the public and the view that the public will take."

They would have to, I would think, be fastidious—they would have to be fastidious about parallels, because they might consider that somebody over here is going to ask the question of analogous circumstances.

Now those are some of the considerations. What I think the parole board should have done, before granting parole—and we are always informed here that it was a sudden revelation to the Minister and the government—I would think that having decided, they should have attended upon the Minister. From the point of view that the parole of Viola MacMillan, in all the circumstances—in all of them, would have to be a political decision, the Minister would have to ask the opinion of the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and he might ask the Attorney General and all of them might ask themselves. Because aside from the context, the very thing to me in the whole piece is the fact that the woman at the time of her parole by this board—which the Minister epitomizes as being the be all and the end all of everything in the universe—at the time of her parole she is facing this charge.

Everyone who, by deceit, falsehood or other fraudulent means, whether or not it is a false pretense within the meaning of this Act, defrauds the public or any person, whether ascertained or not of any property, money or valuable security, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for ten years. That is quite a serious charge.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: So you are being the judge.

Mr. Sopha: I am not being the judge at all. I am stating a fact, that Viola MacMillan is facing that charge at the time of her parole. All right!

Perhaps the Minister will explain to me: I have sat in the magistrate's court in Sudbury and I have seen inmates of Burwash industrial farm arrange to have charges from all across Canada—the charges sometimes come from B.C., they sometimes come from Nova Scotia—brought to that court and be dealt with on a plea of guilty by the presiding magistrate.

I enquired, a long time ago, the reason for that procedure. They might bring as many as four or five or six charges from Saskatoon and Halifax and all over the place, bring them there and the fellow pleads guilty and he is sentenced on the charge. I was told the reason is that they want to make parole and they cannot make parole until the outstanding charges are cleaned up.

Not so with Viola MacMillan. Viola MacMillan can make parole, and did make parole, after spending a very limited time in custody with that serious charge, which has not yet been tried incidentally, outstanding against her.

Well every newspaper, every one of the Metropolitan press I am certain, had an editorial at the time in which they reflected the anxiety of the public about the possibility of special treatment to this woman.

That decision I say again, and I take the responsibility for saying it, that is a decision that should have been made by the Minister. The circumstances were so flagrant and were of such widespread interest and knowledge, and so many people out there on the street had been hurt by activities in the Windfall business, which is all recorded in Mr. Justice Kelly's report, that Viola MacMillan, in all the circumstances, ought only to have been paroled on the personal responsibility of the Minister and the Cabinet—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted a question.

Mr. Sopha: —of the Minister and in consultation with the Cabinet body. Now that is what I see was wrong with the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Sopha: Go ahead!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Having in mind the general spirit of your proposition, suppose the legislation says that the authority is entirely within the board and there is no authority in the Minister.

Mr. Sopha: Is that what it says?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: What would you say to that?

Mr. Sopha: There are lots of parallels. The Hydro—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well let us—

Mr. Sopha: Let me tell you the parallels.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Let us just consider them one at a time.

If the Act says that the parole board has the authority of the Minister of Justice of Canada, and there is no clue as to the one that has the overriding authority, what right has this Minister, but to accept their decision?

Mr. Sopha: There are lots of parallels. The Hydro, the liquor licence board; all kinds of parallels—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Oh, no!

Mr. Sopha: All kinds of parallels where they have independence of action, but because it is such a—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We are talking about people and parole.

Mr. Sopha: Just hear me out!

This is such a high policy decision that the decision has to be made as a reflection of government policy. It must be decided at the highest level.

Do you want a parallel? The liquor licence board has the power to order sales of beverages on Christmas day—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is a question of the content of the Act. Here the legislation says that the parole board—

Mr. Sopha: Read that section, where is the section?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It is right in the Act.

Mr. Sopha: Well read it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will read it if you like, Mr. Chairman. I happen to have it in front of me.

Section 6: "Subject to the regulations, the board"—

Mr. Sargent: Why do you not instruct the parole board then?

Mr. Chairman: Order! order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Section 6:

"Subject to the regulations, the board may order the release on parole of any prisoner:

(a) In the case of a prisoner referred to in sub-clause 1 of clause b of section 1, upon such conditions as the board deems proper and,

(b) In the case of a prisoner referred to in sub-clause 2 of clause b of section 1, upon conditions approved by the Minister of Justice, under section 43 of The Prison and Reformatories Act, Canada."

Which is the Act under which we operate. I think that is beside the point anyway, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to make this point. I think it is rather surprising to hear the hon. member for Sudbury, whom I have watched here over a period of years and listened to as he gave some very impassioned speeches about justice and how to mete out justice and so on, to hear him, to actually suggest, that in a case like this, which could have been and I must admit was, a political embarrassment for me, that because it was a political embarrassment for me and the government, that means—

Mr. Sopha: You said that the parole board was intelligent—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now just a moment! That is right. They are intelligent. They are intelligent but—

Mr. Sopha: I do not think they are.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment! But they have integrity and they are not supposed to allow their decisions to be based upon what might embarrass the Minister or the government or else this would create havoc in the parole system.

Mr. Sopha: Are they out to embarrass you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Viola MacMillan is not the only one who could embarrass, because as I just mentioned here before there are many people who would disagree, in this province, with allowing a woman out the first day she went into a jail on a six-month sentence.

It is not just Viola MacMillan. Viola MacMillan makes headlines because she is the kind of person that makes headlines.

Mr. MacDonald: Not when the judge said what he said.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Surely the hon. member for York South really does not agree that the parole board should, because it feels it might embarrass me or the government, base its decision upon that.

Mr. Sopha: They should ask you.

Mr. MacDonald: I did not suggest that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, of course, I would not want them to ask me. They would not ask me; and if they did ask me I would still not interfere. It was quite an embarrassment the day that happened as far as I was concerned, and you may rest assured that I spent a very bad day.

Mr. Sargent: Now you have changed your tune.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No I am not changing my tune. I am defending their integrity.

Mr. Sargent: What integrity is there in a case like this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a politician—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a politician, my decision—

Mr. Sargent: It was your job!

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a politician my decision may very well have been something else. That is precisely the reason why it should not be a political decision, and that is the way it will remain as long as I am head of this department.

Mr. Sargent: You cannot cope with the job.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will not interfere with the parole board so long as I am on this job. They will do their job without interference from me no matter how embarrassing it is to me.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member made quite a point.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order!

Mr. Chairman: Point of order!

Mr. Sargent: There is a point at issue here. If the Minister was embarrassed by the actions of the board then he has responsibility to the people of this province to—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Sargent: Then he has responsibility to the people of this province to do something about the board.

Mr. Chairman: That is no point of order whatsoever.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): You are talking out of both sides of your mouth.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am sure everyone else in this House understands the point I am making and I will not pursue that part of it any further.

Mr. Sargent: Quite a snow job you are doing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For the benefit of the hon. member for Sudbury, as far as what the judge should have or should not have done, as a matter of fact we went into this the first time this case was mentioned. In spite of what the judge said and what he might have felt, the fact remains he made it quite clear in his committal order that she was to serve nine months indefinite.

Mr. Sopha: That sentence was changed in the court of appeal.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well I will tell you how it was changed, it was changed—

Mr. Sopha: I never understood why it was changed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is the point, the point I am trying to make is that in the first instance the judge said nine months indefinite and a fine of $10,000 or in default thereof additional imprisonment for a period of six months. Now when the case was appealed the high court made sure for some reason or other – which I cannot understand, because everyone sentenced to a reformatory is automatically on an indefinite sentence; every female I should say, every female sentenced to a reformatory is automatically on an indefinite sentence. For some reason or other the supreme court added the words—they did not change the sentence except they added the word—"indefinite," as if it were necessary to point this out.

So if they felt this strongly about her they should have, in the view of the hon. member for Sudbury, sentenced her to penitentiary. They sentenced her and the parole board looks at this, presumably in addition to all the other reasons, including incidentally the woman's age—

Mr. Sopha: Just a moment, you cannot say those things unless you know what goes on.

Did the Crown appeal sentence? Did the Attorney General appeal sentence?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mrs. MacMillan appealed.

Mr. Sopha: She appealed?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: Did they cross-appeal?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not think they cross-appealed.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): This is out of order.

Mr. Sopha: What is out of order?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This department has nothing to do with the sentencing of prisoners.

Mr. Sopha: Perhaps you are right; but the Minister is talking about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, which I think is a valid one, is that two courts made quite certain that the correctional system, and, they were quite emphatic, that the correctional system should know that this was an indefinite sentence. Presumably the parole board took this into consideration.

Again I just want to emphasize that as far as I am concerned, this ends it. The gist of the criticism that has been directed at me in this case is that because of the potential political embarrassment involved in it, I should have interfered with the parole board. I did not then, I will not now, and I never shall.

Mr. Sopha: I want to make one final comment to make my position perfectly clear. I never said a scintilla, a smidgeon of anything to indicate that I ever questioned the integrity of that board. I said I did not. They were not very bright; that is fair comment. I do not think they were in the circumstances.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): That is not what the member's colleague says.

Mr. Sopha: And I hope in the future when dealing with a flagrant case like this, I hope they will tread more carefully, because they are like Caesar's wife, they are in the Caesar's wife category the same as the rest of us are. Not only must justice be done but it must appear to be done. And I hope they will appreciate that. And I say again there was grave concern among the public about the early parole of this woman.

Finally, I sum up by saying this, the Minister has failed, has utterly failed—the member for Sarnia will correct me if I am wrong —to show us a single parallel case, and in fact he has not cited any case where the parolee faced a charge of this seriousness, that this woman faces, for which she has not yet been tried. There has not been a single parallel case. And indeed—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How do you find an exactly parallel case? That is ridiculous. The hon. member is a lawyer, he ought to know that.

Mr. Sopha: I will put it this way. The parole board that the Minister says was so intelligent—before they paroled Viola MacMillan in these circumstances they should have made very sure there was a parallel case to buttress themselves; they should have made very sure.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Nonsense.

Mr. Sopha: We are asked to vote $1,608,000 and we would be remiss in our duty, in

view of all the editorial comment there has been across the length and breadth of this province about that action, if we did not stand up here and question it. I say again, I question it from the point of view that, having supported my argument with facts, that in all the circumstances they are not very bright.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: No one has ever been treated in the way Viola MacMillan was treated. I have a fellow going to jail for 45 days now and the Attorney General does not think it is enough, he is cross-appealing the sentence. He does not think it is enough. I do not come here and complain unless I am provoked. But you let this woman march out in the street after 60 days.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister if parole—if every Minister interrupted his colleagues as much as the Minister of Energy and Resources Management I do not know how he would ever get through his estimates when he gets the floor.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We will get through them.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, my question to the Minister, which I was attempting to make through the din from Sharbot Lake, is this: Is a man returned automatically to prison if he break parole—any of the regulations with regard to parole?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told not in every case. I am told this is another instance where they do not lay down a fast rule, he may be taken to a local county jail and have his case reviewed by the board; and they make their decision there whether he is to go back into the institution. On the other hand, they may decide because of circumstances perhaps—just a few days left or a minor breach of parole such as not carrying out one of the minor regulations perhaps of the rehab. officer—that they will not consider this a breach of parole.

Mr. MacDonald: I suppose it depends on what is minor, but let me give a case to the Minister. Certain aspects of it, I will have to agree, are indefensible. But the basic purpose of parole should not be lost sight of. This was a case of a chap who was paroled in Sault Ste. Marie—that is a good place to get out of—and he apparently got out of it.

An hon. member: That is a good place to be coming from.

Mr. MacDonald: He apparently got out of it and did not report to the rehabilitation officer, in fact they did not find him for a year. And when they found him, he had been working in an industry in the west end of Toronto, and apparently was completely rehabilitated. He had worked for a year, he was getting a good income, he was maintaining his family, he apparently had succeeded in the objective of parole—of being rehabilitated back into society. But as soon as he was found, he was immediately put back in the institution.

Let me acknowledge that there are aspects of this that cannot be defended. Obviously if you have parole regulations and you are supposed to report to your rehabilitation officer and you do not do so, one cannot just ignore such breaches. But when you discover that the person has, in effect, achieved the objective of parole, namely, successful rehabilitation, is it not a more advisable procedure that the case should be reviewed and perhaps the advice of the rehab. officer be solicited rather than an automatic return to the institution, which takes you right back to the original weary trail? I would appreciate the Minister's comment on that kind of handling of the situation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised it has been agreed this man will be paroled. I have the summary here if the hon. member would like to read it. I am told—

Mr. MacDonald: You mean you have spotted the case?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is in here, it is in the file—

Mr. MacDonald: He was returned to the institution and he is now going to be paroled again?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All the cases are automatically reviewed and his case was scheduled to appear before the Ontario board of parole on May 22. I understand the board of parole has granted him parole in the very short period of time it would take, which I cannot give the member at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: The second time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, paroled again, probably because of the circumstances the hon. member has outlined.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, the situation in respect of Viola MacMillan is of interest to me from a different aspect. Let me say to begin with, I am not at all interested in Viola MacMillan. I am delighted she got out; the only thing is, I am sorry that others were not able to get out under the same circumstances. The point I wish to make—I am very sorry the Minister was not able to find an analogous case because it would have relieved the minds of many of us who are still not satisfied—but I want to tell you the viewpoint on this matter of parole and Mrs. MacMillan at the Mercer reformatory. The Mercer reformatory is one of the better run reformatories in the province, and I must say how pleased I was when I toured it a short time ago with the member for Lakeshore, to see the attitude of the staff and the care that is given to the prisoners there. One of the progressive things that is done in this reformatory is that they have set up an inmates committee and it is allowed to bring—

Mr. Chairman: Is this all in the question of parole?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman.

This inmates committee is allowed to bring the complaints of the inmates to the attention of the authorities. One of the complaints of the inmates is in relation to parole. They were very upset about the parole system and on February 29 of this year, they sent a letter to the parole board in relation to their complaints. This letter, of course, received the prior approval of the officials at the reformatory before it was allowed to be sent. Because it shows the attitude of the inmate toward parole, I would like to read it in full. It is headed, "the Mercer reformatory, 1155 King Street west, Toronto 3, February 29, 1968." It is addressed to Mr. F. Potts, chairman, provincial parole board, 484 University Avenue, Toronto 1.

Dear sir,

We, the inmates of the Mercer reformatory for women, have become most concerned with the low percentage of inmates fortunate enough to make parole these last few months particularly. Our concept of parole is based on believing that if an inmate has served a sufficient portion of her sentence, has shown an improvement of character and attitude and has a feasible plan worked out with a responsible and acceptable person or organization, her chances for parole should be considered fairly good. We understand the percentage of men being granted parole is much higher than that for women, and it makes us wonder where the obvious prejudices lie, and what we can do about improving relations between ourselves and the parole board.

When an inmate's case is called for review, her hopes are built up into expecting parole. If the parole board has examined a case and decided against parole for an inmate, then we strongly feel that the inmate should be advised by letter, thus avoiding embarrassment and unnecessary release of pent-up emotion which is very upsetting to the whole house. If the board sits at the Mercer for hearings during a morning, then we feel that all results should be posted that day, and not delayed as was the case recently. When an inmate appears before the board members for only a few minutes, her image is often damaged by nervousness, and so on, and it is highly unfair to judge whether or not she is ready for parole on such short contact. We would like to see a plan in force similar to the federal parole system whereby an inmate is interviewed intensively by a regional representative of the board, prior to the date set by hearing.

When an inmate is rejected or deferred for parole, then some reason should be given, either to the inmate or to the rehabilitation organization involved, in order for her to better her position for parole at a later date. It would also seem that a person's progress over the months of living in the institution is completely overlooked and unconsidered in favour of reviewing her past history, for which she has paid dearly and which should not have any bearing on her future plans which, when requesting parole, she is trying to better.

Parole is something that concerns every inmate of the institution, and when the percentage of acceptees is so low, it becomes very discouraging indeed. If parole is granted on the basic principle of helping an inmate to better her prospects of the future, then we as a group feel very strongly that a long hard look should be taken by the parole board at the attitude used upon which the last paroles were refused. It would seem that the purpose of applying for parole is defeated before the inmate's case is given a fair perusal. According to various cases, indeterminate sentences are treated on an equal basis to indefinite sentences.

Perhaps we have been badly misinformed by the courts but it is our understanding that an inmate serving an indeterminate sentence is eligible for parole before serving one third of her time. We would like this point clarified. Our general feeling is that a member of the institution's staff, with the necessary qualifications to better the inmate's position with the board, be permitted to sit in on the hearings each month. As we have already stated, we as a body, and individually are concerned with the parole board's recent findings in particular, and we would appreciate being given the opportunity of bettering our positions for future parole considerations. Trusting you will, as chairman of the provincial parole board, give our letter your consideration and attention, we shall await your reply.

Yours very truly,

that is signed by the secretary of the inmates committee.

To give you just one piece of background to this letter. What upsets the inmates so very much was that in January and February of this year, in January, 11 inmates of this reformatory applied for parole, and 10 were rejected. In February, 17 applied for parole, and 16 were rejected. This situation changed very radically at the beginning of March, for reasons that I will go into very shortly, or reasons which the inmates believe. But before I go on to that, I would like to ask the Minister if any of the suggestions made by the inmates to the parole board, and which of them, are going to be followed, and if they have been given consideration?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, this is a very difficult position that I am in. This is a pilot project which we are trying at Mercer reformatory. The success of this system depends upon the successful operation of the inmates committee. Now, for me to make any comment on this might jeopardize that. I may be inclined to say something which may antagonize the committee. I mean, if this is to operate properly, this should not be made a subject for discussion in this Legislature. This is an inmate committee, and as I say, it is a project. They should have been allowed to be left alone, to operate this in their own way as has been set up in the institution. They sent a letter to the chairman of the parole board and whatever the chairman of the parole board has arranged with that committee should be a matter for an institutional programme not subject to public discussion.

As a matter of fact, as a result of the public discussion which has occurred as a result of the hon. member's visit there and the disclosure of something which appeared on their bulletin board, there was a great deal of difficulty at that time at that institution. It was a great risk, and for a time it looked like the whole programme would have to be scuttled.

Mr. Shulman: Why?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I thought I made myself clear. I hope I made myself clear to the other members. It is a project of a committee of the institution. It is made up of inmates, and we are trying to teach them independence and to make their own decisions and this sort of thing, so that they will not become as we call it "institutionalized." That is so that they will think for themselves and so on. If that is the case, they should not be subject to a public discussion of some of their deliberations, and then have comments made on it by either the hon. member or myself. I may say something in criticism of this which puts their committee in bad light. It is a project which I think would be better left alone to those in the institution. The hon. member has already stated that they are doing a wonderful job. Why not let them do their job without interference from outside?

Mr. MacDonald: I am sure they would not object to reasonable comment.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1903?

Mr. Shulman: Oh, no, we are not through with vote 1902 yet, Mr. Chairman, not by a long shot!

Mr. Chairman: You may be through. If you are going to speak to vote 1902, you may be through or not.

Mr. Shulman: I beg your pardon, I am going to speak to vote 1902.

Mr. Chairman: I will say whether you are through or not!

Mr. Shulman: And I will say when I am through or not. Not you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: On a point of order, vote 1902 carried one hour and a half ago. The Chairman, the Deputy Speaker, occupying this place did permit the member for High Park to ask some questions because he had been absent when vote 1902 carried.

Mr. MacDonald: That is not right, this is obstructionism.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): But surely, Mr. Chairman, this cannot be permitted to go on indefinitely when that particular vote has carried?

Mr. MacDonald: I would just like to clarify that point of order. This is the kind of legalistic obstruction at which the hon. gentleman has become almost a professional in the House. It is true that the chairman at the time called it, and said that it had passed—

Mr. White: And it carried, yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Because it was when we were resuming the business of the House, and he said why he had called it, and nobody had objected, he recognized that the hon. member for Lakeshore had not spoken, so he gave him the right to do it, and there are many others that wanted to speak. To go back and drag up this legalistic point is the kind of obstructionism on that side of the House that prolongs the proceedings.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member take his seat, please? The member for High Park.

Mr. White: Vote 1902 has carried.

Mr. MacDonald: It has not.

Mr. Chairman: The chair will say when it has carried and it has not carried, and I am listening to the member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, before I go on to my next point, I would just like to point out to the hon. Minister that I did not wish to discuss the inmates committee except to praise it. What I wish to discuss are the suggestions that they made for improving the parole procedures. Some of them are obviously good commonsense. I cannot see how it can possibly endanger the committee to consider these suggestions. For example, our general feeling is that a member of the institution staff with the necessary qualifications to better the inmate's position with the board should be permitted to sit in on the hearings each month. I do not wish to discuss the committee, I wish to discuss the suggestions, which are good suggestions whether they come from the committee or the Minister or anyone else.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What does the hon. member mean?

Mr. Shulman: All I am asking the Minister is: Are the suggestions being considered?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we are always pleased to consider any suggestions made by the inmate committee of the Mercer reformatory.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1902 carried?

Mr. Shulman: Not quite, Mr. Chairman, I have another matter.

Mr. White: That vote carried one and a half hours ago.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the member for London South want to persist in defying the chair?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has made some mention of a matter which the member for Lakeshore and I made notice of on the staff bulletin board at Mercer, which is in relation to parole. And because it is relevant to this discussion, particularly the matters raised by the member for Grey-Bruce and the member for Sudbury, I would like to pursue it, because the chairman of the parole board, subsequent to receiving this letter was good enough to come to the Mercer reformatory and he was good enough to speak to a number of the inmates there, plus members of the staff, and as a result of his visit a letter was written up by the inmates, given approval by the staff, and put on the bulletin board. This particular letter, the portion which is of interest in relation to this particular matter reads as follows:

> On March 15, 1968, Mr. Potts, chairman of the Ontario board of parole, was here to speak to the corridor representatives regarding our letter to the parole board.

I am not reading the whole letter, I am reading relevant parts.

> If you have been deferred or given a no-action parole slip, the reason is not given to you at that time because it is usually complex. If you write to the parole board, they will send to you a written explanation of the refusal of your case.

This is what the inmates and the staff members believed Mr. Potts had said to them. Unfortunately, it is in direct contradiction to what the Minister has said in the House tonight. I would like to get that point straightened out.

The letter goes on:

> If you have other charges outstanding it is best to get them—

May I finish, please, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Shulman: No, I am not going to allow —may I finish, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On a point of order, the hon. member just a moment ago said he did not want to make an issue of the minutes of the meeting of this committee. Now the hon. member is going into the details of the minutes of their meeting.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, he reveals something that is directly in contradiction to the Minister's earlier statement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, then we understand he is prepared to make an issue of the minutes of the meeting.

Mr. MacDonald: Do not drag a red herring in on it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He can speak for himself, I am sure. Is that what he is doing?

Mr. Shulman: If I could speak to this point of order—

Mr. Chairman: Let us have no more points of order. The member will finish what he was going to say.

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry, the Chairman does not wish me to speak to the point of order. I will come back to the paragraph I was quoting:

> If you have other charges outstanding, it is best to get them cleared up as soon as possible because you cannot be given parole while another charge is outstanding.

Mr. Sopha: That is what I always believed.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I find this is in direct contradiction to what has been said here by the Minister tonight. I have no further comments on this particular portion of this vote. I would like to go on with some other matters unless the Minister wishes to make a comment on this matter.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1902?

Mr. Shulman: No. I wish to go on to some other matters unless the Minister has some comments he wishes to make.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, again, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one correction. The hon. member stated that these minutes were approved by Mr. Thompson, the superintendent. I should point out to him that Mr. Thompson does not approve minutes—he approves them being put up on the bulletin board.

Now, to go into all of this and make comments on what the committee had put in their minutes is again going to put me into a position—there is an attempt to put me in a position where I may be criticizing the actions of that committee and I am not going to jeopardize the work.

As a matter of fact, quite frankly I was faced with a possible resignation of some top-flight staff of that institution—that staff which the hon. member for High Park praises so highly—because a public issue was made of these minutes and the reply of my department to the hon. member's charges.

These are minutes of a meeting of Mercer reformatory inmates and they belong to them and no one else. I am not going to get engaged in a discussion as to whether I agree or disagree with them or whether there are any errors in them or not. That is the business of that committee.

Mr. Sopha: Does the parole board agree with them?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I can certainly understand the Minister's comment in the light of the facts that have been exposed.

Mr. Chairman: Could we get back to vote 1902?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, 1902 refers to parole and rehabilitation. I would just like to draw to the Minister's attention an article in *Time*, dated March 29, 1968, which is entitled: "Criminals should be cured, not caged". It is a very lengthy article which I do not intend to read at this time. I hope the Minister is familiar with it. But the matter which I would like to bring up—one of the matters which is suggested here—is in relation to the problem of conjugal visits and homosexuality, and I would like to quote just one line here:

> It is ironic that only in Mississippi are married convicts allowed conjugal visits with their wives. Sexual deprivation in other American prisons incite riots, mental illness and homosexuality.

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that homosexuality is one of the problems in our prisons. It is an admitted problem in every prison we have gone through, including some of the boys' training schools. It is not an overwhelming problem, but it is a problem which you run into in any society where men

are cooped up without the possibility of female companionship.

May I say that I believe that the staff of the various institutions have done the very best they can with the problem, segregating active homosexuals from the other prisoners as best they can. I have no criticism whatsoever to make of the staff effort in this problem. But in spite of the very best efforts at the very best places — I am thinking of places like Burtch, and when I say Burtch I am speaking of staff, not facilities, which are abominable. The staff at Burtch are superb, the same at Brookside. But in spite of the excellent staff, this problem exists and I wish to ask the Minister if consideration has been given to allowing conjugal visits of wives to prisoners, not as a right, but as a privilege in return for good behaviour?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, certainly the hon. member should realize the implications in that. In the first place, I think it is the most disgraceful method of trying to solve the problem that one could think about.

Mr. Shulman: Having the wives visiting?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, having a wife come and visit an inmate at an institution obviously for that purpose. I cannot think of a more undignified method of arranging what the hon. member suggested. Might he also suggest to me how—this is a problem which has concerned correctional people all across the world—how would he look after the unmarried man in a case like that?

Mr. Shulman: Is the Minister asking me a question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: I am not suggesting that this is a universal cure. I am saying that for the married men this will solve the problem, which is an admitted problem. I do not say it is a cure for the unmarried men. I am asking the Minister on behalf of the married men. Can he not set up quarters in his reformatories where, for good behaviour, a wife can have overnight visits?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, there are much better ways and certainly the implications involved for the single men, who are not going to be permitted this sort of thing, would create such terrible problems in an institution, Mr. Chairman. It would create more problems than it would solve.

I would like to tell the hon. member that men in most jurisdictions in the world have struggled with this and no one has come up with an answer yet. My deputy was down to see the system in Mississippi and the reports he brought back are of such a disgraceful nature that we would not even consider that kind of a system. We do not know what the answer to this is yet. It may very well be there may be some aspects of the bill which is before this House which may provide a better solution than any of these plans which are ostensibly or obviously for conjugal matters.

Mr. Shulman: The Minister has said there are better methods. I am interested in what these better methods are.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not saying there were better methods.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps I misheard the Minister. Mr. Chairman, may I say I was not suggesting that we model our prison system on Mississippi. There are other countries which use this system, which I think are probably a little more well-run than that particular state.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): And more persons in jail, too. It will not work.

Mr. Shulman: No, you are wrong. Mr. Chairman, I must point out the hon. member is wrong. Our country, unfortunately, ranks first in the number of people in jail.

The other matter I would like to bring up, under rehabilitation—and I would like to quote from a very interesting pamphlet I have here. It is called: "The county jail—the front door corrections." It was written by the hon. Minister of The Department of Reform Institutions and there is just one line I want to quote—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would you mind telling the House by whom it was published. I would not want them to think I was publisher of my book like some other members.

Mr. Shulman: There is no publisher's name on it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was by the John Howard society.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you very much. The one line I wish to quote here:

> the statement of purpose — the main purposes of The Department of Reform Institutions are:

1. To hold in custody for a prescribed period, those persons sentenced by the courts to its jurisdiction.

2. To attempt to modify the attitude of those in its care, whether children or adults, to such an extent that their actions upon release will be essentially law abiding rather than law breaking but to provide them—

and this is the part which I wish to draw to your attention:

with the kind of training and treatment that will afford them better opportunities for successful personal and social adjustment.

I think that last phrase is the key for the whole matter of rehabilitation and that is why I find it so very disturbing that the largest proportion of those people first incarcerated, particularly males, in our institutions —something like 80 per cent of them are not receiving any type of this training and treatment. Most of them are put to work in industry, and there is a great industry that is being run by our institutions, of folding cloths, or making licence plates and I would like to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, this would come under the next vote.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I was waiting to see if the member would get back off institutions and back to rehabilitation.

Mr. Shulman: I was talking about rehabilitation. If the Minister is agreeable to bringing it up in a later vote I am quite—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Has it to do with rehabilitation?

Mr. Shulman: Well no, it involves a number of institutions. What I am really talking about is the rehabilitation there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The types of programmes they have in the various institutions?

Mr. Shulman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I would think it had better come under the institutions—keep it clean.

Mr. Shulman: All right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In more ways than one.

Mr. Shulman: I am almost through, Mr. Chairman. There is just one further brief matter. The Minister, at one point of his interchange with the gentleman to my right, said he could look at any file he wished to look at.

What I am asking is: in future, will he be willing, if a member here is unhappy about the treatment and the fact that they cannot get a reason for a parole, will he be willing to look at the file and find out, at least on a confidential basis, or even if he does not wish to tell a member, that the parolee—or rather the inmate—was refused his or her parole for a valid reason?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, of course I could look at the file, but really I would have to have before me all the things that went on in the interview between the board and the interviewee. His attitude may be such that the board may not have considered that he was ready for parole. He may have been hostile. There are many things that come into it which may not show on paper. The hon. member's suggestion that I call and have a discussion with the board on all these instances would be impossible. I have told the hon. member—I told him and I told other members—what I could gather from the general departmental file and I said it may very well be that these are some of the factors which may have militated against these people receiving parole.

But I am, quite frankly, concerned about getting involved, to a closer extent, with the parole board in individual cases. I know it is very nice for the hon. member to say, "I took it up with the Minister. I took it up with the parole board and his answer is as follows or I do not agree with them," or something of that nature. There are many implications to this. If the hon. member has a case he would like me to look up in the parole board files, I will ask the parole board to let me see the file. What he gets in reply to that I am not going to be able to guarantee.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Because as you know I have asked you to look up cases and you will recall a letter which I read earlier tonight which really says nothing. To come back to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member must appreciate the fact that once you start this, the hon. member will be deluged with dozens of, if not hundreds of letters of this nature. In addition to this, letters of another nature from all the inmates —all our system will be clogged up with this sort of thing. Unless there is an appearance—

Mr. White: He does not care as long as he gets his name in the paper.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Unless there is a *prima facie* case of an injustice, unless there is some reason to believe that the parole board is not doing its job, why not let it continue to do the great job that everyone in the field—in the correctional field—has stated publicly that it is doing so well.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sopha: Except with Viola MacMillan.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that is your opinion.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, may I point out that I have already been deluged with letters from inmates of prisons—hundreds of them—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, of course.

Mr. Shulman: —but I have not bothered the Minister with them because we investigate them before we bother the Minister. I believe I have got in touch with the Minister, with four or, at the most, five cases in the months in which I have been in this House. Certainly less than one a month. I take great care not to bother any of the Ministers with cases which I do not feel are justified. But here, I brought up a case earlier today and I would like to make comment—

Mr. Sopha: He advertises for them.

Mr. Kerr: You are right, he buys them their stationery.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to make comment again because the Minister—

Mr. Chairman: Order. May I point out to the member for High Park that he has submitted the Minister to an exhausting questioning in connection with parole, rehabilitation, various cases. The Minister even went so far as to discuss the Viola MacMillan case. It seems to the Chairman that the member for High Park is becoming repetitious, and I hardly think that in these estimates there should be any repetition of the submission made by the member to the Minister.

Mr. Shulman: I assure you I will not be repetitious and if I say anything that I said before, I hope you will draw it to my attention.

Mr. Chairman: I will listen very carefully.

Mr. Shulman: The hon. Minister has said earlier this evening that this letter which I referred to him was a forgery. Since that time I have had an opportunity to compare the writing of this letter with other letters which I have from the same inmate and I would like to inform him, through you, sir, that it is the same writing. I would be happy to supply these letters to the Minister, so I would like to suggest to him that perhaps his information was incorrect.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not important, anyway.

Mr. Shulman: All right, Mr. Chairman. I would just—to conclude and I am concluding now—I would just like to ask in this specific case which I—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Shulman: —which I find a rather flagrant one and particularly, in comparison, as the hon. member for Sudbury said, with the MacMillan case. I would like to ask the Minister if he would be so kind as to look into this case and see what the circumstances are.

Vote 1902 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: I think votes 1903 and 1904 overlap to a considerable degree. There are institutions, the Ontario reformatories, the industrial institutions, and so on, and I believe, if the members would concur, we can have discussion on both votes at the same time to avoid any difficulty in dealing with the votes separately. So we will deal with votes 1903 and 1904 together. The member for London South.

On votes 1903 and 1904:

Mr. White: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not know which of these votes my own remarks come under. They will be very brief. I was one of a large number of citizens to be extremely well pleased by the government's announcement last fall to take over the cost of administration of justice including jails of one kind or another which have been the responsibility of the municipalities. I was well pleased, because I think it is one of those areas of government which are now better handled at a senior level. I expect that decades ago when the assignment of these responsibilities was made and when transportation and communications systems were very rudimentary that the municipal level of government was the appropriate one for local jails, housing short term offenders.

But, of course, things have changed and now I believe that the province should, as it has, take over this responsibility and attendant costs. I make mention of this, Mr. Chairman,

because for the last two or three years a very real effort has been made by large numbers of thoughtful and well informed citizens in the London area to construct a regional jail serving three or four counties in that part of Ontario. It will come as a surprise to some of the members here to learn that the county jail in London is the oldest structure in the city, built at the same time as the court house, and that it could have held Napoleon Bonaparte during his second incarceration. It was available to prisoners at that time. It has been condemned unmercifully by jurists, grand juries, lawyers, and citizens like myself who have visited this building. And as a result of this public concern and the movement which was spearheaded by the able officers and concerned members of the John Howard society, quite a lot of progress has been made in the last two years to persuade the municipalities in that part of the province to come together for a regional jail. There was some reluctance, as you might imagine.

For instance, I think in Oxford county, the warden and his colleagues on county council were not anxious to incur new capital and increased operating costs, because the numbers of prisoners in that jail are very small. Their *per diem* costs were extremely low, in the order of $6 per day, and so they were not in a hurry, as one can appreciate, to enter into a new arrangement which would cost substantially more. There were these and other reasons for the delay. Those reasons have now disappeared, I suggest, now that the province has taken over these costs and this responsibility. I think that the objections which had been posed and which had some validity, have now gone by the wayside.

I stand in my place, Mr. Chairman, to ask this Minister and the government to ensure that the change in responsibility from the municipal to provincial level, should not further delay the construction of a regional jail to serve the counties of Elgin, Middlesex, Perth, and maybe Huron. I think that it would be unjust and inequitable if this progressive step were to introduce a new element of delay insofar as our part of the province is concerned. I make that plea very sincerely to the government.

I am going to make just brief reference to a comment which the member for Grey South made when he wondered if the $10,000 to $12,000 paid to parole officers was an extravagance.

An hon. member: It was the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. White: Grey-Bruce. My expectation is that they are being underpaid.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. We have completed the vote on parole and rehabilitation. We are dealing with provincial jails.

Mr. White: I am not going to speak on parole now. I am moved to ask if it is fair for the taxpayers in this province, most of them working men, some of them in straitened circumstances—and I see that my friend from Sudbury is following my words with care. I now ask, Mr. Chairman, if it is fair for the taxpayers in this province to pay $11,000 a year to the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) so that he can spend most of this session in Montreal—working for the socialists? And concluding in my brief remark, I express the view that the member for Scarborough West and the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown) are being flagrantly unethical in accepting their indemnities while absenting themselves to work on private projects.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The member's remarks are out of order.

On votes 1903 and 1904?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury has the floor.

Mr. Sopha: Part-time members, part-time workers for Brown Camps, and part-time organizers for the NDP. The champion part-time.

Mr. Chairman: May I suggest to the hon. member that we have started out with the provincial jails, and perhaps we could keep to the discussion and finish with provincial jails. Is this agreeable to the members?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Chairman, it was not this party that started the digression. The digression came from that side of the House, and then from this side of the House. I think that we should retaliate with that back bench that has not been there for a week!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for London South was out of order, and the Chairman ruled him so in his final remarks. He started out with the discussion of provincial jails, and I simply suggest to the members that perhaps we could keep on provincial jails at this point in order to keep some semblance of order.

Mr. Martel: I suggest that the Chairman should have jumped out of the chair when this man was out of order.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss some of the conditions in the Burwash institution. I—

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order, please. The member will take his place when the chair calls him to order.

Mr. Martel: I am talking about Burwash.

Mr. Chairman: I am suggesting that we discuss the matter of provincial jails, which is shown on page 119 of the estimates in votes 1903 and 1904. I would ask the Minister if any reference to Burwash is shown in the estimates on page 118, under industrial farms.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. I would urge the members to stay on provincial jails at this point. They can come back to Burwash or Mimico or any other institution. But let us deal with provincial jails.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, can I ask you if we take it that vote 1903, that amount of money, refers to provincial jails on page 119?

Mr. Chairman: I do not believe that it is possible to separate from the total in the votes. The provincial jails are included in votes 1903 and 1904.

Mr. Sopha: Well, simply put, institutions are provincial jails, and the rest of them are adult institutions and industrial operations.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The whole point, if I may suggest—the whole point, was that the heading adult institutions and industrial operations, Ontario reformatories, and on the other pages, industrial farms, provincial jails and so on, do not really belong in the estimates. They are put in there so that the hon. members can discuss the institutions themselves. If they really formed the body of the estimates, they would come under vote 1903, which is institutions. So, the suggestion is that when we are discussing vote 1903, we would discuss all of the institutions; and we may as well discuss vote 1904 because the industrial operations are in the various institutions. That is why the chair suggested that we take them all together. But within that framework, I would suggest that we follow the Chairman's suggestion that we deal first with the jails, now that they have been started; and then the reformatories; and perhaps training schools after that.

Mr. Chairman: May I point out to the members that it is simply because the first speaker on these votes talked about provincial jails. The important thing is that the Chairman recognized it. Provincial jails. The member for Lakeshore on provincial jails.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I will speak on provincial jails in just one moment, but on a point of clarification. I do not know quite how you are going to handle it. We can discuss each reformatory in turn, but I have some remarks that I want to make in an overall way about industrial operations. Shall I make them now?

Mr. Chairman: I put it to the members that, if they wish, they can take each institution separately. Guelph, Mimico, in the order that they come. They can make general remarks. I do not mind.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, we will do that, too, Mr. Chairman, but I wanted to take the overall operation of, say, industrial operations.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They would come under reformatories, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lawlor: As far as provincial jails are concerned, Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk for a moment about the Don. We have raised in this House, without any great measure of satisfaction, at an earlier time, the problems in these jails of psychiatric attention to the prisoners.

Having looked at a number of county jails in the province, and asked questions around, I find that in most cases—for instance, at Wentworth county jail—you have a psychiatrist on staff or on call. As a matter of fact you have two, and they are the only ones. The regular medical practitioner, or jail surgeon as he is called anachronistically, has nothing whatsoever to do, as I understand it, with the inspection of prisoners as to their mental condition. He stays free and clear so that you have somebody who is competent to judge the ability of prisoners to stand trial, and as to their reference over to psychiatric institutions.

This, peculiarly speaking, is not true about the Don jail, the cheapest institution in the province, the one with the largest number in turnover of inmates. This institution has a doctor—I have nothing to say against him or for him, for that matter, as to his medical qualifications as a pure doctor—he has been there since 1941, and is very grossly underpaid. Nevertheless, he has saddled on his

shoulders the task of seeing, interviewing and making adjudication on the state of prisoners to stand trial.

I am sure the legal profession of this province was not aware, or even particularly alive, to the condition that exists there. A man comes before the magistrate's court. He comes from the Don jail. If there is some question raised as to his mental condition, as to problems of insanity or problems of grasping the true nature and intent of his act—anything like that—he is referred back to the Don jail, then brought on for trial.

The jail surgeon has no more competence to judge this matter, I suggest to you, than my younger son. The mere tenure in office does not qualify him, and I suspect he has very little knowledge of Freud and none of Jung at all. He says that from the way they talk, and the way they act, you can tell if a man is mentally ill. I suggest you can tell no such thing—that a wide range of depressive people remain steely cool, and it is extremely difficult to tell what state of mind a man is in. Certainly this condition, which exists as far as I know nowhere else in the province, does exist in this particular jail.

I am begging you, I am suggesting to you, to review it and to change it because if he refers them back and says in his opinion they are mentally ill and not fit to stand trial, then of course the magistrate will refer them out into the regular mental hospitals where they will come in contact with a psychiatrist and get good care.

If he says, on the contrary, that they are capable of standing trial, then they stand trial; and if they are convicted then they go to the regular institutions of this province. It would be more or less haphazard whether or not they would then come into contact with adequate, or any, psychiatric care at all, unless they ran amok or did something completely atrocious. Apart from that, these people would not. They would be sentenced to considerable terms—it is possible for ten years and longer—to institutions of this province without an opportunity for this type of care—on the most unfair basis.

Presuming that they are mentally ill, presuming that they have never been given adequate testing to determine that, they are treated as ordinary prisoners. They are no doubt among the mischief makers in the institutions, are no doubt recalcitrant prisoners, no doubt spend half their time in the hole, no doubt cause all kinds of difficulties in the prison system; and all based upon the word of a totally unqualified individual at the beginning of the whole chain.

That condition, I suggest, has gone too far. It has existed for a long time in this city. I think that the legal profession should raise its voice on being informed of the conditions. Without even asking for that particular development, the Minister is sufficiently cognizant and sufficiently good willed, I am sure, to take the matter under advisement. If he has any comments I would be pleased to hear them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I just have to add that the Don jail is not yet under our control, but in any case the hon. member's whole argument is based upon his opinion that a medical practitioner is not competent to judge the mental competence—

Mr. Lawlor: It is generally accepted.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I do not know where the hon. member gets that idea; medical practitioners every day certify people as being mentally incompetent, do they not?

Mr. Shulman: But they are seen by a psychiatrist immediately after.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: After they are certified.

Mr. Shulman: But these people are not. That is the whole point.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Many of them are seen by a psychiatrist.

In the first place there is a psychiatrist available to the Don jail in the person of Dr. Cooper from our head office. There is a whole range of psychiatric facilities in Metro Toronto. There is the solicitor for the person who is not satisfied with the decision of the practitioner at the jail that this person is mentally competent; he can ask for a remand for psychiatric examination.

There is quite a to-do made about this sort of thing and I have never really been able to understand this.

Now, if the hon. member is suggesting, if he wants to say that the doctors at the Don jail are overworked, that is another matter altogether, we will agree with that. But to suggest that they are not competent to judge the mental competence of a person; all medical practitioners tell me that by law they are.

Mr. Shulman: By law?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Naturally by law; how else do we operate?

Mr. Shulman: On this particular point, Mr. Chairman: The whole point here is that it is very true that any medical man in this province may certify—or rather any two medical men—may certify someone as mentally ill and he will then be sent to a mental institution, but they are then examined by a psychiatrist so that if those doctors have made a mistake the person is let out.

In this particular situation, the examination is being done by general practitioners with no psychiatric training whatsoever; for the Minister to suggest that if the defence counsel is not satisfied he can get the opinion of the psychiatrist, this is just not so.

I have a letter here from the Clarke institute of psychiatry which was sent to Chief Magistrate A. O. Klein. I think this underlines the situation very clearly and proves why you must have a full-time psychiatrist at the institution.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is absolute nonsense and you know it.

Mr. Shulman: If the Minister of Health will be so kind as to listen to this letter he will realize it is not quite so much nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is absolute nonsense and you know it as a practitioner.

Mr. Shulman: This is dated March 12, 1968, it is from the Clarke institute of psychiatry, it is signed by Dr. R. E. Turner, chief of service, forensic science.

> To Chief Magistrate Klein.
> Your Worship:
>
> We feel it is important for you and the magistrates to know the reasons for the increasing delays in arranging appointments for statutory referrals. We are extremely short of professional staff at the present time and have only Dr. Zacek and Dr. Howie to handle outpatients statutory referrals. We have no postgraduate psychiatrist in training since December 31, 1967, for the first time since the forensic clinic opened in 1956.
>
> This is a result of a general decline in physicians undertaking psychiatric training which began three years ago. The situation is improving but the effect of this improvement will not reach us until such physicians in training reach at least the third-year level.
>
> At this moment statutory appointments are booked until May 15 with yet another ten of such referrals still to be assigned appointments. This means that a statutory outpatient referral request today will likely not be reported to the referring magistrate until the summer.
>
> I am enclosing an explanatory letter which will accompany all such new referrals.

And there is a letter along with it to the individual magistrates saying that they just cannot give any assessment until the summer. So the result is that when a defence counsel goes into a case where he knows—and I have one specific case—where he knows that the doctors at the Don jail have made a mistake and he wants to get a psychiatrist to give an opinion, he cannot rely on the Clarke institute. If the person is so unfortunate as not to have a large sum of money to get a private psychiatrist there is just no recourse.

I do not wish to waste the time of the House, but I have here four letters concerning people who were examined by the physicians at the Don jail. They had been referred for mental examination by the magistrate after being charged with certain offences. The letters describing their mental examination are rather pitiful.

In each case it took something under 12 minutes, two visits of some 12 minutes, with each of the individual doctors asking the most cursory questions and filling out a form. I do not think any psychiatrist would consider such an examination competent.

I think it is quite understandable why this system grew up. It is because of a very ridiculous salary that is given to the Don jail physician. I believe it is less than an intern is paid at the present time in the smaller hospitals in Toronto. In order to supplement his income he gets his extra $15 for each of the 300-odd patients he examines every year.

This is a bad system. The doctor should be paid a suitable salary and those patients whose mental competence is in question should be diverted to a proper place. I would like to draw this to the Minister's attention. I think this is terribly important.

Can I go back to this report again, from 1954? I would like to quote from page 44 on this very point. It reads as follows:

> There should be provisions for transfer of inmates suffering from a mental disorder, but not certifiable, from a custodial institution to a hospital, or other suitable place of treatment.

And then more to the point, on page 201:

> It is no more logical to examine persons suspected of being mentally ill in a jail

than it would be to examine persons suspected of having a tumor in a jail. Those who are sick, or appear to be sick, should go to a hospital, whether the sickness in question is physical or mental.

Jails are literally safe and comfortable places for ordinary purposes, but they lack such facilities as padded rooms and restraining jackets that are necessary to ensure the safety of one who may be mentally ill.

There is also considerable question as to whether they are comfortable for mental patients from the medical and psychiatric points of view.

Just to elaborate on this vote further. The member for Lakeshore and I went down to see where these suspected mentally-ill prisoners were kept. Then there was a great discussion in this House as to how long they were kept there, and frankly it does not matter, because—let me tell you—that any person who is on the verge, who is mentally upset, if kept in those surroundings would be pushed over the edge. This I can assure you.

Mr. Lawlor: That is right. Dreadful place.

Mr. Shulman: Let me tell you what the surroundings are for this particular—

Mr. Lawlor: They are all in together.

Mr. Shulman: The surroundings for these suspected mentally-ill people are one large cell. When we visited the cell, there were no guards present, but outside there was a gentleman. He was a convicted drunk and his function was that, if anything went wrong, if one of the prisoners were to attack another, he was to call and a guard would run in.

The fact that nurses are on duty in other parts of the institution, really is quite irrelevant. These people we saw were lying there, or sitting on the chair, there was no reading material inside this one communal cell. There was a movie some years ago called The Snakepit and this is a parody of that movie.

What a terrible way to treat people who may be mentally ill. The ones who are mentally healthy will survive it. The ones who are mentally ill, who are on the verge of becoming mentally ill, will not survive it. And what is worse mistakes are made. I know of one case, where I am convinced an error was made, and surely this is the boy Mario who I went to visit in the Burtch reformatory. This was a lad who—I will tell this story, because this typifies the horrible thing that can happen.

This was a mental defective who had never been in trouble. Did not have the competence to be in trouble. One day an older individual gave him a drink of alcohol, and said: "Do you want some more? Throw a brick through that window, and climb in and get those cases of liquor." He pointed to the liquor store, and this boy threw a brick through the window, climbed inside, took out two cases of alcohol, and got away with it strangely enough. He took it to this man who had asked him to do this, and went home to bed.

Later that night, the police picked up the man who was holding the alcohol, and they said: "Where did you get it? We know that a store was broken into." He said: "Well, I didn't do it." They said: "Well, if you will tell us who broke into the store, we will let you go." This is the deal that was made. They laid no charges against this man. They let him go. But they came and they picked up Mario at his home and they laid charges of breaking and entering.

It was obvious to the magistrate, it is obvious to everyone, that the boy was mentally defective. He can hardly talk, and when he does get out his words they are slow and stilted and often irrelevant. So the magistrate referred the boy to the Don jail for a mental examination. The doctor said he was mentally competent to stand trial.

The lawyer who was involved was upset and he asked to have a psychiatrist see the boy. The psychiatrist appeared and gave evidence that the boy was mentally defective, but the boy was sentenced. He was sentenced, I believe, to 7 months definite and 6 months indefinite, and he was sent to Guelph.

At Guelph they have a system of taking out the boys who presumably are trainable to be sent to other institutions to learn a trade, and somehow, goodness knows how, he was picked out as one of the boys who could be trained. He was sent to Burtch. This already raises another question: how they do the selecting. But anyway, he got down to Burtch, and I visited him at Burtch, and I spoke to a very fine man who was in charge there. What they did, they put him in what they thought was the easiest thing to learn, which was the carpentry class. The only trouble was, he could not learn.

So I said: "Well, does he not hold up the rest of the class?" They said: "We do the best we can with him. We are kind to him and we try to give him individual attention, and try and bring him along."

So what happened was—here is a boy in a carpentry class, who has no chance whatsoever of learning carpentry. He just does not have the mental ability. So he was holding up

the other ten in the carpentry class, in a place where he is not receiving the care he should be receiving, because Burtch is not set up for that purpose. Ultimately he received his parole after some months, and got out and went back to where he should have gone, which was to his parents' home, where he was receiving care, or to a proper institution.

The whole system went wrong, because in the first place, you have a method of examining suspected mentally ill, which is not a suitable system. These doctors are not competent to make final diagnoses in these cases, and for goodness sakes, if you do nothing else, Mr. Minister, get a psychiatrist at that jail. If you cannot get a psychiatrist, refer these persons to the Ontario hospitals for their examination.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I thought I made it quite clear to the hon. member that there is a psychiatrist available for consultation.

Mr. Shulman: But he is not doing the examination.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, of course, you cannot. Where are you going to get enough psychiatrists to do all of the examinations?

Mr. Shulman: One examination a day, one a day—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if one a day is needed, if one examination a day is needed in view of the medical practitioners, the two of them are at the Don jail. One psychiatrist is available. He will come to the Don jail.

Mr. Shulman: Is it being done?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the view of the medical practitioners, apparently, those cases have not needed it.

As a matter of fact, the hon. member has talked about how mistakes can be made. He has made a mistake. He has given opinion about this Mario case. Now we follow this through. The hon. member asked this question on April 23. We answered this question, and he disagreed as to the competence of the Don jail doctors to judge this particular case.

Then tonight he was reading from—I think it was Dr. Turner from the Clark institute of psychiatry. Was it Dr. Turner? Well, let me point out to the hon. member what Dr. Turner has said about this case. He agrees wholeheartedly with the decision made by the medical practitioners at the Don jail.

Mr. Shulman: Is Dr. Turner the psychiatrist who gave evidence in court?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No he is not.

Mr. Shulman: Why do you not believe the psychiatrist—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, do you want me to believe the letter? Does the hon. member want me to believe the letter he read from Dr. Turner as being authentic?

Mr. Shulman: Please read the letter.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will read the letter from the Clark institute of psychiatry in respect of this. He was the psychiatrist, was he not the psychiatrist who examined him, I think for the defence?

Dr. Turner states, under date of May 17: "No certificate of mental defect was provided in this case, although the psychological test indicated mental deficiency in the moron range—intonation code 325.2."

Mr. Shulman: What more do you need?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment, if the hon. member will hold his horses, we will follow it through. We did not recommend hospitalization for retardation. Now further on, Dr. Howie, associate psychiatrist at the Clark institute of psychiatry—I think this is the gentleman who appeared for the defence. This is the psychiatrist who appeared for this man, in his defence. Amongst other things, he says: "It is my opinion that Mr. A is not suffering from a certifiable form of mental illness."

Mr. Shulman: Did he not say also that he was mentally defective?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment, there is no evidence of any basically anti-social tendencies in the accused's personality.

Mr. Shulman: Exactly.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To continue:

> Similarly, there is no evidence of psychosis. The dominant impression is that of a mentally defective, immature personality. The patient's intellectual defect can adversely affect his judgment of a social situation. It will therefore impair his ability to maintain himself independently in society. However, with sympathetic help he could probably manage fairly adequately if it were not for his speech defect, and his lack of special education to facilitate learning an appropriate skill.
>
> With careful training, most persons of the patient's intellectual level are able to maintain themselves in the community with some help. He is capable of maintaining

himself in the community with continued supervision and guidance which would be necessary for a child of nine years, three months of age.

There does not appear to be any indication for psychiatric treatment for the accused. Rather what he requires is to refrain from the use of alcohol, since even small amounts of alcohol appreciably reduce the already deficient judgment and controls of a mentally defective person, and debilitate him. It would certainly seem worthwhile to investigate the possibility for special work training for him at one of such places as the progress training centre at 78 Industry Street, Toronto, a sheltered workshop for adults 190 Beverley Street, Toronto, or at the adult occupational centre at Edger terminal. This is a living-in training situation for the mentally retarded, run by the department with the help of the province. We trust that this report will be of some assistance to you.

Yours sincerely,

D. Howie, M.D., associate in psychiatry.

Mr. Shulman: And you sent him to Guelph, after all that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment—

Mr. Shulman: This is hopeless, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is exactly what the doctor at the Don jail said—

Mr. Martel: Oh, three-year olds.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is exactly what the doctor at the Don jail said in his medical report. That is precisely what he said.

Now, we are faced with a man sent to us by the courts. The doctor has to give an honest appraisal of what he thinks of this person. He gave the same appraisal as the psychiatrist who handled the case for the defence. He therefore was sent by the judge, who took all of this into consideration, and the judge stated, if I recall, that in his view, Burtch was the place for this man. The judge then sentenced—

Mr. Shulman: The judge sent him to Guelph

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He recommended Burtch, I remember—

Mr. Shulman: Burtch is not the place for him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, Burtch is, as a matter of fact, precisely the place for him.

Mr. Shulman: Burtch does not think so.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is for mentally retarded. I read from the transcript of the evidence:

Question: One final question, in your examination of the accused, would you say he is certifiable to an institution or not?

this is Dr. Howie:

Answer: I would think that he would be certifiably defective, yes.

Question: But not insane?

Answer: No, not insane, no. As a mentally defective, not as a mentally insane person.

The court: Well, of course, we are always concerned with the rehabilitation of the offender here, but in this case the protection of society must be paramount, and the sentence I propose to mete out to the accused will, I hope, result in his being sent to the Burtch training centre, where he will get precisely the kind of training, even an education that the doctor has told us about.

Mr. Shulman: What an indictment of a system you are giving.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, this is precisely what the court stated, and he sentenced him to our institutions with the recommendation that he goes to Burtch, because he knows this is the kind of training that we give at Burtch. Now what were we faced with? We were faced with precisely these facts, that we had a case in which the judge said, after having listened to the psychiatrist, Burtch was the best place for him. He was released on parole, from Burtch, on May 17, to reside at the home of his parents, in Toronto. Prior—

Mr. Shulman: That is where he should have been in the first place.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment, prior to his release—and I mentioned this to the House the other day. The director of rehabilitation services, of The Department of Social and Family Services was contacted with a view to placement in a sheltered workshop facility for training. An appointment was made for an interview on Wednesday, May 22, 1968. Our rehabilitation officer, Mr. P. D. Park, took Mr. A to the director's office on May 22, 1968, for the interview.

Arrangements were completed for Mr. A to be interviewed by the progress training centre, Industry Road, Toronto. They agreed to accept him, and he started at the centre on May 28, 1968. The progress training centre

is a sheltered-workshop type of facility where trainees are taught acceptable work habits and engage in assembly work, and work activities. The trainee is assessed after a six-week period, periodically thereafter, and eventually the training centre will attempt to place him in a suitable, competitive employment situation.

I do not know what else could be expected, even though, in my view, all the jails of the province require a great deal of attention, as well as Don jail. Even though I say this, I do not know what else we would have done had the Don jail been under our complete control, at that time, than what was done. The doctor at the jail prescribed in exactly the same fashion as did the psychiatrist for the defence. He gave exactly the same decision, as to his mental stability. The court listened to the psychiatrist for the defence. The court said the best place for this man is Burtch. We have no control over that. The court then sends him to us, with the recommendation we send him to Burtch. Burtch is for the mentally retarded. We do what we can with him then, put him out on parole when it is deemed advisable, and he goes to the progress training centre. What else is the correctional system supposed to do?

Mr. Shulman: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all to get the facts correct, I trust the Minister has the transcript of the evidence in front of him. I do not unfortunately. But the reason the psychiatrist was called in was because the lawyer was so outraged—and this was a legal aid lawyer—he was so outraged by the comments of the doctor from the Don jail, and to suggest that the doctor from the Don jail said the same as the psychiatrist is just ridiculous. But the important—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just read what they said.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, but you did not read what the doctor from the Don jail said.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Read it from the transcript, not in the letter you have there now. What he says in the letter may be a little different from what he says in the transcript.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I have the medical practitioner's certificate at the Don jail.

Mr. Shulman: Read what he said in the court, that is what matters. We find the Minister defending the indefensible. The whole system is wrong. He stated here that this mental defective of the mental age of nine years was sent to Guelph reformatory, and from there to Burtch. The results on that poor boy were incalculable. At Guelph he became the butt of physical and verbal abuse, until he begged to be taken out of there. At Burtch, he was again the butt of the other boys, which was natural. Boys are cruel at that age, and here they have a mental defective in their midst, who, in addition, can barely talk. And to defend this system as the Minister does is shocking. What you should be doing, is getting up and saying, "It is wrong, of course it is wrong, we are going to improve it, we are going to change it." How can you defend a system like this? Incompetent people making mental examinations, sending mental defectives to reformatories, and then in May, six months later, they finally go into the proper training—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We did not send the man to a reformatory, a judge sent the man to a reformatory.

Mr. Shulman: Tupper Bigelow sent him, and there is another indictment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, then, that is something else again, let us keep to the facts.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The judge sent him to a reformatory, we did not. The question that the hon. member started to talk about was the competence of the medical staff at Don jail, and I pointed out to him, the hon. member, that the Don jail physician's opinion of this man was almost word for word what the psychiatrist for the defence had said.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would like to say a word or two on this matter. The hon. member for Parkdale is not exactly—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He is not from Parkdale.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: My apologies, the hon. member for High Park, has not been completely frank, or professionally frank in his statements. First of all, let me state, as I am quite sure the hon. member knows, if he is willing and fair enough to admit it that Doctor Hill has long experience as a general practitioner who has dealt for many, many years with the type of person where I would suggest, sir, he has probably learned

at first hand, and on a practical basis, more psychiatry than a great number of those who are certificated—

Mr. Lawlor: You do not know how many mistakes—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I have the floor please?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —and/or have a fellowship in psychiatry. The hon. member also knows quite clearly that the great majority of mentally ill people or mentally disordered people are first seen and first screened by family physicians. They are then referred to psychiatrists, and I would agree with them that perhaps had—and indeed I am quite sure, knowing Doctor Hill—had he believed that in his professional judgment this lad needed psychiatric consultation, he would have ordered it because this is available to him. Not only, sir, is it available through Clarke institute, it is available through any psychiatrist in Toronto because he has the right to call him. I am quite sure, if I recall anything about The Department of Reform Institutions, the department would pay for a consultation if, in the judgment of the jail surgeon, it is necessary. This apart, the fault, sir, does not lie with The Department of Reform Institutions, I respectfully submit to you. The fault lies—and I think there is a very glaring fault here which I hope the Attorney General would pay attention to because, in his department he might be able to do something about it. The fault, I submit, sir, lies with the presiding magistrate who ignored the recommendations of a psychiatrist—a recogniezd psychiatrist—who pointed out that this lad was mentally retarded and was of the age of nine years. He did not, so far as I can glean from either of the letters read, question whether or not in the view of the psychiatrist this lad knew the nature of or enormity of the seriousness of his acts. And instead of saying, "It has been recommended that this boy be put in certain specified places," which, in the judgment of the psychiatrist, were capable of dealing with such a case, he elected to send him to The Department of Reform Institutions, which of course, the hon. Minister pointed out, had nothing to say. My point, sir, is not to—

Mr. Singer: The Attorney General is not going to like that—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —not to defend the department at all, but to point out that the fault lay with the magistrate in that he neglected to follow the advice and recommendation of a psychiatrist who was trained to judge these things.

Mr. Singer: Who was the magistrate?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to get back to the Don jail situation, so we will not go off into the Tupper Bigelow problem which would take another night.

Regarding the situation at the Don jail, the hon. Minister has defended the system of Dr. Hill in examining these patients. I just want you to know what Dr. Hill does at the Don jail, so you will realize just how impossible it would be for him to make a proper mental examination.

He examines some 80 patients per day, incoming patients. It is his job to do a superficial examination or superficial interview of each patient—of each inmate that comes into the jail. He does not have a secretary. He fills out the forms of each patient. It is also his job to do a physical examination and fill out a form for every sentenced person who is being transferred out of the jail.

It is also his job to examine and treat any person who takes ill in this jail's population. Then, in his spare time, he does mental examinations.

Let me suggest to the Minister that no doctor, were he to have all the experience that Dr. Hill has had, all the training the best psychiatrists in the world have had could do his work competently. He could not possibly do the work he has even without the mental examination. And he has not even got a girl to fill out the forms. Now to defend this, to have the Minister of Health get up and defend this, and the Minister of Reform Institutions get up and say he is competent, he does not have the time—if he were competent and he is not competent—to make the diagnoses.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, neither I—nor did I hear the Minister of Health—suggest that we were defending incompetence. What we were saying—I was saying, and I am sure the hon. Minister of Health was saying, was you really had no right to talk about the competence of Dr. Hill as a medical man.

The hon. member in the first place should know that Dr. Hill does get some help. Now if the hon. member had got up in the first place and said: "Do you not think that Dr. Hill is overworked?" I would have said what I—

Mr. Shulman: That is not the point.

Hon. Mr. Grosssman: I would have said what I said a number of weeks ago—that he is overworked.

Mr. Shulman: That is not the point.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But to say, to express himself in the manner in which he is accustomed to doing, which in effect smears the doctor by saying he is not competent, it is an entirely different thing.

An hon. member: The same old story—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All he had to do was to say the man is overworked and I would have agreed with him as I agreed with him a number of weeks ago. This will be changed. But why should we have to get up and defend the competence of a doctor who has been doing such a tremendous job over so many years?

Mr. Shulman: Because a general practitioner is not fit to make the final decision in these cases.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well then you are arguing about something else and I disagree with you and so does the Minister of Health.

Mr. Lawlor: No, he disagrees with you.

Mr. Shulman: Then I would like to ask the Minister—what is his view of the accommodations given to these poor people?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not as good as it should be.

Mr. Shulman: What are you going to do about it; and when?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are going to correct it.

Mr. Shulman: When?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As soon as we can.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

On provincial jails: the member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: On provincial jails.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, the first question is—what has become of the Wentworth jail?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is still there.

Mr. Deans: What has become of the new one, the one that we were supposed to be going to get?

What is going to happen? Are we going to get rid of that monstrosity on Barton Street in Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think we have mentioned this two or three times. There is a task force out examining all of the jails. There will be a priority list set up. I cannot tell you now as to which place in the priority list the Wentworth jail will take. We shall have that report very soon and we will then announce it publicly.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on the provincial jails programme? The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: I just want to pass a few comments on the conditions of the jail at Milton.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is bad, you do not have to tell me.

Mr. Deans: I realize I should not have to but obviously I do. You do not require a task force to tell you it is bad.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, I did not say I require a task force to tell me it is bad.

Mr. Deans: The juries have been going through these jails for years and every year they have been recommending that it should be replaced.

Mr. Singer: Not as bad as the Don jail.

Mr. Sopha: The one up in London is worse.

Mr. Deans: Well, so the hon. member says—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Every year we recommend that the municipalities replace them.

Mr. Deans: Well now we are recommending that you replace them—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You do not have to; we are going to. I mentioned it to the House here that we have a programme to replace them over a period of 12 years.

Mr. Deans: The big problem with your programmes is that I do not believe them. They are all very nice on paper. Twelve years from now, if I have the misfortune still to be here on this side of the House, I will still be asking the same question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, perhaps this would make the hon. member happy; I have a report here that as of December, 1967, the Treasury board had approved proceeding with preliminary plans for this project to be located at either Carleton, Middlesex or Wentworth counties. Now we have to make a decision which ones will come first.

Mr. Singer: Is not London in the county of Middlesex?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is right; that is the one right there—the larger jails.

Mr. Singer: Which is going to win?

Mr. Chairman: On provincial jails. The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: I am a little disturbed, Mr. Chairman, about the treatment in the Don jail of prisoners or perhaps in other jails of prisoners, once they attempt suicide. I am referring to a Mr. Don H.—sorry, Mr. Richard H.—who was a suicide risk and actually attempted suicide several times in the jail. He was held for a very lengthly time in the cell for the suspected mentally ill which we have gone into before, for many weeks. And when I complained about this matter, instead of him being transferred to a mental hospital, he was transferred to Kingston penitentiary. I find this absolutely incomprehensible and I wonder if there is some explanation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know why the hon. member finds that incomprehensible, Mr. Chairman. The man was sentenced to Kingston penitentiary and all we can do is to send him to Kingston penitentiary. We have no other authority. The judge sends a committal order and says this man is ordered to go to Kingston penitentiary and we send him to Kingston penitentiary.

Presumably, at Kingston, if they find this man should be certified they will do this. I mean, there is nothing else we can do.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, here is a man, who in jail, attempted suicide several times. We presume if someone attempts suicide several times they are mentally ill. I do not think this requires too much difficulty in diagnosis. But nowhere along the line did the jail authorities or did the jail doctors feels that this man was mentally ill, nor did they make any attempt to transfer him to a mental hospital. There is something wrong here.

Mr. Chairman: I believe that the Minister has indicated to the committee at various times that there is a shortage of psychiatrists, that they take as many as they can get. He has explained to the member for High Park and the committee the situation that existed at the Don jail. The member for High Park is exhaustively putting questions to the Minister about the Don jail about one specific case and now he is introducing another specific case.

The Minister has replied and I would respectfully ask the member for High Park to confine further remarks to the provincial jail programme in these estimates.

Mr. Shulman: Very well, sir. I would like for the moment to leave the Don jail and go to the Simcoe jail and I would like to ask the hon. Minister why it is that visitors who visit relatives in the Simcoe jail—although they may speak to the relatives—cannot see them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I cannot recall this particular jail. I think that I have visited every jail in the province with the exception of one or two. I do not know what the situation is there. Do they have a very thick screen?

Mr. Shulman: It is a combination of double screening and double glass and when you visit the prisoner—

Mr. Chairman: There are two members on the floor at this point, and only one member can have the floor at one time.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, when a prisoner is visited in the Simcoe jail in Norfolk county, you can tell that you are talking to a prisoner in there, but you cannot tell who it is. All you can see is a shadow, because this has been made so thick and with so many layers that the family cannot even see the person that they are visiting.

This is very disturbing for relatives who have come, many of them from a very long distance—because there are prisoners there from long distances away—and surely it would not be impossible while we were waiting for this 12-year programme to evolve to put in a sheet of glass, rather than this very strange system that you have at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think that we could really save a lot of time of the House if we remembered that the policy of the department when they take over the jails, which we have not yet done,

legally—we will then be in a position—after having received a report from the task force which I have mentioned on numerous occasions—to decide also on a matter of priorities as to renovations. These are the things that we will look at. It seems to me that this is one of those things in a jail that can be changed with a reasonable amount of expense. There is no use bringing up these individual situations in each one of the 35 county and two city jails because they are not ours yet. We are examining them all, and will do what we can to renovate those which are not slated for rebuilding in the immediate future.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, the estimates for this department cover this year's expenditures. It is quite proper for us to bring up these matters, because they are matters that should be brought to the attention of the Minister, for changes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am agreeing in advance with anything that anyone says about the physical condition of any of the jails. I do not think that there is any point in wasting the time of the House on this.

Mr. Shulman: Very well. I would like to come back to the Don jail. The member for Downsview has some—

Mr. Chairman: May I point out to the member that there has been considerable extensive discussion on the Don jail; not only by the member for High Park, but last evening by the member for Downsview. The Minister has replied to all the questions put to him, and this can only be repetition.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, you have not yet found me being repetitious. The matters I spoke on, before, had to do with the condition of the treatment of suspected mentally ill prisoners. I now wish to bring up the matter of the ordinary prisoners, and this has not as yet been brought out by any other members.

Mr. Chairman: May I point out to the member that the Minister of Reform Institution has on numerous occasions pointed out to the House and the member that he realizes the circumstances in many of these jails; and he has intimated to the committee that he is going to do something about it. He has told the committee what the programme is. He is taking over jails, for which he has had no responsibility in the past, but will have in the future. It seems to me that this type of question is entirely out of order.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, it cannot be out of order. If we have the largest jail in this province in this largest city of Ontario, which has disgraceful conditions, I do not see how you can possibly think of cutting off discussion on any aspect of those conditions. The fact that the Minister has promised to clear it up in due time is certainly not sufficient.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member tell me how else I could answer that? Shall I say tomorrow, next week, yesterday? How could I answer that?

Mr. Shulman: Yes I would be delighted to hear that. Your priority should come first of all to the jail that is housing these people in the hundreds and the thousands, not the jail that is housing 12, or 24, or 36 at a time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we discussed this last night.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, this whole question has been covered quite thoroughly by the Minister.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, the remarks that I was about to make will continue unless you are ruling I may not do so.

Mr. Chairman: The discussion on the Don jail has been completed.

Mr. Shulman: You will not allow me to make these comments?

Mr. Chairman: No more discussion on the Don jail. This subject has been thoroughly covered.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I would like to say to you, with some regret, that I do not believe that it is the role of the Chairman in this committee to speak for Ministers in discussion of an estimate. I believe that this is what you did in ruling that the member for High Park could not speak further on the matter that he intended to talk about in connection with the Don jail. His remarks, as he explained them to you, Mr. Chairman, pointed out a new topic of discussion. You ruled him out of order as being repetitive, and you ruled him out of order in a manner which I feel was putting yourself in the place of the Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Well, with respect to the member—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the Chairman is putting himself in my place, how could I rule him out of order?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment on what is going on. I was interested, and rather encouraged to hear the hon. member for High Park, at least by strong inference, indicate that he did not believe in the proposition of repetition. I just make that point because it was out of his words, and I think that that is a healthy situation. I am sure that from now on, and in the days to come, there will be no undue repetition. There is bound to be some, but we are here to get the estimates through. I would be concerned about one point, and in this moment, I speak as a private member. I would like to point out that we are talking about a situation where society is protected by statutes of the criminal code, and the judicial system. That is the number one point.

Thereafter, when charges are laid by the police or other authority, it goes to the courts to deal with the matter. So the first instance of a man's trial is there. Parole systems and treatments, and other situations and conditions then follow and are subsequent to the action taken by the courts, which is designed to protect society. This is the general public. Speaking as a private member, what would have appeared to have been said here tonight is that the punishment must be with gold blankets and other remedial things which we all agree with, but they come in sequence.

Mr. MacDonald: That voice from the Victorian era once again.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There is no Victorian era at all. According to some of the voices expressed in the debates and the views tonight, we should open the jails and let everybody out. I just make this for the record because this is exactly what is being said.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee do rise and report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Was that motion made by a private member or the House leader?

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, before the orders of the day, we would like to turn to the order paper and deal with third readings and such other matters and the House in committee. I do not think it would be long before we proceed with the estimates of this department.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:00 of the clock, p.m.

No. 100



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, May 30, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 30, 1968

Presenting report, Mr. Welch 3637

Second report, standing committee on legal bills and municipal affairs, Mr. Kerr 3637

Consumer Protection Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, first reading 3637

Income Tax Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 3637

Financial Administration Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 3638

Department of Revenue, bill to establish, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 3638

Public Service Act, 1961, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 3638

Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 3638

Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, **Mr. Davis, first reading** 3638

Statement re appointment of Mr. D. M. Coolican as chairman for the regional council of Ottawa-Carleton, Mr. Robarts 3642

Question to Mr. Bales re the UAW and Massey-Ferguson negotiations, Mr. Nixon 3643

Question to Mr. Gomme re construction on Highway 401, Mr. Nixon 3643

Question to Mr. Gomme re the Penage Road, Mr. Martel 3643

Question to Mr. Gomme re underpass at La Cloche Island, Mr. Martel 3643

Questions to Mr. Stewart re grants for farm bridges, Mr. Ruston 3644

Questions to Mr. Gomme re Walpole Island bridge, Mr. Bullbrook 3645

Statement re irregularities in the Timmins area, Mr. Gomme 3645

Third readings 3645

Royal assent to certain bills, the Lieutenant-Governor 3646

Pharmacy Act, bill to amend, reported 3647

Medical Act, bill to amend, reported 3647

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman, continued 3647

Recess, 6 o'clock 3677

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 30, 1968

The House met at 2:00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon in the east gallery we have pupils from St. Augustine separate school in Sarnia and Martin Street public school in Milton; in the west gallery from St. Raymond's separate school in Toronto. Later this afternoon in the west gallery we will be joined by students from St. Mary's school, Lindsay, and Minto-Clifford central school in Harriston.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the annual report of the teachers' superannuation commission for the year ending October 31, 1967.

Mr. G. A. Kerr from the standing committee on legal bills and municipal affairs, presented the committee's second report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill 59, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Bill 60, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill 50, An Act to amend The Securities Act, 1966.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that, until further order, this House will meet from 9:30 o'clock, a.m. until 2:00 o'clock, p.m. each Friday.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of bills.

THE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 1966

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, with reference to this proposed bill: at the present time itinerant sellers regulated are those selling from door to door or credit. There is an amendment to extend the Act and control to all door to door sales.

There is an amendment requiring an itemized breakdown of the price of goods or services in an executory contract. While it may be said that most contracts deal with a specific item which is identifiable and the information readily understood, particularly with respect to food purchasing contracts where a multiplicity of many items are included, this requirement, we think, is desirable.

At the present time, the two-day cooling off period applies only to contracts with itinerant sellers where credit is extended. We asked for an amendment to extend this to all executory contracts with itinerant sellers. Now I think that one major item has to do with the situation where a seller is liable to pay the costs of returning the goods after the buyer rescinds the contract.

The amendment that we ask for confines the liability of the seller to the cost of returning the goods from the place to which he originally delivered them.

THE INCOME TAX ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides that the tax payable by individuals for the 1969 taxation year, shall be 28 per cent of the tax payable under the federal Act for that taxation year.

THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, this bill, together with the one that I shall introduce immediately following, makes provision for the changing of The Department of Treasury to The Department of Treasury and Economics, and provides for the transfer of certain department functions in The Department of Treasury to the new Department of Revenue.

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish The Department of Revenue.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, this bill together with the bill just previously introduced implements the recommendation of the Ontario committee on taxation that the government of Ontario establish a Department of Revenue responsible for the administration of all revenue statutes now administered by The Treasury Department.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT, 1961

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Public Service Act, 1961.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the amendments in this bill limit the responsibility for salary recommendations by the civil service commission to classes not subject to negotiation and to new classes, and is complementary to an amendment of The Financial Administration Act. Section 2 makes provision that will be complementary to an amendment of The Financial Administration Act that I have just introduced concerning the appointment of persons to the official side of the joint council, and section 3 amendment is complementary to the amendment in section 1.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that there be a somewhat complete explanation, not only of the legislation, but perhaps the background leading up to the introduction of these bills on this occasion.

The legislation which I have the honour of introducing today, Mr. Speaker, can be truly termed historic, not only for this province but also, I believe, for Canada. It sets out the legal provisions for the establishment of French-language schools at both the elementary and secondary school levels. No specific statutory guarantee has ever before been made for French-language schools in Ontario. Before dealing generally with the contents of the legislation, I should like to trace briefly the background leading up to the creation of the special Ministerial committee on French-language secondary schools and the work of that committee.

In August of last year, the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) speaking to the association Canadienne des educateurs de la langue-française stated:

> We believe that Canadians of French origin must be guaranteed certain basic rights and privileges. We recognize, and are in sympathy with, your desire as French-speaking people in Canada to preserve your language, customs and culture as an integral part of Canadian life.

Although language is not the only means to preserving a culture, it is the most central and obvious means. In the first volume of the final report of the Royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism, entitled "The Official Language," the relationship between language and culture is succintly put:

> Language is in the first place an essential expression of a culture in the full sense of the word; from the intellectual

> standpoint, language is certainly the most typical expression of culture. As a means of communication, language is the natural vehicle for a host of other elements of culture. It fulfills this function in many ways. Not only does it convey the notions and modes of expression which are part of a culture, it is also the means by which a cultural group discovers and assimilates new elements originating outside it.

It is in this context that the French-speaking community in Ontario has always looked upon education as one of the most important, if not the most important, force for survival as a cultural group. Education in his mother tongue permits the Franco-Ontarian to receive the values of his society and his way of life in the same way an English-speaking Ontarian does in schools where English is the language of instruction and communication. Both for himself and his children the Franco-Ontarian wants to preserve his linguistic and cutural heritage.

This natural desire is not an attempt to draw a curtain around, or to shut out, the overwhelming presence of English-speaking North America. On the contrary, the desire of the Franco-Ontarian to live in a French milieu is perfectly harmonious with the equal desire to contribute fully to the cultural, economic and technical progress of his province and of his country. It is with these considerations in mind, and the very basic consideration of the provision of equality of educational opportunity, that the government approached the question of French-language education in this province.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that French as a language of instruction in Ontario schools can be traced to the early French settlements. The use of French, then, as a language of instruction is not something new in this province.

Today we find that there is a well-established system of education in which instruction may be given in the French language to the end of grade 8 and, in some cases, to the end of grade 10. This latter arrangement evolved at the end of the last century when many elementary schools also provided grades 9 and 10 because the nearest secondary school was too far away. It must be clearly understood then, that historically the principle of bilingual education for the French-speaking people of Ontario has been recognized. By compromise and agreement this principle has gradually been extended until today the availability of French-language education at the elementary level is quite substantial.

In September 1967 there were 89,483 French-speaking pupils attending elementary schools in which French was a language of instruction. Of these 87,024 attended 372 French-language separate schools and the remaining 2,459 attended 13 French-language public schools.

At the secondary level there are, at the present time, schools in some 40 communities offering an instructional programme in French in at least one or more of the following subjects: history, geography, Latin and, of course Français. As of September 1967, there were 10,541 pupils registered in the schools offering one or more of these courses. In addition 5,121 French-speaking pupils were attending the grades 9 and 10 of the separate schools and 3,000 pupils were in private Franco-Ontarian institutions.

Several years ago, negotiations took place whereby the University of Ottawa became eligible for full participation in provincial government grants along with the other universities of the province. Both Laurentian University and the University of Ottawa receive grants in excess of the pattern for other institutions to assist them to meet the costs inherent in carrying on programmes in both English and French.

In the area of teacher education, there are two bilingual teachers' colleges operated by the province. One is in Ottawa and a second bilingual teachers' college was established three years ago at Sudbury in accommodation provided at Laurentian University.

The major problem which has faced a great many of the French-speaking graduates of the elementary schools is that, apart from the four courses previously mentioned, all secondary education is given in English. This has placed a severe handicap on the French-speaking student who moves from a school in which most of his subjects are taught in French, to one in which practically all the instruction is in English. The result has been a high rate of dropouts among the young people of the Franco-Ontarian community.

In effect three choices have, in the past few years, presented themselves to the Franco-Ontarian student at the end of elementary school:

(a) If his parents had enough money he could go to a denominational private school where French was the language of instruction. However, these institutions did not

offer the wide range of courses found in the other secondary schools of the province. They offered basically the five year academic course but not the technical and vocational programmes of the public school system.

(b) In certain public secondary schools History, Geography, Latin and Français were offered in French but no technical or vocational courses were given in that language.

(c) Finally the Franco-Ontarian student had the option of attending the English-language composite secondary school in his community. Yet it is difficult, after four or five years, for the student to retain anything but a tenuous connection with the French language and culture.

This then, Mr. Speaker, was the problem. At the secondary level, steps had to be taken to extend the availability of instruction in the language of the Franco-Ontarian community. It was with these thoughts in mind that the Prime Minister, last August, stated that the government of Ontario would aim to provide, within the public school system of Ontario, secondary schools in which the language of instruction was French. This decision was but the logical extension of the programme of French-language instruction at the elementary level, and complemented the present bilingual university programme.

The Prime Minister announced, on that occasion, that:

> The government of Ontario will direct The Department of Education to proceed with the establishment of a committee whose terms of reference will be to advise the government as to the procedures required to provide adequate opportunities in the public education system for those who are primarily French-speaking.

It was very clearly stated that it was not prepared to develop another system of secondary schools parallel to the existing framework. Rather, within the present system, the fullest possible range of programmes and options in the French language would be offered. He emphasized that the province was not creating an exclusively French-language system of education. Special attention would have to be paid to the teaching of English in the new schools so that the graduates of the French-language secondary schools would be able to compete with their English-speaking compatriots on the labour market and participate fully in the life of this province, and of this country. As the new schools would be part of the existing public system, they would receive the same financial support as other secondary schools.

In November, 1967, I announced the creation of a committee on French-language secondary schools. The chairman of the committee is Mr. Roland Bériault of The Department of Education's policy and development council. The members of the committee are: Mr. Blanchard, assistant director, teacher education branch; Mr. Thomas Campbell, executive assistant to the Deputy Minister; Mr. Cyr, assistant superintendent, curriculum section; Dr. L. Desjarlais, dean of the University of Ottawa's faculty of education; Brother Omer Deslauriers, president of the Franco-Ontarian private schools association; Mr. Vincent Gauthier, the administrator of the Ontario bilingual school trustees association; Mrs. Elise Grossberg, a member of the Toronto board of education and chairman of the Ontario school trustees council; Brother Maurice Lapointe, principal of La Salle academy in Ottawa and 2nd vice-president of the Ontario teachers' federation; Mr. Jacques Leduc, vice-president of l'association Canadienne-française d'education d'Ontario; and Mr. A. H. McKague, the superintendent of the supervision section. The secretary of the committee is Mr. Charles Beer from The Treasury Department.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the membership of the committee reflects not only the French- and English-speaking people of the province, but also the various groups and associations concerned with education in Ontario. In this way the government ensured it would receive the best possible advice. The 12 committee members have met for two days every two weeks since early December to suggest the ways and means by which the government could implement the policy enunciated by the Prime Minister. I should like to take this occasion, Mr. Speaker, in that the members are in the Speaker's gallery on this occasion, to commend them publicly for their work.

The first and most immediate task of the committee was to study the legal and procedural requirements needed to provide the guarantees necessary for the establishment of the French-language secondary schools wherever the numbers could provide a viable unit. It was soon evident that this question of French-language instruction at the secondary level could not be viewed in isolation. It had to be examined in the light of practices at the elementary level. For this reason the committee also prepared legislation concerning French-language elementary schools.

I shall touch briefly, Mr. Speaker, on the legislation itself. The legislation proposed by the government involves amendments to three

Acts: The Department of Education Act; The Schools Administration Act, which I have introduced today; and The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, which will also be introduced on this occasion.

The amendment to The Department of Education Act, which will be considered as part of the general amendment to that bill, will give the Minister of Education the power to make regulations prescribing the language of instruction which may be used in the elementary and secondary schools of the province.

The amendment to The Schools Administration Act. These amendments cover the legal provision for establishing French-language elementary schools or classes; and the language of instruction and communication used by teachers in the schools and classes themselves.

The amendment that I have introduced to The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act will add a new part to the Act to establish French-language secondary schools and classes.

At the secondary level, the ideal situation —in our view—would be the establishment of French-language composite schools providing all options and programmes. Such a situation, we believe, can be achieved in some areas, but the government recognizes that due to a shortage of pupils this cannot be done everywhere. It has, therefore, proposed legislation to cover a variety of cases.

Three basic situations have to be provided for: 1. Classes for Français and other subjects; 2. French-language branches or sections within a secondary school; and 3. French-language composite schools.

In some areas it may only be possible to provide one class of Français and perhaps one or two other subjects in French. In other areas a complete arts and science programme and some commercial subjects could be started. The intent of the legislation is, however, that a divisional board will provide the fullest programme possible.

The requirements for establishing a French-language composite school will be the same as those used to create English-language composite schools. At the present time such schools are built for a student population of 1,000, although inherent in all the policies of The Department of Education this is not always rigidly adhered to. In some instances composite schools have been set up for less than this number, if the situation warranted.

The policy of The Department of Education is to project secondary school enrolment on a five-year basis using 40 to 45 per cent of the pupil population in the elementary schools as a base. In this way plans will be made for the construction of French-language composite schools using fundamentally the same criteria.

To represent the views of the Franco-Ontarian community to the divisional board, a special committee is being created within each divisional area. The name given this committee is the Franch language committee. The French language committee will be composed of seven members, four of whom will be elected by the French-speaking ratepayers of a division. The remaining three members would be trustees appointed by the board.

The procedure required to create a French language committee will be as follows: (a) if ten or more French-speaking ratepayers of a school division apply in writing to the divisional board for French-language instruction; or (b) if the board introduces or plans to introduce a programme of French-language instruction; or (c) if the board extends an existing French-language programme.

These stipulations would cover all situations and permit the Franco-Ontarians to make recommendations on the whole question of French-language instruction at the secondary level, whether it be a composite school, a branch or section within a secondary school or classes within a secondary school, or classes themselves.

The method of electing the four French-speaking ratepayers to the French-language committee will be for the divisional board to call a general meeting of all French-speaking ratepayers within the divisional area. Once elected the names of the four members will be forwarded to the board.

The most important function of the French language committee will be to make recommendations to meet the educational and cultural needs of the French-speaking pupils.

Yet it must be kept clearly in mind that the final decision and the final responsibility for the French-language secondary schools will rest with the divisional board elected by all the people of the divisional area. The French language committee will report at each regular meeting of the board and will act in a way similar to that of an advisory committee. We are not creating another school board.

The legislation also provides that English shall be an obligatory daily subject of instruction for all pupils of grades 9 to 12. In addition to acquiring a complete command of the French language and culture, the Franco-Ontarian student will need a complementary and adequate knowledge of English. A great deal of work has been done within The Department of Education to prepare special English courses for French-speaking pupils.

The legislation concerning the French-language elementary schools parallels that for the secondary schools. Provisions for French-language classes and schools are set out. English, as a subject of instruction, for French-speaking pupils is made obligatory from grade 5 on.

Finally it should be emphasized that this legislation does not encroach upon the rights of the members of the English-speaking community to have their own classes or schools, wherever feasible. The establishment of English-language elementary and secondary schools and classes is provided for. And provisions are also made by which an English-speaking pupil will be permitted to take his courses in the French-language schools.

These then are the major aspects and history of the legislation. With the creation of French-language schools at the secondary level, there will be assured to every French-speaking student in the province the opportunity to receive his education from kindergarten through university, graduate school and teacher education in the language of his choice.

There is one last point, Mr. Speaker, which I believe cannot be underestimated. Since the Prime Minister's speech of last August local school boards have proceeded with the implementation of the government's policy on French-language education for French-speaking pupils. This has been especially encouraging for it means that French-language schools and classes will begin in several centres this coming September although the legislation itself is tied in with the divisional boards of January, 1969. It indicates that the divisional boards and the French language committees already have a precedent for working together harmoniously and effectively.

The legislation presented today provides the framework for the new schools. Its implementation will allow French-speaking Canadians in this province to maintain their rich heritage and to contribute a positive influence in this province and in this country. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that in the next few years French-language instruction in this province will be the equal of that given anywhere in the country.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, I would like to ask the Minister if he is going to table the report of the committee that he was referring to, the committee on French language instruction?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the committee dealing with the question of French language instruction prepared what really amounts to an interim report dealing with legislation only. They are continuing their meetings and they will be preparing, shall we say, a final report which I hope to have available early in the fall. It is my intention, at the moment, to make this available.

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps we would benefit by seeing the interim report on legislation since we are going to be discussing the legislation. Would it be possible to have a look at that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether this would be possible but because this legislation will be going to the education committee, I think it would be appropriate if we were to invite the chairman and some members of the committee to meet with the education committee to discuss it. I think this would be the best way to deal with it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in informing the House of the government's intention of appointing the first chairman for the regional council of Ottawa-Carleton, in the person of Mr. Denis Murray Coolican. Mr. Coolican is a native of Ottawa and a graduate of the local separate and public school systems, having attended La Salle academy, Ottawa University high school and Glebe collegiate. He graduated from McGill University in chemical engineering in 1933 and attained a Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Ottawa in 1937.

As a member of the Royal Canadian navy from 1940 to 1945, Mr. Coolican served on minesweepers and convoy escort vessels, with the rank of Lieutenant-Commander. He became a member of the staff of the Canadian Bank Note Company in 1945, and served as president from 1952 to 1966, when he became vice-president, administration, of Brazilian Light and Power Company Limited.

Mr. Coolican has already distinguished himself in public life, having been a member of

the Northwest Territories council from 1961-1964, reeve of the village of Rockcliffe Park from 1956-1966, and warden of the county of Carleton for the year 1960. In these latter positions, Mr. Coolican sat as a member of the Carelton county council, actively participating in the discussions of city-county planning which preceded the establishment of the Ottawa, Eastview and Carleton county local government review. This experience has provided Mr. Coolican with a deep appreciation of the importance of sound inter-municipal relationships upon which the effective operation of regional government depends.

It is generally recognized that the quality of leadership that will inspire co-operation in others remains the first and primary requisite for the implementation of municipal reforms. We are most fortunate in having in Mr. Dennis M. Coolican a man who is willing, prepared and well qualified to devote his energies to this very challenging undertaking.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Is the Minister in a position to report any progress from the meetings between the UAW and Massey-Ferguson?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think at this time, I would not want to say more than that the meetings are continuing.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways, dated yesterday.

1. What company has the contract for the construction of the portion of Highway 401 between Yonge Street and Bayview?

2. What is the new completion deadline?

3. How long was the construction held up by strikes?

4. Have any penalties been imposed on the company for not meeting the original completion date? If not, why?

5. Has the Minister any plans to see that the section is completed on an urgent schedule?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in the question I have there is no part five. I will answer the four parts as asked.

1. Standard Paving Limited, Toronto.

2. The expected completion date is now July 31, 1968.

3. This contract was affected by strikes between May 19, 1967 and November 14, 1967.

4. The contract contains liquidated damage clauses. If there are damages assessed against this contract they will not be assessed until completion of the work.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the question is initialled by your office.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would let me ask the Minister if his copy is numbered on the right hand corner "604" with initials "WF" in red?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: It is marked "question 604," Mr. Speaker, no initials.

Mr. Speaker: Because the original copy which should have gone to the Minister's office would have been so numbered and initialled and has question number 5 on it.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I was going to rise and say that mine has all the marks that your office put on it, including the approval of question number 5.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Minister would then take number 5 as notice, for tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Highways.

Who did the road work on the Penage Road in the Sudbury area? Were tenders called for that road work, and was this road work given out under the authorization of the provincial government?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, the answer to part (a) the reconstruction of Highway 549, Penage Road, was carried out by The Department of Highways under day-labour-construction programme.

(b) Tenders were called for the rental of such equipment as compressors, bulldozers, and so on. In addition to the reconstruction, contracts were recently called for the application of prime dust layer and a supply of fresh gravel. These are considered normal maintenance items for gravel.

(c) The answer is "yes".

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, another question to the Minister of Highways. Did the Minister's department contribute financially to the construction of an underpass under the highway on La Cloche Island, Manitoulin Island? If so, how much and why?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, "underpass" is an accepted terminology for a structure which carries a highway under an intersecting road. The only highway bridge structure on La Cloche Island is over the Goat Island channel. Although this is a water crossing and would not, normally, be termed an underpass possibly, this is the structure the hon. member has in mind. It was built in 1938, it was subjected to minor repair including waterproofing and paving under the recent road reconstruction contract for which my department bore full financial responsibility. The cost of the work on the bridge itself was $5,300. The work on the structure was done to restore it to an adequate condition for future service. My department paid for the work because the structure is an integral component of a King's highway.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I have questions of the Attorney General. Will the Attorney General conduct an investigation into the complaints of local 6500, united steelworkers of America, to Dr. H. B. Cotnam on May 24, 1968, that investigations of fatalities are conducted by police officers of the town of Copper Cliff who also serve as security guards to INCO and may therefore have a built-in bias in their investigation?

If so, when will such an investigation commence?

Will the Attorney General instruct the chief coroner that only non-INCO employees may be used to investigate fatalities in the various INCO plants and underground operations to assure complete impartiality?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I will take these questions as notice and give an answer very shortly.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I might as well, then, just ask the remaining questions and leave them with the Attorney General because they all deal along the same line.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, the member will please ask the Attorney General.

Mr. Martel: In order that all parties have all questions which they consider important and relevant at a coroner's inquest, asked of various witnesses, without any difficulties and asked in the manner intended, would the Attorney General advise coroners that direct questioning by all interested parties or their representatives be permitted?

One final question: Is it the duty of a coroner to obtain all information available to him when an inquest is held, to avoid repetition of similar accidents or fatalities?

Would the Attorney General investigate why Dr. Pidutti, a coroner in the Sudbury district, refused to accept evidence in the recent Stacknick inquest, a fatality at Creighton Mines, from the officers of the united steelworkers of America?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will answer the questions, Mr. Speaker, all at once.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food. Would the hon. Minister give consideration to enlarging the capital grants programme to include farm bridges, that are not now covered under The Municipal Drainage Act?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask my hon. friend what type of such structures would not be included for grant purposes under The Municipal Drainage Act presently?

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, that would be bridges that would be normally running through a centre of a farm, ditches that would be normally running through a centre of a farm. There seem to be some problems with regard to engineers' reports and who is really responsible for these.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to belabour this but it would seem to me with respect to my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that such a structure should normally be a cost of the drain, if indeed—and I know I have this experience on my own farm—where a municipal drain goes through a man's farm and it severs part of the farm. Then the engineer who was doing the survey in this particular case considered that the farmers so affected were entitled to one structure to connect the farm, and it would seem to me that they would then qualify under the costs of the drain. The member knows that the province of Ontario pays one third of the cost of that drain and now under ARDA, retroactive to April 1, 1967, we pay an additional one third, so that two thirds of the cost of that drain is paid for now; and that structure should be a cost to the drain, as far as I am concerned the farmer should qualify for the two thirds subsidy.

Mr. Ruston: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: I had looked into this matter as the

Minister mentioned, with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I had spoken to some people in the department, and there seems to be a little problem as to who is responsible. Their legal department has been looking into it, but it has been some time now and we have not been able to get a comprehensive—

Mr. Speaker: Have you a supplementary question?

Mr. Ruston: No, Mr. Speaker, I think he—

Mr. Speaker: Just a point of clarification?

Mr. Ruston: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Highways has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to a question asked of me by the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) last Tuesday: question No. 601.

The Department of Highways subsidy on this project amounts to 80 per cent of the cost of the bridge and 50 per cent of the cost of the approach roads and lands necessary for its construction. The member should realize that tenders for this work are not called by The Department of Highways.

I am advised that all tendering procedures in this particular instance were carried out by the department of Indian affairs, Canada. I have, however, established that on April 15 the advertisement for tenders was placed in the Sarnia paper as well as a paper of general circulation in the construction industry, and the closing date for those tenders was May 27.

Mr. Speaker, I also have a statement which I promised to give to the House re some irregularities in our department in the Timmins area. As a result of recent investigations in the Timmins area, David Reginald Edwards, patrol supervisor for The Department of Highways, was charged in respect of two incidents in which he corruptly demanded and received payments from the owner of equipment being rented to the department, contrary to section 368 of the criminal code, and in respect of two incidents involving theft of sand and gravel valued in excess of $50, contrary to section 280 of the criminal code.

Mr. Edwards, upon appearing before Magistrate Goddard in Timmins, pleaded guilty to the six charges involved and was sentenced on May 29, 1968, to a total of 13 months in jail as follows: six months, plus six months concurrent in respect of two charges involving the corrupt demanding of payments; six months consecutive and six months concurrent in respect of two charges involving the corrupt receipt of payments; one month consecutive and one month concurrent in respect of two charges involving theft in excess of $50.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third readings upon motion:

Bill 74, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Bill 75, An Act to amend The Crown Witnesses Act.

Bill 76, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Bill 77, An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act.

Bill 78, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Bill 79, An Act to amend The Partnerships Registration Act.

Bill 80, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Bill 81, An Act to amend The Probation Act.

Bill 82, An Act to amend The Sheriffs Act.

Bill 83, An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act.

Bill 84, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Bill 119, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with your permission I will ask His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor to join us and give assent to certain bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province, at the present sitting thereof passed certain bills, to which, in the name and on behalf of the said assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles to the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 7, An Act to amend The Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1965.

Bill 36, The Conservation Authorities Act, 1968.

Bill 41, An Act to amend The Lord's Day (Ontario) Act, 1960-1961.

Bill 45, An Act to amend The Age Discrimination Act, 1966.

Bill 51, An Act to establish the Ontario economic council.

Bill 57, An Act to amend The Blind Workmen's Compensation Act.

Bill 61, An Act to amend The Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-1963.

Bill 62, An Act to amend The Homes for Retarded Persons Act, 1966.

Bill 63, An Act to amend The Children's Institutions Act, 1962-1963.

Bill 64, An Act to provide for provincial courts and judges.

Bill 65, An Act to amend The Centennial Centre of Science and Technology Act, 1965.

Bill 66, An Act to amend The Public Commercial Vehicles Act.

Bill 67, An Act to amend The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act, 1961-1962.

Bill 69, An Act to provide for the administration of justice.

Bill 70, An Act to amend The Coroners Act.

Bill 71, An Act to amend The County Courts Act.

Bill 72, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Bill 73, An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

Bill 74, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Bill 75, An Act to amend The Crown Witnesses Act.

Bill 76, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Bill 77, An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act.

Bill 78, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Bill 79, An Act to amend The Partnerships Registration Act.

Bill 80, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Bill 81, An Act to amend The Probation Act.

Bill 82, An Act to amend The Sheriffs Act.

Bill 83, An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act.

Bill 84, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Bill 85, An Act to amend The Homes for the Aged and Rest Homes Act.

Bill 88, An Act respecting motorized snow vehicles.

Bill 92, An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act.

Bill 93, An Act to amend The Private Hospitals Act.

Bill 94, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

Bill 95, An Act to provide for the control of forest tree pests.

Bill 96, An Act respecting the northerly boundary of lot 19, Concession XIV, in the township of Tay.

Bill 97, An Act respecting forest fires prevention.

Bill 98, An Act to amend The Provincial Parks Act.

Bill 99, An Act to provide for the establishment and functions of the Ontario geographic names board.

Bill 100, An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act.

Bill 101, An Act to amend The Railway Fire Charge Act.

Bill 102, An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture and Food Act.

Bill 104, An Act to amend The Industrial Safety Act, 1964.

Bill 106, An Act to amend The Line Fences Act.

Bill 108, An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act.

Bill 109, An Act to amend The Local Roads Boards Act, 1964.

Bill 114, An Act to amend The Surveys Act.

Bill 115, An Act to amend The Public Lands Act.

Bill 116, An Act to amend The Dog Tax and Livestock and Poultry Protection Act.

Bill 119, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

To these Acts, the Royal assent was announced by the Clerk of the legislative assembly in the following words:

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Clerk of the House: The 17th order, the committee of the whole House; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

THE PHARMACY ACT

House in committee on Bill 122, An Act Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill 122 reported.

THE MEDICAL ACT

House in committee on Bill 123, An Act to amend The Medical Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 123 reported.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report two bills without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report two bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Clerk of the House: The 28th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS
(Continued)

On votes 1903 and 1904:

Mr. Chairman: May I say to the committee that when the committee completed their deliberations last evening the Chairman had made a ruling pertaining to continued debate in this particular vote regarding the Don jail. Several members had risen on points of order and the Chairman would ask if there are any further points of order in connection with the ruling.

The member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I just wish to point out that the remarks I wish to make and which you presumed were repetitious before I had made them, were not going to be repetitious. The remarks I intended to make have not been made either by myself or any other member in this House and I respectfully request your permission to make my comments.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, there is a point I would like to add. If you will recall the night before last the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) intervened on what was finally accepted—whether enthusiastically or reluctantly is not for me to say—that we were debating ten per cent of the estimates of Don jail and the other 90 per cent would come later. I presume that we have that 90 per cent to deal with now.

Mr. Chairman: Well I would say to the—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): If you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, before you make any further statement—I understand you have made a ruling on this matter and while I personally believe the matter pertaining to the Don jail has been very carefully scrutinized on both the occasions, it is, in my view, too previous to rule that the hon. member's remarks were going to be repetitious. It may very well be that there would be some irrelevance in them if we concern ourselves with what the Minister has already said, that he is taking over responsibility for that institution sometime in the future. Nevertheless, under the circumstances as I understand them, I believe that the Chairman is in error in making the ruling that he made; and I say that with some regret because I believe the Chairman is making an excellent job of operating the committee of the House under these circumstances.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman would say to the points of order that have been raised that the member for Downsview has debated and discussed the Don jail matter quite extensively in generalities. The member for High Park has also dwelt on some generalities, and he dwelt on certain specific cases.

Many questions had been directed to the Minister and the questions had been answered. The estimates before us in votes 1903 and 1904 deal with the amount of money to be voted under these estimates for the department's future control and operation of provincial jails.

It is the Chairman's opinion that further debate specifically in connection with any particular details pertaining to Don jail are irrelevant to the vote. In addition, the Chairman had earlier ruled that the remarks were becoming repetitious.

The Chairman would therefore confirm his ruling that further remarks on the Don jail aspect of the provincial jails would be out of order.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, with regret, I must appeal your ruling.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I just want to make it quite clear that as far as I am concerned it does not make any difference which way you have ruled. The manner in which I am going to vote is that I believe in upholding the ruling of the chair under practically any circumstances.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the Chairman's ruling?

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the ayes are 52, the nays 30.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the Chairman's ruling upheld. We will proceed with debate on the matter of provincial jails. The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, in reference to jails in St. Catharines, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if this jail has been given special priority in light of suggestions by the Ontario Supreme Court jury which toured the jails in St. Catharines.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As I stated yesterday, Mr. Chairman, there is no point in my prejudging the report of the task force which is working on all these jails now. When I have the complete report the department will go over it and we will then made a decision as to priorities and what we will do in any particular jails.

Mr. Shulman: When will the report be ready; do you have any idea?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know; it should not be too long.

Mr. Shulman: Did the jury suggest any immediate changes while you are waiting for a replacement?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I do not have the jury's report before me. All I can say is that there are very few jails in this province that have not had jury reports condemning certain aspects of the facilities. All of this will be taken into consideration.

Mr. Shulman: Has the Minister looked into the charges made by one Wayne Douglas Hart who was confined in the Lincoln county jail for a period of some months, and who made some rather alarming charges about the jail and the treatment of prisoners in that jail?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to answer this question—just hold on a minute, there may be something here. No, we do not have anything here on this particular inmate.

Mr. Shulman: You do not have anything?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, they do not seem to have anything here on this particular inmate.

Mr. Shulman: Could the Minister look into this matter for me?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we look into all complaints.

Mr. Shulman: Has this particular complaint been investigated?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As I have advised the member, the name is not familiar. It may very well have been that this is one of many complaints which we have investigated; on the other hand it may be something which has not yet come to my attention. I cannot answer that.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister report back at his convenience on this particular matter?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member wishes me to go into this particular complaint, if there is such a complaint, and report back, I will be glad to do that. However, he must remember that if he is going to keep asking me about all the complaints made by all the inmates we could be here for an awfully long time.

Mr. Shulman: We will not keep the Minister here longer than necessary; but, yes, I would like that answer for the simple reason that this involves a rather serious charge—including a fire at the jail, just to refresh the Minister's memory.

So if you would report back, I would be very pleased.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman. The hon. member seems to be bringing up once again many of the questions he has asked in this chamber before, and for which he has had answers. He is now referring to the charges of fire at the jail and that sort of thing. It seems to me that this was answered on April 22.

Mr. Shulman: Only a very small aspect of it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will look this up, Mr. Chairman, and see if there is anything further to report.

Mr. Chairman: May we continue on provincial jails? The member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Chairman, does this include reformatories?

Mr. Chairman: No, just provincial jails; which is on page 119 of the estimates.

If there is nothing further on provincial jails we will move to the estimates of votes 1903 and 1904 on page 117—adult institutions and industrial operations. If it is the pleasure of the committee we can deal with the institutions in the same order as listed in the estimates book. Would this be agreeable to the committee, and to the Minister?

The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman do you recall that the other day I asked for a boon? It was the opportunity to talk, in general, about the industrial operations, to examine the overall picture before launching into specific or individual institutions. If I may, I would ask you to permit me to do that now.

Mr. Chairman: I believe the member for Lakeshore would be quite within his rights to proceed on this basis.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The institutions of this province have under their various headings and under their various locations—in reformatories, industrial farms and whatnot—a wide diversity in the vocational tasks that they are performing.

I will not attempt to run through all these vocational courses and the types of training done at the various institutions. It goes from sheet metal working, to barbering, to electrical work; horticultural work, work in forestries, abattoirs, looking after and tending cattle, and so on. I have a list here of about 37 different occupations, which cover the spectrum pretty well.

So far so good.

Looking at page 93 of the Minister's report for this year I notice that the total income derived from all industrial production is the sum of $2,630,000 odd, and the farm recoveries are $480,000.

In discussing this matter it may be just as well to take out one example, that would be Guelph, which is the largest in the schedule. Guelph reformatory brought in $1.5 million to the coffers of the province in this past year from work done by the inmates of that institution, and helps in this regard to reduce the overall load of maintaining reform and other institutions.

My complaint about this matter is that in a visitation to Guelph, for instance, and in other places too, in an overall way this tends to be an abuse. In other words, what has happened in this province is that these institutions of penal reform have become sidetracked from the purposes and opportunities of reform, into self-servicing units which are to a great extent dedicated wholly to keeping interservice of a governmental kind.

In the tailor shops around the province they are making their own uniforms, pajamas and whatnots—not only for the inmates of the other institutions throughout the province, each being allocated little tasks to do to keep the rest of the thing working, but for Ontario Hospitals and various other provincial institutions.

This is an abuse, to the extent that most of the time, the emphasis at least, if not the direction, is completely wrong.

This business of taking in each others's washing neglect the custodial, remedial, rehabilitative services which should be your prime intent, and which you have indicated in this House on numerous occasions, and no more than the last few days, is the thing that is uppermost in your mind and the driving force of your department.

Your department is being jeopardized, braked, held back and retrograded as a result of the emphasis in production.

You have all kinds of inmates out looking after cows. You have numerous inmates raising various types of crop. You have inmates in tailor shops—and most of the inmates hate the tailor shops; their position on the tailor shops is this is women's work. Some, perhaps, among the homosexual prisoners in some institutions rather like it, but they are few and far between.

This whole business, in this regard is one of prostituting the intent of your department.

It has grown up I suspect half a century now, and you have become involved, you are committed, on a production schedule. You are in business, and you are in business in order to provide for other institutions in a gainful way.

You are taking it out on the prisoners because they are paid, as we all know, negligible, absurdly low amounts of money. They are put to desultory tasks which are not useful to their own purposes, but simply useful for the government of this province in keeping costs down at the expense of these prisoners.

I must recognize that there are numerous prisoners, with some selectivity, who do not offer themselves for academic training. Directed toward remedial work in the motor trades or for various vocations in the different types of trades, many who would not otherwise become welders or motor mechanics or electricians and who would go out of that institution, take gainful employment and never come back again. This is all in the cards.

And of course for some of these prisoners it is better to have them employed and doing something other than hanging around all day, as happens at the county jails, doing absolutely nothing and stultifying in their own juices, dreaming up other possibilities for mischief.

But a certain proportion of prisoners would be better in academic courses; you, however, have the overwhelming proportion of your prisoners involved in this particular kind of thing. Very few of the numerous inmates at Guelph undergo any academic training at all.

You have some teachers who may say that they do not make themselves amenable to this kind of training. I think with a little more cultivation, with greater remedial care, these people could be very well brought into it. Your own report indicates that with your therapeutic techniques, you are now inducing more and more people to involve themselves in what are positive beneficial programmes which will ultimately be of great value to the service of this province.

I would ask the hon. Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, to get rid of the subterfuge as it stands, of all the talk of remedial care and to make it a living reality. In process of doing so, I am afraid you are going to have to cut down on the number of trays or the number of redi-rolls or the number of toques that you are turning out of some of these institutions.

I want to launch further into what is perhaps somewhat a speculative venture as to what might be done in the province in this regard. I have not thought it through to its possible conclusion; but why not, you free enterprisers over there, why not have the prisoners paid regular wages like regular working men doing regular work within the confines of these institutions?

I mean as a long-term objective, why not have them participate in industry? Why not make them do positive tasks, not just digging holes and filling them up again, a thing which is degrading and which empties them of any purpose; and which again afflicts them so you will not get people restored to the community.

Why not do these things? You may say the trade unions might object, well I say not; as long as you allow them to form a closed shop, which they are already, and as long as the union rates are observed. I see no reason why this cannot take place.

I tell you who will object; industry might very well object.

Why should they? It is to their overall interest. These people would then accumulate savings in advance. They would come out of these institutions not with $20 or $50 —usually $20 in your institutions—in their pocket with which to enter a new life; which they spend on the first night of their freedom in order to wash away in soap and suds of various kinds all those months of repression and being forced into a tight corner.

Why can they not work in a regular process in jobs, be trained for those jobs, and work within the manpower situation, work within your educational-vocational systems of The Department of Education of this province?

Why can all these things not be thought about and motivated? Then they would come out knowing something, they would come out as men equipped to do some positive job, with work habits established and able to make a positive contribution.

Also, incidentally, they would pay income tax, and be able in part to support themselves making money, and the welfare rolls of this province would be vastly relieved in terms of the wives deriving constant income; then also the children would be placed in a better position, from the point of view of care and maintenance, and the food they would get. Why cannot all these things be done? I see no overriding objection to doing so, rather

than this make-work—or at least if it is not make-work business, the business of a very tight, enforced type of utility which benefits you, benefits the custodians of the institution and does very little, if anything, in your tanneries and your pickle factories and your jam jar institutions, to rectify or bring any degree of goodwill out of all these men.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The member must have read our critic's speech, he said all this two days ago.

Mr. Lawlor: My only comment to that, Mr. Chairman, is that I very regretfully missed it, if such was the case, which I rather doubt. I have not noticed any great imaginative impact proceeding from the Liberal side over there.

But they say, when you complain, say, to the man in charge at Guelph, "Well, now, listen, you have got these boys working for you and not for themselves". He says, "Yes, but we are teaching them proper working habits; in other words, many of these people have never in their lives got up at a proper hour and gone to a particular task, been punctual, and got into the way of regularizing their lives, and this is what we are teaching them. And whether they are out prodding cows in the pasture or whether they are in the tailor shop or the cannery does not matter too much, the fact is that they are doing something on a regularized basis." I say, balderdash—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Is that parliamentary?

An hon. member: That is pretty strong language.

Mr. Lawlor: —that effect is not true.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Poppycock, I said.

Mr. Singer: "Poppycock" is worse.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, if I were not in the Legislature, I oculd express myself properly. But in this regard, the business of saying they are teaching good work habits just does not go far enough. It is again a subterfuge with which to hide the internal operations. I feel that these matters and this approach to these sorts of problems and not the reliance upon the income that you get —which incidentally seems to be dropping somewhat at least in certain categories, which I might or might not mention subsequently. That income is not your overpowering, your overriding or your primary consideration, not even a tertiary consideration so far as reform institutions are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, in this wide area, a third matter to which I want to address myself is training or what is done to the inmates of the institutions academically. You know that in this province people have been to our reform institutions—recidivists—time after time, and they remain illiterate. I have before me a report from the Oshawa *Times* of April 27, in which a story of a 30-year-old Ottawa bachelor who has never spent a day of his life in school, was revealed in Oshawa magistrate's court Friday, during the pre-sentencing examination of the man's background by Magistrate Donald Dodds and Crown attorney Bruce Alfred. This man was arrested for filching goods from automobiles, and the magistrate says:

> It is an indictment of our society that in this day and age this can happen. This man by his very circumstances is almost doomed to a life of crime. This is a lonely desperate kind of existence for a man to lead.

Now, Chapman, who has an extensive record dating back to 1959 for offences in Ottawa, Oshawa, Pembroke and Brantford, was offered his choice of penitentiary or Ontario reformatory. He chose the reformatory, saying he did not want a federal record which a penitentiary would give him. The magistrate decided to sentence him to two years less a day and sent him to a reformatory. He finally ended up by saying as the man left the court, "It is a personal tragedy."

I believe, looking through the Minister's records—I have not checked this year's but last year he had 117 illiterate people in the institutions. Surely something could be done about the academic facilities at least to give them a modicum of education. How can they work, how can they come out and get any type of job? Certainly, sitting around in those institutions for the long hours and months they spend, they should be directed into—and why are there so many of them?—directed into some kind of instruction where they can learn a little of the language?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, are there any more comments on this particular subject?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Industrial, Burwash.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think perhaps, Mr. Chairman, in view of the nature of the

comments of the hon. member for Lakeshore, I might deal with that.

In the first place, his overall philosophy in respect of pay for work and that sort of thing, I wholeheartedly agree with. This is what we are working toward, and have been. That is one reason why we have appointed a trades and industry advisory committee, which has been working now, I think, about a year and a half. They are studying the whole gambit of vocational training and industry and so forth, so as to bring to us a recommendation as to whether it is necessary to scrap something—if there is anything that should be scrapped—whether any of our courses are not up to date, and what will be more meaningful in respect of teaching those of our inmates vocations which would lead to a greater opportunity on the outside. In other words, is our programme up to date and in keeping with the requirements of industry on the outside?

Unfortunately, the hon. member used the expression that there is an "emphasis on industry to turn out production." I disagree with him. This may be the impression that he got there, but this is not our goal and this is not what we are stressing. The fact remains that going into Guelph—if the hon. member would like to hear my answer to him, I hope that he will give me his undivided attention. Going into Guelph and saying that most of those in Guelph are in industry and in that way giving the impression, or deciding from the impression that he sees there, that this is what is happening to most of our inmates across the whole reformatory system would be tantamount to my saying, after I go into the Brampton training centre, where we skim the cream of the crop from the classification at Guelph, and saying, "It looks like we rehabilitate more than 66 per cent." That is true at Brampton. But taking the whole system by and large, I am sure that our success ratio is not anywhere that good.

The fact remains that about 50 per cent of the inmates in the reformatories are in training centres. They would not be in industries that the hon. member is referring to. They are in training centres getting some trade training. Most of those who are in industry have either refused to take vocational training, or have refused to take academic training in many instances, and have proven themselves not motivted towards learning anything in particular. We put them to work in the industry which in itself is a rehabilitative measure. The idea that because someone is working on some mass-production machine, is not rehabilitative is entirely wrong. This teaches inmates good working habits which, by and large, many of them, or most of them, have never had. They do not know what it is like, many of them, to get up in the morning in time to have breakfast and get to work, do a half day's work, have some lunch, go back to work, and after that, go home for dinner and to have a couple of hours of relaxation. They do not know that kind of life, and so part of their rehabilitation is getting them adjusted to this kind of routine. It is a disciplinary routine, if you like, but it is some kind of routine in their lives so that they know, by and large, that this is the way society lives. From this point of view, it has a rehabilitative factor to it.

And the fact that they turn out some product that can be used to reduce the cost to the taxpayer, is something I am sure the hon. member would have no objection to at all. Now, he made some comment about it being better to do something useful than to "dig holes and then fill them up again." I am sure that he never saw anything like that at our institutions. If there is any instance where he has seen—in our provincial system—anyone doing useless work, I wish that he would call that to our attention.

Mr. Lawlor: Millbrook.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, I do not know how he can say that about Millbrook, because they are doing something useful there too. One of the factors in rehabilitation is that, in order to have the inmates recapture some of their dignity and self respect, you have them do something useful.

He also suggested that he is sure that if we put in a "pay-for-work" programme, we would have no objections from the unions. No doubt —as he put it—we would have objections from industry. Of course, this is going back to the dogmatic doctrinaire approach of the socialists, who are always looking for a rampart to storm.

The fact remains that the objection comes from both industry and unions. We have had trouble with this. They have had trouble with this in every jurisdiction in the world. I would like to qualify that because I have not seen every jurisdiction in the world. In most of the jurisdictions in the world—and I have seen many—this is the problem that they have, even in socialist countries. They have a great number of problems. The hon. member can have an example right here in Ontario. We have a great deal of objection at the Lakehead. I have correspondence. I think that

the last time we had an objection was last year or two years ago. I am sure that it was at the Lakehead. We were going to have some of the men do work such as building a training centre. We were having our own inmates as part of the programme of teaching them something useful rather than to "dig holes".

We had objections from the union which was at the Lakehead, and we had to abandone it when we went to Fort William. We were building a training centre there as part of the programme. The hon. member will please keep in mind we are training these people who seem to have some interest in learning a vocation. We were teaching them carpentry and we were having them do the carpentry work in building the training centre. We had a tremendous objection from the labour union.

Mr. Lawlor: On your terms, yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, well the hon. member is suggesting that we should pay them union wages and, of course, that is an ideal which no one—

There is only one place in the world where I have found this in operation and that is in Helsinki in Finland. There they are able to work this out, and they use it for short term offenders—usually those people who are convicted of drunk driving. You find many businessmen there serving short sentences, of 60 days, 90 days and so on.

When I was there they were building an airport in conjunction with private industry and they were being paid. They even had a system of currency within the penal system and it was a very good system. I look forward to someday having something like that here. But it also had its problems. I am not suggesting that it is not a good idea, but if the hon. member thinks that they do not have problems now, and did not originally, with some of the unions and private industry there, he is mistaken. They are having trouble all over with this particular problem. I think that a conversation that the hon. member for Lakeshore had with the hon. member for High Park when they were visiting Guelph, is a perfect example of the difficulties that we have in trying to arrive at some policy which might be acceptable to the community. It is not easy, but this is what the trade unions and industry advisory board is working on.

As a matter of fact, I have a report here from the assistant superintendent at Guelph —the result of the hon. member's visit to Guelph—and he states here:

> Dr. Shulman, later after learning that the products which are produced in our industry are sold to other departments in the government circle, such as picnic tables, blankets, suits, socks, hand goods, meat, and so on, immediately suggested that production in these particular areas should be increased and further suggested that these products be made available on the commercial market. Mr. Lawlor immediately interjected and pointed out to Dr. Shulman that it would be highly improper for the government to start competing with outside industry, and certainly made it quite clear to Dr. Shulman that this would have many political repercussions. At this point there was an immediate abandonment of the subject under discussion.

I hope that this is an accurate description of their discussion. I do not repeat this out of malice, but in this discussion there was exemplified the dilemma that all correctional jurisdictions have all over the world.

Mr. Lawlor: These difficulties, with a little good will, could be overcome.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have our problems there along the same line as was mentioned by the hon. member. Of course we have.

The hon. member said something about some of the releasees from our institutions being illiterate. There are some, of course, go through our system time and time again and they still remain, many of them—some of them, I should not say many of them—some of them, by and large, illiterate.

But what would the hon. member do about that? Would he strap them into a chair and whip the education into them? Some of these people refuse to take academic training. They just refuse and you cannot knock education into the head of an adult. Now you might try it with a child, which is also most difficult.

The fact remains, that some of these people will not take academic training. May I read for the hon. member some of the reports that we have from the inspectors of education—our department. This is from the director of education of the department:

> There are 108 full-time qualified teachers and 36 full-time instructors in our department at present. A number of part-time teachers, including 34 already appointed for this summer, also assist. All teachers work on a 10-month contract basis, with

salary benefits commensurate with community schools. Our contract plan follows the pattern of progressive school boards in paying a $500 special allowance to attract and hold teachers with the abilities and qualifications necessary for teaching special classes. We have added new teachers and upgraded the facilities where possible. Plans have been made for other improvements and existing facilities. Education will play a significant role in the various new facilities presently being planned. The teachers, according to the inspection reports of The Department of Education, are working at a very high level.

I will refer to that in a moment.

> Many teachers have qualified as teachers of special education and guidance. We have just completed our teacher recruitment for 1968-69 and we are very pleased with the response to our advertisements and with the teachers that have come with us. Our teacher turn-over—

and I think I mentioned this in my opening remarks.

> —our teacher turn-over is considerably less than most schools. We are continuing with various experimental programmes. Many teachers in community schools have become interested in some of these projects. We have developed a full fledged educational system of which we can be proud.

Just to read some of the reports, I have four or five pages here, some of the reports from the inspectors who inspect the education that is going on in our institutions.

Mr. Steele, the regional superintendent at Fort William, in writing about the Ontario training centre there says, and I quote:

> Visiting inspectors were generally impressed by the professional ability, staff rapport, sympathetic attitude and spirit of the teaching staff.

The following is from a report from Mr. Martin after having inspected the Ontario training centre at Bramtpon:

> The school is well organized and the programme carefully planned. Mr. Scott, head teacher of the school, shows a keen insight into the needs of the students and works conscientiously to provide the programme that will successfully meet these needs. Special programmes and devices such as the team-teaching experiment are indicative of the progressive planning that goes into the programme of the school. His relationship with his staff is excellent and the teachers on the staff of the school appear to be well oriented to the teaching situation that exists in the school. They have a good relationship with the students. They plan their programmes and lessons to suit the needs of the class and involve the students in the lessons quite successfully. The student participation was surprisingly good.

Mr. Chairman, I have, as I say, four or five pages of this. I will not trouble the hon. members with them but I think, that to give the impression we are not expending every posible effort to give academic training where academic training is indicated and accepted, would be to give the wrong impression.

The ones the hon. member is referring to are those who have refused to accept academic training or have proven in the past that they pay no attention or will not attend the classes as they should, to learn what is possible to normally teach them.

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue this matter before we go on to specific institutions.

I am not completely satisfied, as you might expect, by the Minister's reply and the reason I am not satisfied is that the member for Lakeshore and I have been to a number of institutions, have interviewed a number of men and I never would have thought of repeating the superintendent's comments at the time because I thought our comments at that time were confidential; but since the Minister has set the precedent, I now have no hesitation in repeating them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think that that comes ill from the mouth of the hon. member. This hon. member has repeated conversations he has had with superintendents and staff of our institutions right on the floor of this House.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, anything I repeated on the floor of this House, the person who I first spoke to is well aware that it is going to be repeated. If the Minister is referring to the matters from Mercer reformatory, I made it very clear at the time, at Mercer, to the lady superintendent, that I wished to copy the material to bring up in the House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me make it quite clear, Mr. Chairman, that we made it quite

clear to the assistant superintendent that we were going to report the hon. member's remarks to this House.

Mr. Shulman: Fine, then may I continue, Mr. Chairman?

At the time we visited the institution, we questioned a number of men as to why they were doing the various menial tasks which they had been assigned to, and why they were not taking some training and these were men who had no—these were boys really—who had no training, no skills, no jobs to go out to; and invariably, the same answer was given—they were not given the opportunity to take these classes because the classes were filled.

We questioned the superintendent about this and it was quite true. There was a very limited capacity, something under 15 per cent of the number of prisoners at the reformatory were able to take these classes and, as a result, they were put off into industries; and the question I asked the deputy superintendent at that time, was "for goodness sakes why do you not ask for more capacity in your training classes?" His reply was—and the member for Lakeshore was there—we need the men for the industry.

Mr. Lawlor: That is right.

Mr. Shulman: And this is why we were so upset with this situation. He needs the men for the industry. This is where the emphasis is. This is not where the emphasis should be. The emphasis should be put on rehabilitation and on training, not on your industry, and all the Minister's fine words are not going to change that situation because man after man goes in there. If they are not fortunate enough to be taken off in the cream and sent down to Brampton or to Burtch, they are in Guelph, and they do not, unless they are in a very small minority, get proper training. This is not satisfactory.

I would like to ask the Minister a question. I was quite amazed when I visited, last weekend, to one of the institutions, to find that a letter had been sent to this institution and, presumably, to the others under the control of this Minister, stating that if members of this House visited and questioned prisoners, that the guards were to listen and to write down what the members of this House had asked the prisoners and were to report it back to the department.

I would like to ask the Minister: What is the purpose of this particular surveillance?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the hon. member quote such a letter to me.

Mr. Shulman: Is the Minister denying there is such a letter?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would like to see the letter. I said that—

Mr. Shulman: Is the Minister denying there is such a letter?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, how can I deny something, the existence of which I do not know? I do not know whether it exists or not. I would like to know if such a letter exists.

Mr. Shulman: I can assure the Minister there is such a letter.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not take that assurance. I would like to have it read by the hon. member. Does the hon. member not have that letter?

Mr. Shulman: I do not have that letter—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then I would suggest—

Mr. Shulman: I have a copy of that letter, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would doubt very much if such a letter exists.

Mr. Shulman: Is the Minister denying such a letter?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is not going to give me a Shulmanism. I did not say I denied it. I said I would doubt if such a letter exists. May I answer the other statement at the same time?

In the first case, the hon. member usually makes his visits on a Saturday, and Saturday there is very little—I suppose there is no—academic training going on on a Saturday. If there was a member of our staff who made such a statement to the hon. member, which I again doubt, then that man had no right making such a statement. It is not the policy of the department. And may I suggest to the hon. member, as I mentioned earlier, in the first place, if it was a person suitable for real good academic training, he would not be at that place. He would probably be getting academic training in another institution. He probably would have been in a training centre, that is where that person would usually be.

Now to take the word of some inmate in respect to what he thinks—what he thinks is

the policy of the department—well, you can get all sorts of opinions of this nature.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, it was the deputy superintendent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I—

Mr. Shulman: The hon. member for Lakeshore was present.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The deputy superintendent at which institution?

Mr. Shulman: At Guelph, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will ask the deputy superintendent.

Mr. Shulman: You may do so and fortunately, there was a witness who will back it up.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: But the point really is, Mr. Chairman, that they do skim off the cream but the cream is too small. There are hundreds of inmates left at this particular institution. I do not wish to go off into details of that now but I will present them when we get to that particular institution, which is Guelph. I want to speak about the general problem.

Now to carry on on general matters.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why do you speak about Guelph now, when we want to talk about the general problem?

Mr. Lawlor: You are not in the chair.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to ask the Minister what is the policy of the department in relation to visits or tours of institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: By whom?

Mr. Shulman: Is there a policy?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: You have a policy that certain persons may tour it and others may not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, not everyone who comes to an institution can visit, it is still a penal institution. Of course, all the hon. members are free to visit the institutions.

Mr. Shulman: What about the press?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The press, by arrangement with the head office, can visit institutions and have done so on numerous occasions, although I should say the press do not have to use the subterfuge which was used by the hon. member to get the press into one of our jails last week. This is a very reprehensible practice and I want to say right here and now—

Mr. Shulman: What is the Minister referring to?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will give you the details. Which jail was that? Hamilton jail. The hon. member went in with—

Mr. Shulman: We did not go into that jail with anyone. We visited a prisoner, let that be quite clear. We were asked to tour the jail and we refused, so let there be no doubt in the Minister's mind.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did the hon. member not go into the Hamilton jail to visit a prisoner? He went in with the hon. member for Lakeshore, and he went in with another man, who was described as an assistant—

Mr. Shulman: Wrong. Who described him in this way? You only have to look at the book of visitors.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is exactly what is written in the book of visitors—"as an assistant".

Mr. Shulman: I would suggest that you check that, sir.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He was listed as an assistant. The reporter, whoever he was, did not need to go to that subterfuge, all he had to do was ask permission from the department and he will usually get permission to go in. Now the hon. member—

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, may I rise on a point of order? The Minister is again misleading the House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —the hon. member tried to go in—

Mr. Shulman: I must rise on a point of order here, Mr. Chairman. The Minister is misleading the House. What I asked the Minister about was touring the institutions. In the case he is referring to there was no tour of the institution. Two other gentlemen and I, one of whom is in the House, visited a prisoner. We did not go into the institution although we were so invited. We refused to tour the institution for the very reason that

one of the people with us was not a member, and let that be quite clear.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member trying to tell me that his intention was not to go in with the other man?

Mr. Shulman: My intention was to visit a prisoner, not to tour the institution.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not to tour the institution?

Mr. Shulman: Do not throw another red herring across the path.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will see who throws the red herring. The press has been in and out of our institutions on many occasions, on many occasions—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, what are you arguing about?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am just arguing about the method employed by the hon. member. There was no need for this. I do not know why some newspaper men seem to think that they cannot visit our institutions.

Mr. Shulman: They want to visit your institutions and see all the facts.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, just a moment, the hon. member has asked me about the policy concerning visiting institutions, and I am telling the hon. member. The reformatories have always welcomed the press, providing arrangements are made in advance, obviously. And we also have to make sure that the visits are spaced far enough apart so that the inmates do not feel they are constantly on display. Obviously, if there had been a newspaper man in today and another comes along tomorrow and wants to go through, we cannot permit that. We will allow a gap to intervene before someone else goes through.

There has been no interdiction against the press. There are, I think, at the last report —the report I gave to this House last year— if I can recall, I pointed out that, in addition to family visits, there were some 3,000 visits to our institutions by students from the school of social work, by other people interested in sociology, by service organizations, by community organizations who go in and out of our institutions. I gave this figure again at that time, which I sem to have to do every year, to lay that canard to rest, if it is possible to do so: that no one can go into our institutions to see what is going on.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you very much. Then you would say that it would be incorrect to say that tours of institutions by persons other than those having a clearly established and formally identified interest or involvement in work with the prisoners are allowed—that it would be incorrect to say that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would the hon. member repeat that?

Mr. Shulman: I will not put you on the spot; I was just about to get you—

Hon. Mr. Grosman: Oh, I am sure you do not want to put me on the spot—

Mr. Shulman: I will make it easy for you.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Will the members please address their remarks through the chair.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I have a letter here signed by H. C. Hutchison, Ph.D, administrator, adult male institutions, dated January 26, 1968, which says:

> Please be advised that we have discontinued tours of institutions by persons other than those having a clearly established and formally identified interest or involvement in work with prisoners.

This gentleman, is, I believe, a man of some importance in the institution, and I find it difficult to understand how the Minister decides who goes in and who does not go in. The department has a policy which seems to affect some people sometimes and other people at other times.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To whom was such a letter sent?

Mr. Shulman: I must keep this man's name confidential. I have the letter here. I will be glad to give you a photostat of the letter if you so wish.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Surely the hon. member must appreciate the fact that there are certain people who would be undesirable—

Mr. Shulman: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —to go into institutions for various reasons—now, how else can I answer that?

Mr. Shulman: I am not asking about various people. I am asking whether this is the policy which is written down here.

> Please be advised that we have discontinued tours of institutions by persons other than those having a clearly established and formally identified interest or involvement in work with prisoners.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That would be our general policy, yes.

Mr. Shulman: How in the world do you explain that certain people like certain members of the radio world are allowed to go in? It would seem that this sentence would definitely exclude these people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are certain people of the radio world who are members of the news media—certainly aside from television; and the reason for that is so that they will not identify inmates' faces. This is a purposeful visit is it not, to inform the public what is going on in our institutions? Why would you not allow the press—

Mr. Shulman: I am not arguing that. What I am saying is that your sentence is quite different. Let me ask you one more question here—Mr. Hutchison's sentence is quite different—when the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is his name?

Mr. Shulman: Hutchison—H. C. Hutchison, Ph.D, administrator, adult male institutions, you may have heard his name before, Mr. Chairman. What I would like to ask the Minister is: Are individual reporters allowed to tour the jails?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member referring to reformatories or the jails?

Mr. Shulman: Reformatories.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Reformatories—yes.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Then I would like again to go on in this letter. He mentions certain groups of people who are allowed to go through and it says:

> In such cases we prefer to arrange for groups to be given a tour of the institutions.

This is also backed up by press people who, I understand, have been invited to go through the institutions in groups. I am again wondering why specific exceptions have been made for one or two people to tour the jail individually, particularly when it seems to be in direct contradiction to the policies expressed by Mr. H. C. Hutchison.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I fail to see where there is any contradiction. I do not know why the impression is that the press has to go in in special tours. The press has been in and out of our institutions. They have written all sorts of articles about what goes on in the institutions, some good, some bad, some indifferent, so I do not know what point the hon. member is making. The facts speak for themselves, the press have gone in and out.

Mr. Shulman: The point I was asking, Mr. Chairman, was not whether the press was allowed in; we have already had that answer. The point I was asking is: Are they allowed to go in individually and the reason—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is yes.

Mr. Shulman: Fine, thank you, that is all I wanted to know—for the future—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They have been going individually—there is no change in policy in that respect.

Mr. Shulman: Well, this letter is incorrect.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not think it is incorrect, I think it is the way the hon. member interprets it. Is that a letter to a member of the press or from a member of the press?

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry, as I said before, I have to protect the person who received it. I would be glad to give you—look up your own files, I gave you the date of it.

An hon. member: If you cannot bare the name, keep quiet—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out in reply to the interjection that when I have mentioned names in the past—

Mr. Chairman: The member need not reply to the interjection; the interjection is entirely out of order.

Mr. Shulman: I know the interjection is out of order, but it goes on the record and I wish to reply to it. In the past, when I have mentioned names the hon. Minister has castigated me for that, and when I do not mention names the backbenchers join in; so I just wish to make that quite clear. That is all for the moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: In this connection I would like to address myself to the actual estimates themselves. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the Minister would advise

whether there is any computer or data processing education or anything of that sort available?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is presently at Mercer reformatory, but I do not know whether you would refer to this as a data processing. I think that, to a point, there are some of the complicated calculating machines which they are teaching the inmates at Mercer to operate. I think that beyond that you could hardly call it a complex IBM system.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, if I might, reading from page 45 of the Minister's report, it reads as follows:

> Education programmes to fit inmates' needs, individually, and work and training programmes geared to the present requirements of industry, must constantly be reviewed. Highly-trained and experienced professional staff work with inmates on both individual and group basis.

Now, I must say, and I say it most respectfully to the Minister, that as I read that I come to a conclusion as I look at the statistics of your training programme—it is unduly self-serving and self-aggrandizing. Perhaps I am wrong, but as I look on page 81, of your statistical review, you talk about auto mechanics, sewing, laundry, hookery, nurses' aid, hairdressing. I just cannot for the life of me accept this as a training for the present day requirements of industry.

I do not wish to associate myself entirely with the comments made by my friend from Lakeshore, general as they may be. But there was some kernel of truth in what he said. There is an obvious attempt here to gear the industrial training programme to the needs of the department and the other departments of the government. Mr. Chairman, I convey to the Minister, through you, that perhaps having regard to the highly-automated state of our industry—and I come from an area whose industry is highly automated—and having regard to the great growth in the computer field, The Department of Reform Institutions might well consider establishment and development of computer programming training.

I would refer you, sir, to the *Christian Science Monitor* of May 18, 1968. An article by Richard C. Halverson talks about Massachussetts state penitentiary at Walpole, Massachussetts, where they have undertaken this type of training through the Honeywell Electronics Corp. If I might, I would read this to you:

> The prisoners view computer training as the first genuine rehabilitation training that they have seen. They say that, too often, vocational training is a farce—all promise and no delivery. The prisoners stressed the hope that the programme has given them. They say that they are not apt to slip back to their old ways and waste their new-found opportunity. Mr. Smith—who is the director of the programme—maintains that some companies will have to hire them despite their prison records. Their skill is simply too valuable, even though some firms might slam the door in their faces.

Computer training, Mr. Smith adds, gives ex-convicts plenty of doors to knock on. He talks about the fact that in the state of Massachussetts alone, there are approximately 30,000 places available to their comparable Department of Reform Institutions for ex-convicts when they come out of the reform institution trained in this type of effort and initiative. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that what is being done here—and here I associate myself entirely with the remarks of my friend from Lakeshore—is not training people for the needs of modern-day industry, but a vehicle of self-service for your department and the other departments of government.

You cannot by any stretch of the imagination, Mr. Chairman, conceive hairdressing, auto mechanics, barbering and plumbing, as serving the needs of modern industry. I ask you, sir, are you serving the needs of some industry, but not really modern industry? The plumbing industry has been with us for centuries, thank heaven. I ask you to look at the needs of modern industry through this type of effort and initiative. Perhaps you might comment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, there was a misunderstanding about what length of time we have many of these people. Some of them are in there for such a short period of time that there is really no possibility of really teaching them any kind of trade. There is nothing wrong, certainly, with keeping someone who is there for a short length of time working at the laundry.

As a matter of fact, it may be the kind of person who could not get a job anyway outside of a laundry or something like that. Now, surely the hon. member will know that the sewing is done by girls. Nothing wrong with teaching a girl how to sew. Most of

these people have never done any of these things. Certainly the hon. member is not suggesting that there is anything wrong with teaching girls cookery or nurses' aid?

Mr. Bullbrook: I do not for one moment say that there is anything wrong with this. I referred you to page 45 of your own report. We need cooks, we need plumbers and we need hairdressers. I am saying that you are conveying to us, as members of this House, through your report, that your programme was geared to the present-day requirements of industry.

I would ask you to direct your comments to me, not to the necessity of training people in connection with cookery and laundry and things like that. You made a valid point, I suggest, in connection with the limitation of time. I accept that as a valid point. The majority of your inmates are there less than one year, I would think. But I would ask you to consider directing yourself to the possibility of training for these modern-day needs. I accept that we need these other training programmes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, this is precisely the purpose of having set up that trades and industry advisory committee. This is their purpose, to go into our institutions and go through the system and tell us what we are doing that is redundant, and what is going to be useless, and what we are doing that is beneficial, what can be improved upon, and if our machinery is old fashioned—in other words, putting everything into tune with modern-day requirements. This is precisely what they are designed to do, and we would like to get it as up-to-date as we possibly can —as soon as possible.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, in the case of the gratuity or honorarium, or whatever it is called, to the prisoners in reformatory—I would like to discuss this briefly with the Minister. At the present time, it is six and a fraction cents a day. I would like to suggest to the Minister that waiting for a non-existent federal government to pass a non-existent federal bill, which may not pass if the Minister's fond hopes are realized, and a Liberal government is not returned.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then the Conservatives will.

Mr. Shulman: The Conservative government, in all the years that they were in power, never suggested bringing such a bill in, Mr. Chairman. I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there is no need for the people of the province of Ontario to have to wait for the federal government to pass such a bill.

This is within the realm of this particular department, and I would like to commend to the Minister the *Wall Street Journal* of Tuesday, April 9, 1968, which had a lengthy article on problems in American prisons. They pointed out, referring to the prisons down there—specifically to San Quentin—that the men are paid 2 to 16 cents an hour, depending on the work they do and on their experience. I would like to suggest to the Minister that this would be a progressive step that need not depend on the federal government.

The men would have a feeling of achievement, and leave the prison with a backlog of more funds than they get at the present time. This would lead to far less recidivism and would give a man a far better chance to start out. May I suggest to the Minister that if this bill is not brought in by the federal government, then he take steps to make such changes here on a provincial level.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, again this is one of the purposes of the trade and industries advisory committee. There is no use in establishing a system of pay for work until you decide what is going to be the kind of productive work that should be done. On the other hand, it is rather interesting to find the hon. member suggesting on the one hand that we can go into this sort of thing in competitive work and pay up to 16 cents per hour, and on the other hand, a few moments ago, I was told that the only real acceptable method of paying these people would be to pay them the going wage. Now, do I take it then that I will have the support of the NDP if, as, and when we bring in pay for work—even though it is not the going wage? Do I take it that they will support that work, they will support the marketing of those products and the paying of the prisoners this particular wage?

Mr. Shulman: It is amazing to me, Mr. Chairman, how the Minister always manages to confuse two items. What I am discussing here, and the Minister knows it very well—at least I hope he knows it very well—is the rate of pay given to the workmen doing the work they do at the present time. The Minister, not too cleverly, has managed to confuse the other issue, which was brought up by the member for Lakeshore, of the selling to industry of the materials produced in the reformatories. I certainly hope, Mr. Chairman,

that if the Minister does not understand the difference between the two problems, he will get together with his deputy and get some instruction.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on the Ontario reformatories? Agreed to.

The next item in the listing on page 119, industrial farms. Is there anything further on industrial farms? Perhaps I might suggest to the committee that in the same manner in which we have completed provincial jails, we completed the Ontario reformatories, we move—

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, you have skipped Guelph.

Mr. Chairman: No, no, may I point out the Chairman asked if there was anything further on Ontario reformatories.

Mr. Shulman: We were talking in general—

Mr. Chairman: This is exactly what the Chairman asked—Is there anything further on Ontario reformatories?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, there is quite a bit—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): No, it is carried.

Mr. Shulman: Nothing is carried. The motion has not been put.

Mr. Chairman: Order! There is no specific vote on reformatories and the Chairman must say that it is not possible to "carry" Ontario reformatories. I asked if there was further discussion. And this is the only manner whereby we can handle this.

If there is further discussion—may I put it this way? Is there any further general discussion on Ontario reformatories? If not, we can proceed with them item by item, Guelph, Mimico, and so on.

Mr. Shulman: Are we now on Guelph?

Mr. Chairman: Guelph.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he would care to inform the House as to the contents of the report submitted to him by Mr. Sanderson at Guelph reformatory in relation to the disturbance which took place in that reformatory on May 9?

Mr. Chairman: I do not see how specific instances or specific details relate generally to the estimates before us.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, may I point out there is some $5.3 million—

Mr. Chairman: I do not care if it is $30 million.

Mr. Shulman: I care, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman does not care if it is a third or $30 million. The discussion should be general in connection with Guelph.

Mr. Shulman: May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that a part of the problem at Guelph has to do with administration of that institution, which ultimately resulted in a disturbance and eruption which occurred at that institution.

Mr. Chairman: All right, perhaps we can keep it general.

Mr. Shulman: At the time that this was brought up, I believe the Minister said the proper place to discuss it is in the estimates. We are now in the estimates and I am going to ask the Minister through you, sir, if he would care to inform us what was the cause of the difficulties at Guelph reformatory?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Again, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we answered this as an answer to four questions which the hon. member asked on May 14. I thought I gave him the answer to that then.

Mr. Shulman: The Minister is quite right, he did give the answers to those questions and it was very disturbing to us to find the answers were not correct. For example, he said there were no personal injuries in that disturbance. We subsequently found that at least three prisoners were treated by the doctor at Guelph, and other prisoners elsewhere. Now perhaps the Minister would care to give us a truthful answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member mean the other answer was not truthful?

Mr. Shulman: That is exactly what I mean.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member has intimated to the committee that the Minister will not provide the truthful answer. I must remind the member of a similar situation two days back and I am going to ask the member to withdraw his allegation.

Mr. Shulman: With pleasure, Mr. Chairman, I will use the words of the hon. Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko): The answer was not correct but

inasmuch as the rules of the House do not allow me to call the Minister a liar, I withdraw my comment, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, it is very generous of the hon. member to withdraw his words because the rules do not permit him to call me a liar. I must say that I would feel completely alone in this world if the hon. member had not called me a liar at some stage —he has called everyone in this House at some stage or other. We all know he is the—

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I could not hear the member's point of order.

Mr. Shulman: My point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Minister would not like to mislead the House and has done so inadvertently. I wish to point out this is the first time and to my greatest regret that I have called anyone a liar in this House and I would like to point that out to the Minister. He is the first.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, how much longer do we have to sit here and listen to this guff?

An hon. member: That is a good point of order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I still think I answered this question. If I have to do it the way I have to do it, at some great length, the hon. member will have to take the responsibility for it. I think it was answered in this House, insofar as he said I had answered that no one received any injuries.

Because I said that and he has discovered since that there were three who had some minor injuries, this makes, as usual, a liar out of me. I just want to point out, Mr. Chairman, as soon as I got a report from the institution that one man had two stitches in his head—which I am sure every hockey player gets about every three days—and that two were treated for minor concussions, I told my staff that this is another reason why one should take notice from the hon. member for High Park at least a week in advance before answering his questions. Instead of having said "no serious injuries," I sued the words "no injuries". This, of course, in the eyes of the hon. member, means that I have misinformed the House.

The fact remains that the injuries were of such a minor nature, that they were apparently of not enough importance to be reported to me, and no one knows even how they were caused. If this is what he calls misinforming the House, I think it is a perfect example of why one has to be careful before one answers the hon. member without notice.

Mr. Chairman: May the Chairman make some comments on the Minister's remarks before the member for High Park raises his point of order?

I would like to say that the Minister pointed out that the question had been asked during the question period before the orders of the day on a previous date, that he provided the answers at that time. The member for High Park intimated that they were not truthful answers and he has now withdrawn the allegation that they were not truthful answers. Therefore, the Minister has answered the question.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, just to make this quite clear before going to the point of order, I wish to say that what I withdrew was that the Minister was a liar. Someone could give him incorrect answers inadvertently and I would like to believe that this is the situation here.

It was not just the matter of the injuries, one of the other questions was on discipline —I do not recall exactly—punishment or discipline given to the prisoners. There was nothing mentioned about running a gauntlet. There has now been in the press statements by some six prisoners that they had to run the gauntlet. I would like the Minister in as much detail as he wishes to explain what happened at Guelph.

Mr. Chairman: I do not think at this point in dealing with the estimates that the matter of investigating any specific incident at any institution should be discussed or that the Minister should be required to give full details of any investigation. I repeat that we should deal with these estimates in generalities. I put it up to the Minister whether or not he wants to give any further answer to the question already asked.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think the only way to clear this up is to read everything there is to read on this thing, because the hon. member will only go to the press and issue a release or something. I might as well read and give the background of the Guelph reformatory system. This is what the hon.

member is asking for—how they carry on their discipline. And with your permission, sir, I will read it.

Mr. Chairman: Well, if I may just state to the committee that I want it clearly understood as was alleged by one member of the New Democratic Party last evening, that the Chairman is not influenced by the opinions of any member on the government side. However, if the Minister wishes to read the statement, he may go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, Guelph reformatory admits all offenders under 18 years of age, from the south of the province. Other offenders at Guelph—it is important to know this so we can know the type of inmates we are dealing with at Guelph—other offenders at Guelph over the age of 18 years are all serving their first imprisonment. On admission to the reformatory, those under the age of 25 without extension records are placed in the reception wing where they are given a battery of psychological and aptitude tests. They then appear before a classification committee, where those with the ability to benefit from a training centre programme are selected and go to either Brampton or Burtch.

Obviously the better motivated inmates are taken out of the reformatory, leaving the more difficult inmates at Guelph. Some of these inmates below the age of 25 form the core of instigators of major incidents in the Guelph reformatory. Some show patterns of disruptive behaviour, they have histories of disturbances amongst themselves, and in their defiance of authority frequently involve other inmates against their better judgment.

Of the 1,313 inmates under the age of 25 that went to Guelph last year, classification boards selected and transferred 308 inmates to the Brampton training centre, 74 to the Burtch training centre, and 185 to Camp Hendrie—leaving at Guelph 746 who showed little motivation, who had very short sentences, or who were custodial risks of behaviour problems.

Last year out of a total of 1,614 inmates under 25, in addition to those recorded above as having been selected for training programmes at Brampton, Burtch and Camp Hendrie, 84 inmates were initially classified into Fort William training centre, 117 into Monteith training centre, and 100 into Rideau training centre. Thus, from the total of 1,614 inmates in the under 25 age group, there was a selection of the better motivated, better behaved offenders, leaving at Guelph 746 of this age group, 46 per cent of the total, who in general represent the most unmanageable, most disruptive, and least motivated of the inmates of their age group.

Can I just explain, sir, something about the previous criminal history of this age group? Many of these inmates, even under the age of 25, have a distinct pattern of criminal behaviour, of disregard for public property, public safety, and public well being.

Between them, these 1,313 inmates under the age of 25 admitted to Guelph last year had served 810 terms on probation, had been given 147 suspended sentences, paid 748 fines, served 567 short terms in jail. Only 87 out of a total of 1,313 had previously been in the reformatory. When it is considered that the most difficult 50 per cent of this group are retained at Guelph, I believe, sir, it is a credit to the staff that there are not more incidents of friction.

The behaviour of some of these men in the institution is often atrocious. Details of the overall behaviour cannot easily be gathered, but select behaviour patterns can be read out.

May I just give you one example, and it is by no means an isolated one. It is a record typical of the type to which I am referring:

March 4, 1967, insolence and causing a disturbance; March 14, 1967, admitted to Guelph from Ontario training centre at Rideau as a behaviour problem; March 30, 1967, unsatisfactory conduct and work; April 13, 1967, unsatisfactory conduct, gambling in the tailor shop; April 26, 1967, unsatisfactory work and insolence; April 27, 1967, destroying government property; May 13, 1967, continuous poor conduct; June 5, 1967, intimidation of another inmate; June 26, 1967, insolence and stealing food; August 10, 1967, unnecessary visit to the hospital; August 19, 1967, causing a disturbance after the lights out, being in an unauthorized place; August 21, 1967, unsatisfactory conduct in confinement cells; August 30, 1967, misuse of tobacco, insolence, threatening an officer, using obscene language; September 7, 1967, possession of contraband, instigating misconduct, use of profane language; December 4, 1967, unsatisfactory conduct in dining hall; January 30, 1968, disobeying a direct order; February 17, 1968, unsatisfactory work; March 27, 1968, leaving workgang without authority, (2) insolence, (3) possession

of indecent drawings; April 13, 1968, unsatisfactory conduct in the cellblock (2) insolence.

It goes on and on this way, Mr. Chairman, I could read at some length.

In spite of this difficult group, many inmates at Guelph do make considerable progress in amademic training, vocational training, industrial training, group therapy, farming and gardening. We realize that Guelph is too large. We have said this on numerous occasions, although of course over the years we have reduced its population considerably. This is why we announced some little time ago our plans to construct a perimeter security training centre for about 200 young people.

Now, with respect to this recent incident of the inmates' allegations of brutality against correctional officers, I can only emphasize that we do not in our institutions, in any way, condone the use of force except where it is necessary to maintain order. This was one instance where a little bit of force was required to stop a tremendous amount of damage.

We have all read of riots getting beyond control, and apart from untold property damage the danger to lives that results from this. This was an instance where the staff, working under extreme pressure, did only what was necessary. Our staff do work under great pressure. They have seen examples of members of our staff who have been disciplined for using force even though it may have been greatly provoked. I would like to read, in part, the directive issued by the Deputy Minister on this point. This is dated November 29, 1965:

> You are directed to inform all employees of your institution that assaults on inmates involving the improper use of physical force—example, slapping, striking or punching—will not be tolerated. Where it has been established that such action has taken place the offending employee will be dismissed from the service.
>
> There are, of course, occasions when it is necessary for employees to use some form of physical force in order to control the behaviour of certain wards or inmates. Some may become disturbed, agitated or rebellious to the point where it is necessary to restrain by physical force; but only sufficient force should be used in order to accomplish the restraint.
>
> In adult institutions an inmate may become agitated and attack an employee or another inmate. This can also happen in training schools, particularly in the case of older wards. Certainly restraining force should be used and an employee or inmate has every right to defend himself and others against physical attack.
>
> However, in every instance where physical force is used, a complete report, a written report of the incident, will be made and submitted through the usual channels to the superintendent or governor.
>
> I realize that such instructions are not necessary for the great majority of your staff who would not entertain the practice of this form of assault in any case. However, so that no one can be in any doubt about the consequences, you are to reproduce this letter and have every employee read and sign a copy. Signed copies can be placed on his or her file. Future employees should be required to sign a copy as part of the induction routine.
>
> L. R. Hackle, Deputy Minister.

I think under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, hon. members will appreciate that it is not our policy to use or permit force; but equally, it is our policy not to let disturbances get to such proportions that they become uncontrollable.

I am very proud of the loyal, dedicated staff employed in my department, as most hon. members are aware. The adult male institutions are all under the direction of Dr. Harry Hutchison. Surely no one would suggest that he would condone brutality in any form.

I feel that is most unfortunate that severe criticism is being levelled at my staff on the basis of statements made by a few disgruntled inmates. If such unwarranted criticisms continue, we shall be unable, undoubtedly unable, to attract professional people; and I feel certain that many of our present people will simply not remain in a setting where they are subjected to such unwarranted and abusive criticisms.

Mr. Chairman, there is more here that I could give you, but I have just received the following letter and I think it is my duty to read it into the record.

I have a letter here, signed by Mr. Harold Borne, the general manager of civil services association, Ontario.

This letter is dated today.

Dear Mr. Grossman:

I have just received the following telegram:

Guelph, Ontario.

We, the members of branch No. 11, civil service association of Ontario, employees of the Ontario reformatory, Guelph, are greatly concerned with the unfavourable publicity caused by Dr. M. Shulman's insinuations of brutality. We unanimously pledge our support to Mr. Charles Sanderson, superintendent, Ontario reformatory Guelph, in his actions of May 9, and we also demand all necessary action be taken to have these defamatory insinuations cease immediately.

(Signed) F. Hitwood,
President of branch No. 11,
civil service association.

It is unfortunate that we seem to have to periodically suffer publicity which could only reflect on the employees of your department. I may say that we do not hesitate when such rumours are circulated, to indulge in our own investigations, and I can say with assurance that by and large, the employees, particularly the correctional officers, should be the recipients of praise, rather than the butt of accusations.

Generally speaking, the law officers—and I include the allied employees—exhibit a great deal of interest in the progress and welfare of the inmate. We concur with the Toronto *Telegram.*

I believe that you will recall that on past occasions of this nature, we have also indicated our general support for the general policies and procedures of the department, particularly for the continuing improvements designed to more speedily and effectively rehabilitate the inmate.

Your sincerely,

(Signed) Harold Walm,
General Manager,
The civil service association
of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, I think that speaks for itself, and that is all I intend to say on the subject.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I was quiet while the Minister read his long, long speech, but he has not answered my question. I asked him very specifically what happened in Guelph on May 9, and he comes up with "nothing happened." I ask you specifically, if I must ask you, were 54 inmates forced to run the gauntlet? And if so, why?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The report from my inspector is that they were not forced to run the gauntlet, as the hon. member refers to it.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, now I can proceed, Mr. Chairman.

I have done some research into this matter myself. I have visited a number of jails and I have spoken to nine prisoners in separate jails who have had no opportunity to cook up a story.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Reformatories or jails?

Mr. Shulman: These were prisoners that were in Guelph reformatory.

Mr. Chairman: We are speaking on reformatories.

Mr. Shulman: These were nine prisoners in Guelph reformatory who have now been scattered about the province. These nine prisoners gave the names of other prisoners.

All the prisoners that I spoke to—let me stress again that these prisoners were spoken to individually and in different parts of the province at different times. All of them gave this story, and I find it very difficult to equate it with the Minister's answer.

This story is—and let me preface this by saying that these 54 prisoners undoubtedly contained some very difficult characters. I do not question this whatsoever, and I do not question that the people at Guelph have difficult people to deal with and disciplinary measures are called for. However, the situation is not helped by the Minister trying to hide the facts.

I am convinced after speaking to these nine prisoners—and let me say again that there was no opportunity for these prisoners to consult together to produce a story for me. They all gave the same story, that they were involved in a sit-down strike in Guelph on May 9, some 250 prisoners were involved there; 200 prisoners went back to work when so requested and 54 were sitting in a corner. They were the hard core, presumably, and were not requested to return to work. After the other 200 had gone out, the 54 were instructed to line up, which they then did, because they felt that if they did not do so they would be moved out in any case, violently.

Mr. Sanderson, who is the superintendent, and who was present in this room, promised that there would be no violence. I believe that this is also what Mr. Sanderson said. The men lined up and they were then told that they were going to be moved out four at a time.

At this point let me say that they were already under control. They were then moved out four at a time through a long corridor. As they entered the corridor, there was one of the guards who stood at the head of the corridor. Let me say, this man, whose name I know, a Mr. C., did not strike them at all. He just tapped them and said, "All right, boys, away you go", and they were to run down the corridor, which was lined with some 45 guards—and let me stress, these guards were not from Guelph, and I think that this is very significant. These guards were from the training school, who subsequently were, or are to be scattered all over the province. And what a training they have taken with them, these 45 guards! Each of these prisoners in turn said that they were struck as they ran down the corridor by these men with billies, many receiving up to 20 or 25 blows. Three of the men, as a result of this, were taken to the doctor in the Guelph reformatory, and at least two others were treated by a doctor elsewhere. One of the men, I am told, received two or three stitches. I was told three, and the Minister says two, and the doctor said that the man said that he got them as a result of falling down the stairs after being struck. In find it very serious for the Minister to deny that this occurred. How did these men get their injuries? It is ludicrous for the Minister to try to pretend that this did not occur and that it is going to go away.

For goodness sake, Mr. Sanderson gave a report. Read the report and tell us what happened.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, of course, the hon. member is really saying that we have sadistic correctional officers.

Mr. Shulman: I am not saying that at all. Stop playing games.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr Chairman, may I give an answer to this? I will state—the hon. member has told it in his way, and I will tell it in mine. The hon. member has in fact stated that they "ran the gauntlet", and that someone was beating them when "they ran the gauntlet". Now, if that is not a charge of sadism, on the part of staff, what is? For what other purpose would they be doing this?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, since the Minister has asked I will tell you. I believe that this was done as a disciplinary measure.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a charge that the staff is sadistic.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I have made no charge of sadism. The Minister would like this to go out. This is not true. I am thoroughly convinced that they did this on orders, and this was done as a straight disciplinary measure to show the prisoners that it does not pay to act this way around there. I do not believe that there was any sadism involved and the Minister's mind certainly moves in very strange ways.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mine is going in strange ways, Mr. Chairman? I am at a loss to understand how the hon. member feels his mind is not going in strange ways. He suggests that these inmates were required to run the gauntlet, that people beat them over the head or wherever they beat them, and they are not sadistic—but they did beat them. They did not deserve it. If he will shut up, I will answer it.

Mr. Shulman: We have been waiting for over an hour for your answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will be quiet, Mr. Chairman, I will answer it.

Mr. Shulman: We are waiting.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So he in fact describes actions which are sadistic, on the part of staff, which he says are not charges of sadism.

Mr. Shulman: He is not answering the question, Mr. Chairman; he is merely trying to confuse the issue.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the members who have directed questions to the Minister to recall the rules of Parliamentary procedure and please observe them if they want to get anywhere in these deliberations.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, ask the Minister to answer the question.

Mr. Chairman: Shut up, will you?

An hon. member: Hit him harder, hit him harder!

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, for you to tell a member to shut up is not parliamentary. I must protest!

Mr. Chairman: I used it and the member knows exactly what I mean. He knows the rules quite well, and that he should observe them and allow the Minister to reply. I ask him to remain seated and silent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, when I suggest that this charge means that these people are sadistic, the hon. member says, "I do not say they are sadistic, they were merely carrying out orders". Well, in fact, he is saying that they acted in a sadistic fashion or were carrying out someone's orders, someone who is obviously sadistic. If he means Mr. Sanderson, I think that he is going to have a difficult time attempting to make that stick, because people in correctional circles know Mr. Sanderson too well. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I stated that it was very clear that Mr. Sanderson was not present.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, may I proceed? Mr. Chairman, the allegations contained in the Toronto *Daily Star* of May 28, which to a large extent was the work of the hon. member for High Park—

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, that is a lie.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, that is two lies.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member to withdraw the allegation that the Minister lied.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, may I say that I was not responsible in large part for the story in the Toronto *Daily Star* as stated by the hon. Minister. However, if the rules of the House say that I must withdraw, I shall withdraw.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, may I save you the trouble? Any time the hon. member calls me a liar, do not bother asking him to withdraw, it does not make any difference to me. I do not think that it makes any difference to anybody in Ontario whom this hon. member calls a liar. If the hon. member—

Mr. MacDonald: Why do you not deal with the issue?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is not letting me deal with the issue. You just got here and you do not know what the discussion has been about. May I proceed, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Please do.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The allegations are attributed to disruptive and hostile inmates who are among the hard-core offenders who took part in a sit-down strike and were transferred to jails from the reformatory. Now, incidentally in that respect, the hon. member said that, because he got the same story from six different inmates—

Mr. Shulman: Nine; nine inmates.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, nine different—I am a liar again—nine different inmates from the different jails. Their stories jelled, and because they were, by and large, the same it must be the truth. He forgets, of course, to point out and emphasize something he sort of glanced over. That the 54 spent the night together before they were transferred. Now, they could have very well, if they wanted to, cooked up such a story, and it has not been unknown that they do this sort of thing.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Did they?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know, I was not there. The implication, Mr. Chairman, is that inmates suffered serious injury during this incident.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One inmate is quoted as saying, "They"—meaning the correctional officers—"were hitting us with sticks on the back, the head, I got hit about 25 times". I might point out that this same inmate was given an examination on admission to a jail on May 10, the day following the incident. This examination was carried out by Dr. T. C. Gibson, who attends the jail daily. Perhaps the hon. member will call Dr. Gibson a liar and he will join the rest of us.

A member of my staff spoke to Dr. Gibson on Tuesday of this week. Dr. Gibson reports that:

> If this young man was struck on the head and shoulders 25 times it must have been with a fairy's wand. I detected no marks of violence on his head or shoulders and he made no complaints to me about any injuries.

It is incredible, Mr. Chairman, that a man can claim to have been struck 25 times, presuming he counted the blows, and not have sustained any visible injuries or any injuries serious enough that he would not mention

them to a medical doctor. This is typical of the allegations being made.

Mr. Shulman: What about the stitches? Did he get those from a fairy wand too?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because this department, Mr. Chairman, is responsible for the custody of offenders against society, I am not at liberty, of course, to reveal for security reasons all the plans and precautionary measures taken by the staff to prevent very serious incidents. To do so would be to make public, for inmate use, a handbook on how to carry on a successful riot.

However, when some 250 inmates collectively refuse instruction given to them by correctional personnel and subsequently become hostile, a potentially very explosive situation arises. This requires sound judgment, clear thinking and quick action.

At the Guelph reformatory on May 9 such a situation arose. Due to the sound judgment and courageous actions of the superintendent and the deputy superintendent, the crisis was met and overcome. The superintendent, Mr. Sanderson, and the deputy superintendent, Mr. Harlaw, were informed that men had refused to work. They subsequently went to the area where these men were seated, where they were subjcted to loud verbal abuse and where they were in danger of suffering physical violence.

However, they remained calm and walked amongst the men, ordering them to leave the area. A group of just over 50 defiant and hostile men remained. Subsequently these men were informed that they must move to another area or they would be removed forcibly.

It was essential at this point that these men be removed quickly to avoid the incident spreading to other areas of the institution, leading to extensive property damage, serious injury to staff and inmates, or possibly leading to a death. The correctional officers were placed at strategic points along the corridors to keep the inmates moving quickly. The officers were equipped with billies.

In this tense situation and in the confusion and excitement of the moment, some inmates may have been prodded with the night sticks, I would not doubt that they were. The fact is that after the movement was completed only two inmates were required to have an examination by the medical officer. One of these men received two sutures.

I think that members of this Legislature will agree that when some 250 hostile inmates are moved and controlled without damage to property or serious injury to any inmate or correctional officer, in such a potentially explosive situation and when the tensions are running high, the staff should be applauded for their sound judgment and for their self control under extremely difficult circumstances.

I would again emphasize to this Legislature, Mr. Chairman, that brutal behaviour on the part of correctional staff is not condoned by this department or any official of this department. To suggest otherwise is ludicrous. A Deputy Minister's directive which I quoted earlier made it very clear that a correctional officer faces dismissal if he strikes an inmate.

As a matter of fact it brings me to mind that on at least one occasion very recently it was reported to us that there was some brutal action on the part of some staff and a local jailer. Our inspectors went out on an investigation and because there was *prima facie* evidence that such a thing did occur, laid the information with the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). A charge was laid by the Attorney General, they were charged with this offence. They were cleared of it by the courts, but in the meantime they stand suspended, and I think they are presently grieving.

This is indicative of the action this department takes if there is any evidence of this.

Another occasion occurs to me, about two years ago, when a supervisor, and some other employee of one of our training schools voluntarily advised us that in a fit of temper he had struck a child; I think it was a 14- or a 15-year-old. This is against the rules. He was dismissed, he grieved, and quite frankly he won the grievance. I must admit I was somewhat unhappy about that incident because he was an employee of long standing. He lost his temper once. But in a case like this there are rules, this is the policy laid down and we have to carry it out. He went to grievance and won his grievance.

Those are examples of what we do when there is any substantial evidence, any evidence at all, that there has been unnecessary force on the part of any of our staff.

I think it is unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that the dedicated staff in our institutions must constantly be subjected to allegations by disgruntled, behaviour problem inmates who have no responsibility for the allegations they make; and the unfortunate fact is that there are politicians who always want to make headlines on these allegations.

Finally, to put this into its proper perspective, the hon. member went to Guelph and at the request of numerous inmates, who were transferred to jails, asked the superintendent to take these inmates back into Guelph.

Mr. Shulman: One inmate, one inmate only!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well one inmate. Is this the reaction of an inmate who suffered brutality, he wants to return to the same place?

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I want to say it does not help the correctional system of this province to have a member of this Legislature put himself on the side of inmates as against the administration. We cannot get the proper attitude in our institutions, we cannot carry out a rehabilitative programme, when someone is going into the institution and in fact making the inmates hostile to the administration when we are spending so much time and money and effort to establish rapport with the inmates so that they can be rehabilitated.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

There has been quite sufficient discussion, full and free discussion, regarding this specific incident at the Guelph reformatory. The Chairman hereby rules that any further discussion on this incident at the Guelph reformatory, or any other reformatory, will be out of order.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: The member on a point of order; what is the point of order?

Mr. Shulman: I would like to say, sir, that you have heard in some great detail the versions of the incidents presented by the Minister, which contain some facts that are not quite correct.

Mr. Chairman: What is the point of order?

Mr. Shulman: That the Minister has inadvertently misled the House and I would like to set out the other version of the facts, sir. May I finish please?

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman has ruled that further discussion on this is entirely out of order.

Mr. Shulman: May I finish before you cut me off, sir?

The point of order is: If you do not allow the other full explanation to be given you are being unfair, allowing only one side of the story to be presented.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman's ruling stands. There will be no further discussion on this incident at the Guelph reformatory or of any similar specific incidents at any other reformatory.

Anything further in connection with—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, is that for the whole of the estimate, or what?

Mr. Chairman: Any specific incidents at any of the reformatories.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that this is the most extraordinary ruling that has ever been made in this House.

Mr. Chairman: They are irrelevant to the estimates.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Well that is certainly agreeable.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if there were half as much effort directed to the interjections from the other side of the House I would not have the feeling that I expressed yesterday that there is an uneven application of the rules. Now I know your position is almost an impossible one, but the vigour and the anger should not always be directed at this side of the House. However, let me get back to the point at issue.

The proposition that the Chairman, as my colleague from Windsor said last night, gratuitously intervenes and say he is going to cut off debate on something when the debate is not finished in the view of the members of the House is a completely new approach to the consideration of the estimates in this House.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Not these members!

Mr. Chairman: I would say in reply—

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, if you will permit me, I must agree with the leader of the NDP in this regard. The discussion on this matter may be related to personalities. We have found that the hon. member for High Park has been using a good deal of the time of the House in this particular part of the estimates, and frankly I wish we could get on to some other business. But when you, sir, would rule that further discussion on this matter is out of order, I am

afraid that I cannot support you in this. As much as I wish we could get on with further business, I do not believe, sir, that it is your responsibility to cut off the debate as you are doing in this particular instance.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the members of the committee that in the opinion of the Chairman, we are dealing with certain estimates to conduct the affairs of the Ontario reformatories, as clearly set forth in votes 1903 and 1904. I had said previously that general discussion and policy matters should properly be discussed under these votes, but in the opinion of the chair, to bring up and rehash in the supply committee the details of any incident that happened at any one of these reformatories is irrelevant and immaterial to votes before us.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, can I address myself to the point of order? Technically the estimates relate only to the expenditures from the period starting on March 1 of this year and running to March 31 of next year. However, it is certainly traditional in this House and traditional in all legislative bodies that are conducted under the British system, that when the Minister brings his estimates before the House, he is called upon to answer, or at least to face, the questions that members of the House wish to put to him in regard to the conduct of his department during the period since his department was last reviewed.

He is not compelled to answer. He can sit and not answer if he wants, but in any event, the custom in this House in the time that I have been here is that the whole policy of that particular department is before the House for review. Opposition members in particular, any member, can put questions to the Minister as long as they want to, regarding the operation of that department.

It is within the Minster's competence and it is his prerogative as to whether or not he wants to answer, and I would agree with the remarks that have been made by my leader that it is not your prerogative, sir, with great respect, to say that is the end. It is the right of every member to come here and to talk on these estimates, sir, insofar as the operation of a particular department is concerned. Whether or not the Minister wants to answer, is the Minister's prerogative, but there are no time limits. This debate can go on until the votes are carried. That is the custom and that is the rule of this House, and I say, sir, that if you are going to rule to the contrary you are establishing a new set of procedures which you have no right to do.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South has the floor.

Mr. MacDonald: May I draw your attention to the fact that what you are now stating is a contradiction of what you stated at one point yesterday?

At one point yesterday, I believe, it was the House leader who rose and objected to somebody going on here; and your comment was that there had been no official ruling as to exactly what was done in the estimate. What the hon. gentleman was talking about was something in relation to a specific estimate, and, I submit allegations which have to be sorted out. This is the only place we can sort them out with regard to alleged brutality and conduct in the institutions are fit topics for discussion during the estimates. You yourself, in dealing with some objections on the other side of the House, said that there were no rules laid down, and until rules were laid down, you were not going to cut the debate off. I suggest, sir, that you are now getting yourself into an untenable position of creating new rules and cutting the debate off.

Mr. Chairman: May I say in reply to the member for York South that the Chairman is guided by rule 18, which specifically rules out irrelevancies. In my opinion the continued inquisition and the series of questions in connection with a specific incident happening at any reformatory is irrelevant to the vote.

Mr. MacDonald: No sir, it is not irrelevant to this House.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it quite clear that as far as I am concerned it makes no difference to me. We can go on for three months. I just want to make it clear that I have nothing to do, nor do I care whatever the ruling is. I will buy whatever your ruling is.

Mr. MacDonald: Therefore, Mr. Chairman, your position is even more untenable. If you personally are changing the rules of this House and cutting off debates on a matter which comes within the estimates, and the Minister says he does not care which way it is, I submit to you that he has highlighted the fact that what you are doing is in effect, rewriting the rules of this House by saying that it is an irrelevancy.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On a point of order. The hon. member should not put words in my mouth. I made no such suggestion that

your ruling was irrelevant, or anything of that nature. I just said that I was prepared—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I did not say—the hon. Minister has put words in my mouth.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has the floor. The member for York South may rise on the point after the Minister has finished.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I only want to repeat that there was nothing that I said which could be construed in my view, as saying that your ruling will be irrelevant if you rule against any further discussion on this matter. I merely said that I was unconcerned one way or the other. And I would abide by your ruling whatever it was.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, this is precisely the reason why these estimates are going on. This Minister has one of the best developed capacities for twisting the situation and being provocative, while contending that the provocation is coming from this side of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay. Now, Mr. Chairman, just for one moment.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Is the member going to speak to the—

Mr. MacDonald: I did not say that the Minister said it was irrelevant. What I said was that the Minister said he had no objection to answering, he could go on for three months; and his observation underlined the fact that the responsibility was with you and that you were creating new rules. It was you who said it was irrelevant. I did not attribute it to the Minister at all, and he was deliberately twisting the thing to try to create that kind of provocation and argument across the floor of the House. He accuses us of being provocative. Nobody is more provocative in here than he. However, Mr. Chairman, let me get back to the important issue. You are creating new rules that are out of keeping with the traditions of this House, and I suggest to you it is not your right to do that.

If the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), who has privately and publicly threatened—is that too harsh a word—suggested that if we do not get through the estimates a little bit more quickly then he is going to set up an estimates committee, and he is going to set a time limit and so on—that is his prerogative if he wants to cut it down. We will deal with that issue at the appropriate time. It is not your right at this point to cut the debate down and change the traditions of the House in dealing with estimates.

Mr. Chairman: I say to the member for York South that the basis for the Chairman's ruling may be found in rule 18, and in the opinion of the Chairman the type of debate that has been going on in connection with these estimates, where specific cases are pursued at considerable length in an attempt to bring out all details, is irrelevant to the estimates, and the Chairman maintains his ruling.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, can I add another word to this point of order? Surely the relevancy relates to bringing the argument, whatever it is, to the particular estimate that is under question. I thought that there was a different point of issue earlier this afternoon in connection with the Don jail. It was relevant to two separate votes, and I would have thought that it would have made more sense had the ruling been that it had been debated once, and it should not be debated again, because it cannot be relevant on more than one. However, be that one as it may, it is my assumption that the conduct of certain people, or the alleged conduct of certain people in the institution at Guelph is relevant to this vote.

If a particular member chooses to talk about it *ad nauseam*, chooses to talk about it incorrectly, chooses to make charges that he cannot substantiate, that is the prerogative of the particular member. And he sticks his neck out every time he does it. And there are a lot of gentlemen and ladies who sit in the press gallery up there who have a responsibility to their employers and the public to report it. If the particular Minister wants to answer in a difficult way, or not answer, or to contradict and so on, that again is a part of what we are sent here to do, sir, and it is up to the particular Minister to decide.

But the question of relevancy is not repetition. It relates a particular question to a particular vote. And I say, sir, the rule in my full time in this House has been that, when any Minister brings his estimates before this House for debate, not only is the question of the exact figure that he has put before us relevant, but the question of the conduct of that phase of his department for the last year is relevant. And I would say, sir, that if a member wants to ask bad questions or good ones, that is his perogative. And if the Minister wants to give good answers or bad answers, or no answer, that is his perogative.

But I say, sir, certainly it is my very strong conviction that you have no right to rule as irrelevant a topic that comes within the particular vote that is before this House.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I have been very interested in listening to the comments of the various members of this House and the Chairman is prepared to say that he is not a stubborn man. Perhaps I have been enlightened and I will withdraw the ruling.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief in any case.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: You see—that is the kind of interruption, that is the kind of attitude, if you want to get the House into the kind of mood which has been created.

Mr. Shulman: I just wish to say first of all, Mr. Chairman, that the ages of the nine boys interviewed by me varied from 16 to 19—the average was 17.5. I interviewed them some ten days ago, some two weeks after this incident occurred. Might I suggest to you, sir, that to suggest that these boys—on the day that this incident occurred they were together—that 54 of them cooked up this story is almost unbelievable. I would also like to point out to you, sir, that somehow in the course of this incident, three of these boys were treated immediately by the jail doctor.

I would like to suggest, sir, that at no time did I suggest there was sadism or brutality—my own interpretation after having spoken to the superintendent and the deputy superintendent was that in a very difficult situation someone panicked and did something which they regretted later on. Certainly from our travels about the province there has been no suggestion of—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why did you bring it up?

Mr. Shulman: Because it is wrong and it should not occur and 54 prisoners were made to run the gauntlet—that is why; and you should understand it. If you do not understand it, it is too bad.

Let me say this—to finish off this particular portion of the discussion, in our experience about the province nowhere in any other institution was there any sign of brutality. I am not convinced that that is the situation in Guelph. I think that perhaps, because of previous unfortunate incidents there, they are somewhat hasty to make decisions.

I am personally convinced after speaking to these prisoners that this incident occurred. The Minister's denials are not convincing. I think personally that he knows that this actually did occur. I would suggest to him and to the members opposite me that a visit to Guelph might be very advisable. Let them question the people—the guards and the prisoners there—and let me say again it was not the Guelph guards involved, it was the guards brought in from the training school.

Now, to come on to another matter—unless the Minister wishes to make some further comment on this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I just want to say this, Mr. Chairman, it is very nice for the hon. member to get up and say he is convinced that the inmates did not cook up the story and that it is unbelievable—I think the term he used was that if the inmates cooked up the story it is unbelievable. But apparently the hon. member believes that it is not unbelievable that the staff cooked up the story they have told me. I was not there, I am getting the report from my staff, and the hon. member in fact is saying the inmates told the truth and my staff did not.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, let me say again I spoke to the inmates. I wonder whether the Minister has spoken to the staff? The Minister has a report from one man who himself admittedly was not present. I questioned him and he admitted he was not present. This is what the Minister relies on. He will not rely on the eye-witness reports of nine people who were present.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am relying, Mr. Chairman, on the eye-witness reports of the staff who were present at the time. I did not get a report from one man; I got a report from my inspection staff, who are well qualified to do this sort of work, and I take their word as against the word of those inmates involved.

Mr. Shulman: May I ask the Minister if he would be willing to have representatives of the three parties question the guards—and I am not talking about the prisoners—the guards who were present at the time of this injury?

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further discussion on Guelph?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would now like to speak about Guelph in a general way and I would like again to refer to the book: *Society Behind Bars* which was writ-

ten by the ex-chaplain of Guelph. I referred to this the other day briefly and I mentioned the Rev. West, who had written the introduction to this book. The hon. Minister suggested I should have called Rev. West, so I did call Rev. West, and the Minister is misinformed again.

The Rev. West did not write this introduction eight years ago. He wrote the introduction three years ago and the Rev. West said the situation was exactly correct at the time he wrote it three years ago, but he did qualify this by saying it had improved in the past three years. However, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now let us get that story straight. I did not say that Mr. West had given this introductory eight years ago. I merely said that the Rev. Mr. West had stated that had he been asked to write that introduction today he woul dnot have done so.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): You mentioned eight years ago.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what I said. I said the book was written eight years ago. *Hansard* will tell that.

Mr. Shulman: *Hansard* does not tell that, do not waste our time. The hon. Minister said it referred to conditions eight years ago. The Rev. West informs me it referred to conditions three years ago.

Mr. Chairman: Well I think that is enough. Perhaps the member would now proceed with the remarks he wishes to make.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I wish to read four brief quotations from this book in reference to the general situation at Guelph as it was three years ago and may I say that many of the matters that have applied then—at least the ones that I have been able to see on my two visits there—many of the matters still apply.

Let me say the first thing that strikes you when you visit Guelph is the beautiful surroundings. It is a most striking approach with waterways and greenery, and to the amazement of the member for Lakeshore and myself when we arrived there was a wedding party on the premises. I quote from the book:

> Perhaps the decisive facet of the operation of the reformatory in 1967 is that it is still a large, authoritarian institution with a heavy custodial emphasis. Apart from the fact that the custodial group is still under the same management in 1961, men accustomed to operating a punitive, authoritarian institution, the very size of the inmate population in 1967—about 700—pretty well precludes anything but an authoritarian approach to the inmates.
>
> Unless the institution has facilities permitting considerable decentralization in informal types of controls, the sheer numbers of men to supervise, organize, and keep from escaping, will necessitate a rigid authoritarian approach. An authoritarian, regimented and custodial emphasis on the part of guards and administration leads to the development of a hostile inmate subculture with all its attendant pressures to buck the system and support delinquent codes and attitudes.

He goes on—I am leaving out a portion:

> All these and similar indices of changes in the public's interest have yet to produce significant adjustment at the level of departmental directive and institutional emphasis. Budgets have been increased. For instance the expenditures of the Ontario department rose from $11 million in 1958 to $17 million in 1964-5.

I will interject, of course, $40 million this year.

> Staff at headquarters and in custodial jobs has jumped in numbers. A few new centres have been opened for small numbers of inmates—usually 40 persons. But in heavily populated southern Ontario, a substantial majority of adult male offenders are still—after years of talk—kept at Guelph, Millbrook, or Burwash, all of which follow a punitive, authoritarian system, little changed from the mid-fifties.

In connection with the punitive practices at Guelph, Mr. Mann states, and I quote again:

> Certain not-so-obvious social consequences associated with the adoption of punitive and custodial practices are worth noting. A policy of ineffectual, vocational training at Guelph and many such institutions maintain prisoners at, or close to, the unskilled labour category and inadvertently provides a school of cheap labour. At the same time, a custodial operation of prisoners provides steady employment for the thousands of semi-skilled men, thus slightly reducing the unemployment rate. It furnished politicians, too, with a ready source of job handouts when they are besieged by party hacks on behalf of persons with little technical or personal competence. It can also be argued that aggressively custodial policies increase inter-class hatreds,

distrust and suspicion; help to harden class lines, and by intensifying the anti-social acts of the lower classes, indirectly support the segregationists in authoritarian beliefs that concern the political parties and their supporters.

And finally, to finish, and this is the summary of the book, which boils the whole thing down:

> Fundamental improvement at Guelph may be slowed down by virtue of certain characteristics of its official structure, few of which can easily be altered. These may be itemized as follows:
>
> 1. The military and autocratic character of administrative structure. This means the inmates have no voice in their own government and yet are expected to go out better citizens in our democracy.
>
> 2. The institutionalization of key staff and administrative personnel. This means in brief that as inmates get accommodated to a punitive prison routine and adapt, so over the years do top personnel. Whereas at Guelph the top personnel—like the superintendent, the chief psychologist and the two doctors—have occupied these posts for over ten years, it is easy to understand psychologically their reluctance to accept substantial change and their strong preference in handling prisoners and problems.
>
> 3. The degree to which administration at such an institution is necessarily a series of compromises. This is because Guelph is supposed to both punish and reform, discipline and teach self-reliance, operate in terms of impersonal routine and yet teach men individual initiative.
>
> 4. Norms hindering the dismissal of inefficient members of the staff owing to their membership in the provincial civil service.
>
> 5. Well established patterns of resistance to significant changes on the part of a majority of employees, including any important increasing or changing of the daily workload.
>
> 6. Basic differences in class, occupation and outlook between custodial and therapeutic staff which, combined with specific economic and other disadvantages faced by the latter, tend to discourage recruitment of more competent professional personnel, including doctors, psychologists, psychiatrists, clergy and teachers.
>
> 7. Bureaucratic norms virtually demanding the higher staff positions be filled from the lower ranks, a requirement which tends to promote not only men of inadequate or no professional qualifications in penology, but persons often weekly committed to basic institutional changes in direction of rehabilitation, and including personnel with a latent or overt mistrust of professionals, both penological or therapeutic.

Now Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the basic problem in Guelph is that it is too big. The Minister admits this, everybody admits it, we all know this. There are 700 prisoners there, the Minister has said on numerous occasions that a reformatory, an institution cannot be properly run with more than 200 inmates. To look off into the distant future, 12 or more years away, and say, "Some time we will be able to do something", really is not good enough, because they are going to have trouble at Guelph. Outside of the chronic trouble that people are not being reformed there.

Of this I am convinced. The situation in Guelph does anything but reform. The hole, for example, the punishment hole is worse than any I have seen in any other prison, including Millbrook, which is supposedly for the toughest prisoners. The training of the prisoners is in industries which they are not going to be able to use when they get out, in folding cloth, tailoring, things that are useless. This type of institution is an anachronism from the 19th century, it should have disappeared 20 years ago.

I agree the Minister for years has been saying it is going to go, but that really is not very satisfactory. We would like to hear the Minister say, "We are going to take $50 million out of the highway budget next year. We are going to get the money; we are going to make essential improvements in things like the Don jail which has been discussed here, things in numerous jails across the province, things like Guelph reformatory which should not have 700 prisoners. Places like Millbrook, which was built by mistake for hard-core prisoners and could not be filled."

These are not things that can be passed off by saying, "We have a task force looking into it, everybody knows what the problems are". The specific problem with Guelph is that the whole institution just cannot work because of the way it is built. With the best personnel in the world and 25 psychiatrists, you could not make it work. There are 700 prisoners and you cannot work with that number. For goodness sake, appropriate the money, build a new prison, do what you have to do.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I dealt at some great length last night—this is repetition;

this in my view would have been something properly to have called the member out of order on, because we went into this yesterday.

We had some discussion on it. I dealt with the credibility of this book last night and I do not think there is any need to go into it to any great length. The hon. member is referring to a book which was written about conditions, as I mentioned yesterday, seven or eight years ago. The writer of this book hated the idea of throwing all this material away, he put the book together and from time to time in the book he has notes. You get to the back, to the note and he makes some statement here: "Well, things have changed a little since then" and "there have been other changes made here" and you go to other pages and it says, "Well, they are not quite the same now", and so on, but the book went to print just the same.

Mr. Lawlor: He refers to many first rate criminologists.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the member's leader was talking about interruptions. I gave some examples yesterday about the partisan bias of this book. A man who claims to be a sociologist writes a book and in every third or fourth chapter talks about "There will not be a change in this until the Conservative government in Ontario is thrown out of office". What a great, unbiased, scientific piece of research this is.

All that has happened in this book really, all this man has done, he has bemoaned the fact, which all sociologists and all correctional people have bemoaned for 100 years, and that is that there has to be such a thing as a prison. This is in fact all he is doing. He talks about the subculture of a prison. Now, there is a subculture wherever you get groups of people together, and of course, there is a subculture in the prison, and this is the subculture you are constantly trying to break down. I have stated that our desire is to break this down and the way to do it is precisely what all sociologists say: "Reduce the size of your institution."

I never said that it would take 12 years to reduce the size of the population at Guelph. The hon. member is confusing this with the programme we have for the replacement of the county jail system. This is what we referred to from the standpoint of 12 years. We have done a tremendous job of reducing the size of the population at Guelph. Just a little over three years ago, I think it was, the population was over 1,000, and now it is about 700. And, incidentally, Mr. Chairman, we are one of the few jurisdictions in the whole world which has this policy of coming down to 200. Most of the jurisdictions in the world, including those which are considered among the most progressive, California, Scandinavia, are now building institutions for 2,000, 3,000 and 4,000 people. And we are going in the other direction.

Mr. Shulman: Not for first offenders.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are coming down to an ideal of 200. When it will be reached, I cannot guarantee. But certainly we are attacking it with a great deal of aggressiveness. To bring down the population 300 in one institution in a matter of three years is no easy task.

Mr. Shulman: They are up this year from last year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, as far as this book is concerned, and drawing from it anything authentic—I will just read one little paragraph from this book, which, in fact, is blaming society. This author says in fact:

> There is no use blaming the inmates, put society and their parents behind bars.

Now this is a great philosophy. Let me quote:

> In sum, this is to take seriously the sociologically established notion that the community and certain agents of it, that is, parents, share responsibility for deviate behaviour.

What a very profound observation that is, what a profound observation.

> If the criminal code were changed so that the parents and others were so chargeable, people and groups would be faced with their social responsibilities and there would eventually emerge much more understanding of the social and communal basis for crime and anti-social behaviour.

Well, is this not wonderful? Now how do we help? How does this help? We put the parents and society behind bars, and that will teach them and they will not bring up children who will become offenders. What utter rot.

Mr. Martel: They considered that in Washington last year.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, just a word on Guelph. If what he alleged did happen at that institution—that over 50 prisoners were forced to run a gauntlet; if the prisoners were taken out of this room, four at a time,

along a corridor, with guards with billies; and we understand—I will not push this too hard, I cannot back it up at the moment—that these were not the regular guards, that the regular guards are people who would probably refuse to do this, that these were people in training—and as my colleague has indicated, what training it would be if such were the case, that they permitted these people to be treated—and I will use the word—in this barbaric way. Whether it is sadistic I do not know; that is a psychological condition, but certainly in this day and age, and after the incidents of 1958 at Guelph, and so on, I thought all this sort of thing had been ruled out.

Now, if you think that you are going to rehabilitate prisoners by treating them in this fashion, if this occurred—and I have as much reason to believe it did as not. I spoke to a prisoner who seemed to me completely open, I do not believe I am any more gullible than you, I think that they ought to be taken at face value. This totally defensive attitude on everything we introduce, the utter unwillingness to be open to the convictions of others, the refusal to take things under investigation in a totally defensive stand, does you no credit.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further in connection with Guelph? The Mimico institution? Anything in connection with the Brampton reformatory? Millbrook?

The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, in the case of Millbrook. In the 1966 report of the Minister he says at page 35 that the offenders in this institution are typically impulsive, violent individuals who offer severe threats to the wellbeing of their fellow inmates, and who have engaged in repeated acts which have disrupted the security and order of other institutions. And now of recent date there was some sort of fracas or refusal on the part of some of these prisoners—and it has come up in this House. Exactly what the details are only the Minister will know, and the Minister will not tell us, but in any event they were moved out. A number of these inmates were then taken from this maximum security place. This place it what I call—I call it "Basher's bumble". He erected this institution as a sort of Alcatraz, and apparently, as you approach the thing on the top of the hill it does look a little like Alcatraz, which has been abandoned in the United States.

In any event, this is maximum security. Why on earth would you be moving people out of a place like this to county jails? You said the other day these were maximum security too. But the fact is this: This has the triple-A rating, so to speak, and no county jail could insulate them in the same way. I mean, these county court jails are far looser.

Mr. Singer: What is a county jail?

Mr. Lawlor: The county jails in this province.

Mr. Singer: Ah, I thought that you had invented a new kind.

Mr. Lawlor: These county jails, ancient things that they are, certainly could not segregate prisoners and bring them under the same kind of compulsion as this institution. And I would like the Minister to comment on the reason for moving prisoners in this matter.

A second thing I do not understand. The Minister keeps on warning us over here, that we ought not to mention to where they have been moved. I can see reasons, if we knew ahead of time that they were being moved, not to do so. For the life of me, I cannot see why moving them to a certain jail which I could name, in this case, and which I will not, after they are moved and after they are incarcerated—what difference does it make that they are there or somewhere else? Does he fear some Mafia in Ontario will break in and rescue their fellow criminals or something?

The second question I have, rises out of the nature of the institution itself. It is a peculiar place. Since you are unable, since Basher was unable to fill it up with these totally recalcitrant types, he decided to diversify the institution in the manner of contemporary industry. And he has five groups in there. He has what he calls the rebels; and the second group are the escapees from other institutions. Then he has drug addicts, the sexual offenders throughout the province and the arsonists. And the arsonists go into the yard together with the sexual offenders, and the hard-core go into the yard with the escapees. There is a kind of a selective system operating up there at Millbrook. Very discriminatory system, that is true.

We know that there is some kind of sexual relationship between people lighting fires if they are confirmed arsonists, and so on. But my problem is that at the moment this is a place where sexual offenders are sent—pedophiles and others—they serve the bulk of their sentence. In the case of the drug ad-

dicts, I believe, they are sent for the last six months of their sentence down to Mimico, to the Brown, and in the case of the sexual offenders, particularly pedophiles, they are sent down for three months at the end of their sentence. But they are given, I suggest to you, sir, very little psychiatric care, if at all. There is a part-time psychiatrist who apparently comes in from Peterborough in the environs. But really, what care are these people who have been put away in this institution—how are they exposed—what remedial measures have you got to restore them through psychiatric care at that particular institution?

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister have any response to the comments?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, apparently the hon. member did not find my opening remarks on these estimates very interesting, because I explained at that time that the Millbrook structure was not going to contain all of these groups after we had put our new system into effect. That the pedophiles, for example, were going to be moved. All those suffering from addictions would be moved to the clinics at Mimico as well. So, in fact, we will have, by and large, behavioural problems at Millbrook, escapists and arsonists.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on Millbrook?

Mr. Lawlor: The Minister is again fortunate, in the case of Millbrook, of having a highly dedicated man run this institution. We find this in a good many cases. The whole system would fall apart were it not for the individuals that have put their lives to the cause and bolster an otherwise shaky structure. But they ought not to have to rely upon that sort of thing to keep your institutions going. However, I want to give him some credit. What I want to come to at this stage is the automobile licence plates. That is where you make these licence plates. I do not know, being a new member of this House, whether this has been spoken about before, but certainly I am going to make mention of it very briefly, and that is: What is the point of making these auto licence plates time and after time? Is this not part of that grinding toil, and stupid business? Why cannot the same automobile licence plates be used year after year? Some of the plates changed, and so on? Why do they have to be poured out in the millions year after year? Why is a whole segment of this institution dedicated, with large machinery, to turning them out? Why are most of the inmates in that institution involved in this particular form of purposeless toil? This only goes to point that, instead of being rehabilitated, the whole thing is kind of lunatic.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If there is any example of the need for having some sort of programme to teach good work habits, the plate plant is an example of it. This is not useless work. The inmates know that they are going this for a purpose, that you need licence plates. Now, they are not going to learn a trade from it, except what they can learn from operating a punch press, which may be of some help. But, by and large, the hon. member must keep in mind that we have behavioural problems there, and we try to keep them busy and to keep them in an industrial operation, which is also, as I mentioned earlier, rehabilitative from the standpoint that they learn good work habits. May I repeat that you get up in the morning, you do a day's work, and after doing a day's work you get a couple of hours to yourself. Be it time, you go to bed, you get up tomorrow and you do five days' work like this. Because when they get out of the institution they are not going to get jobs as professors, writing books on sociology or anything of that nature. They are going to go into a plant.

Mr. Martel: Busy work will never teach anybody anything.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well now, is the hon. member telling me that there are not hundreds of thousands of good law-abiding citizens today—now let me finish—working in plants or working on assembly lines doing one operation? Of course there are, you get them in all the automobile plants. They are doing one operation day in and day out, day in and day out, and this is the sort of work hopefully some of these people will be able to get a job at.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is just as difficult, it is just as difficult and it takes just as much intelligence to make a licence plate on a punch press as it does to make a piece of a car or some other piece of machinery.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on Millbrook? Order please. Is there anything further on Millbrook? If there is something further on Millbrook, we will—

It being 6 of the clock, p.m. the House took recess.

No. 101

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, May 30, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

CLASS NUMBER 5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 30, 1968

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman, concluded 3681

Estimates, Department of Transport, Mr. Haskett 3694

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3711

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 30, 1968

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS
(*Concluded*)

On votes 1903 and 1904:

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I believe that we were on Millbrook, is that right, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Well I am not going to restrict it. The member can continue to talk about Ontario reformatories.

Mr. Shulman: We are going to continue to talk about them in order, are we?

Mr. Chairman: If the member wishes.

Mr. Shulman: I would just like to talk briefly about the Millbrook situation. I understand that this was the last major institution to be completed in the programme. I believe that it was in 1958, although I believe that there are others under construction at the present time. I understand that Millbrook was constructed as a maximum security prison.

I would like to ask the Minister if the existence of stern types of prisons such as Millbrook was made to give the law-breaking fraternity cause to think, or to cause them to conclude that Ontario had become an undesirable place to continue their depredations? Was this the reason for constructing Millbrook?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Millbrook was constructed seven or eight years ago, or was it ten years ago? And the purpose was to be able to reduce the security at other institutions by having one institution which will hold all the behaviour risks who cannot be trusted in any other institution, thereby being able to maintain at other institutions, less security, medium or minimum security.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Was one of the reasons for constructing it to frighten the lawbreaker by this place to which they could be sent? A stern place to which they could be sent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I presume that it was built because you have to have a more secure place—if you are going to have institutions which are relatively open. You have to have one place which is completely maximum security, so that those people who will not behave in other institutions can be placed in that particular institution. I might say that probably it also came about as a result of that same select committee which the hon. member referred to yesterday where they suggested that we put a great number, I think 75 or 80 per cent, in a place like Burwash, and I presume that was the institution.

If we had to build it today, as far as I am concerned, it would not be under the present policy of the department. We would not build in the place where it is today.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Well then I am wrong. It was not built to intimidate the prisoner?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member wants to quibble about words, I suppose if I were an inmate of another institution, and if I did not behave myself, and all of the sanctions had been applied unsuccessfully to make me behave myself, presumably, a place like Millbrook, which is completely maximum security—the existence might have some effect upon my behaviour. And I might say in such a situation: "Well, I do not want to go to Millbrook, so I will behave myself. If you want to call that intimidation, then I suppose it might be.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you very much. No, the reason that I am asking is because I have a speech here by the House leader, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), and I am sorry that he is not here. He said that the reason for the construction of Millbrook was to give these people cause to think and conclude that Ontario has become an undesirable place in which to continue their depredations against society, and I was just curious to see if this was the actual reason.

What I am interested in really, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, is what is going to be done with Millbrook. I understand that earlier today, you stated in your initial speech that all the sex addicts and those other than hard core are to be treated elsewhere. This is going to leave a tremendous capacity in Millbrook. What are you going to do with it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I have already explained that a portion of it will be separated and renovated in such a fashion that part of it, completely separate from the rest of it, will be used as a regional detention area for the area.

Mr. Shulman: That is the point that I am coming to, Mr. Chairman. It is a very unsuitable place for a regional detention centre for the reason that it is very hard to get to. There is no public transportation. You literally must have a car. Now, this also applies to other institutions which we will come to later in this series, but it particularly applies to Millbrook.

I was out to Millbrook, with the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor), two or three weeks ago. We found extreme difficulty in getting there. We were informed that if wished to go there to visit a relative you must first go to Peterborough and then take a taxi from Peterborough. This can be a very expensive process. It is not close to Peterborough, it is a very expensive process for people who cannot afford a taxi for such a long distance and it cuts down on the visiting that many of these people—who are not hard-core criminals, may I say—some of the sex deviants there are anything but hard core, if I may use the expression.

I would suggest that if you are going to build regional detention centres, they should be reasonably accessible or at the time you are setting them up as regional detention centres, you should make arrangements for public transportation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think that if we considered Millbrook as being that inaccessible, we would be in difficulty attempting to build regional detention centres right across this province. I would think that Millbrook is reasonably accessible, more than reasonably accessible. Even the location it is now in, 17 miles from Peterborough, is right near a main highway. I do not see any problems other than that.

Mr. Shulman: The problem is there is no bus service and there is no train service, you must take a taxi for 17 miles. All right, I will not labour this if the Minister does not think that is important.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, the Conservative backbencher has made a recommendation—yes, I would recommend that regional detention centres be set up where there is public transportation, whether it be a train, or a bus or other service. It is unfair to the family and the prisoner. You are getting rid of the small jails, you are setting up regional detention centres, which is going to cut down the number of jails tremendously. You are going to have a lot of people brought from a lot of areas into a place like Millbrook. It is extremely unfair—not for the lawyers, they have cars and can travel there, even though it is an extra time loss. But it is extremely difficult for many families.

We have the Conservative backbenchers here and they laugh at us. They do not think it is important, but it is important to the people who are involved. They deserve more consideration than the government is prepared to give them.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): What would you suggest that we give them?

Mr. Shulman: Any place where there is a bus line, and this covers many, many areas, 10 miles, 15 miles closer to Peterborough. There is a suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What is wrong with Peterborough?

Mr. Shulman: Nothing is wrong with it, if you have a site, but you should not put it out somewhere where people cannot get at it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There are people in Peterborough.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, might I say to the hon. member, of course, he is correct. When we are building regional detention centres we would build them at a place where transportation is somewhat better than it is going to be and is at Millbrook.

The fact remains that we have a very costly building there and, by putting the regional detention centre there, we are able to save the taxpayers about $3 million and we do not want to have this wasted. Generally speaking, the regional dentention centres will be in areas where transportation is somewhat better and more available than it is at

Millbrook. But the $3 million is also of some consequence.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, sir, I agree with you. May I then make a suggestion, in connection with Millbrook? It is obvious you cannot just junk Millbrook, with this $3 million building. Would it be unreasonable to set up a jail bus to go out, just before visiting hours, from Peterborough to the jail and take relatives back immediately after visiting hours to Peterborough?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, all this is being taken into consideration for all of the jails in all of the regional detention centres. Some transportation facilities are going to have to be made available in some other regional detention centres as well.

Mr. Shulman: At the moment that has not been done at Millbrook. When will this be done?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Again, I hate to fall back on this, but it is the only logical answer I can give—that this will all come about as a result of the task force investigation.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to belabor this, but surely it does not need a task force to do something this simple.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on Ontario reformatories? The member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, when will the official closing day be for the building on King Street, known as Mercer reformatory? What day are you closing it out?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is a very good question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Obviously we cannot close it until the new one is open.

Mr. Singer: That is not what he asked you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member asked me when it is going to be closed. As soon as the new one is open.

Mr. Singer: Well, on what date?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is being built now and, if the hon. member will take a trip out there some weekend when he has an opportunity, he will find it is about three-quarters to four-fifths completed. We expect, as I said in my opening comments, that it will be occupied before this year is over. That means the other place will be closing.

Mr. Trotter: So you expect to close the building on King Street by the end of the year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not a question of closing it, I do not care if it is closed or open. It will not be used for The Department of Reform Institutions purposes. The Vanier institute for women, we expect, will be occupied before this year is over.

Mr. Trotter: Have you any idea what the property on King Street will be used for?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have not the slightest idea. That is in the hands of The Department of Public Works.

Mr. Chairman: Ontario reformatories. We will move then from Ontario reformatories to industrial farms; page 118. Anything further on industrial farms?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East, on industrial farms.

Mr. Martel: Burwash—that is right, I took the time to visit. If you people got off the farm once in a while and visited something it might help.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how understaffed this department is in Burwash. This is a series of short questions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised it would be in the neighbourhood of, perhaps, 20 or 25.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could advise us as to why there is so much difficulty in keeping people in Burwash—and I do not mean the inmates; I am talking about the staff. There seems to be a difficulty there as well—the staff—there seems to be a great deal of concern. I spoke to the officials there last week, and I spoke to some of the guards, and no one seems anxious to go to Burwash.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think that is—well, I am fairly certain that the reason for that is because of its location. It is so many miles from Sudbury. It means that they have to live in Burwash village, which is not really as full a community as, say, Sudbury is, and there is also limited accommodation at Burwash. I do not know, I suppose that some of them have to come all the way from Sudbury.

Quite frankly, if we had to do it today, we would never, I think, arrange to have a village set up specially for this purpose. On the other

hand, I suppose, for the purposes for which it was opened at that time, the location appeared to be an appropriate one. As a matter of fact, perhaps having regard for the number of escapees, perhaps it is an appropriate one.

This is one of the reasons why it is difficult to get staff there, because of this location.

Mr. Martel: I wonder if the Minister would consider setting up some type of facilities for the residents of that community?

They have one old barrack that they use, but what about such things as a bowling alley, and so on? Would this not be helpful in keeping the desired number of staff there, and keep the morale of the men and their families up considerably?

They have one old barrack there that leaks like a sieve, and this is the only area of recreation in the municipality. I think if we could provide something for these people it would be a little easier to attract and keep custodial people in Burwash.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is the idea is a good one. I think it has a great deal of merit. On the other hand I think most of them have cars, not all of them. If they go into Sudbury, it would be a good thing to have more recreational facilities for staff in there. Again, I suppose it is a matter of priority. There is other work to be done in Burwash as well, which we would like to see done. I by no means rule out the idea of having more recreational facilities for staff.

Mr. Martel: Sir, I believe there was somewhere in the neighbourhood of 50,000 hours of overtime worked in Burwash. If there were this number of hours worked in Burwash because they cannot attract people there, then I do not think money is the real object, because they are going to pay it out in overtime anyway. If you were to provide the facilities, you would have the people coming there to work and you would be able to keep people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The problem then again is that we would have difficulty in respect of housing a great many more staff. This is also a problem.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on industrial farms?

Mr. Martel: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what a young single man is supposed to do in Burwash. The point I am trying to drive at, is that a married man can take a bottle of liquor or a case of beer back to his home. And yet a young single man cannot bring a bottle of liquor, or a case of beer to his bunkhouse. I do not think it is fair, because where can he go? Under the laws of Ontario, he cannot go anywhere with his bottle of liquor or case of beer; he is breaking the regulations all the way around if he purchases it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh, no, no.

Mr. Martel: Oh, yes.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on industrial farms?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, this is very important, I am not finished. No, is it illegal?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that one of the problems there is that the inmates look after the quarters of the single men, having access to those quarters. It is felt it is a somewhat dangerous situation, to have liquor available to them. Liquor is allowed in married quarters. I am not too sure that I am satisfied with that answer myself.

Mr. Martel: Can you increase it there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I think it bears looking into. Perhaps some special arrangements can be made. At the moment I do not want to give an opinion off the top of my head but I think this is worthwhile looking into. I do not like the idea that some have these privileges and some do not. Perhaps the liquor can be kept in some locked canteen or something of that nature. I will look into that.

Mr. Martel: This is the point I am driving at; these people—they cannot legally take a bottle of liquor into someone else's home.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, they can.

Mr. Martel: Not legally, I do not think, under the liquor laws of Ontario. They cannot take a bottle of liquor anywhere.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is legal today for the hon. member to present someone else with a bottle of liquor. If I wanted a drink in his home and I wanted to provide the liquor I am allowed to bring liquor to the hon. member's home and he can—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, let us not talk about the laws—I do not think this is the answer anyway. I think what the hon. member is driving at is worth considering.

Mr. Martel: I have some concern over a Mr. Minett, a custodial guard who was severely beaten and I am trying to find out whether he is receiving compensation for the beating he took some time ago.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Quite frankly that is an interesting question. It would be nice to hear someone get up in the House once in a while and speak on behalf of some of the staff who have been beaten by inmates from time to time.

Mr. Trotter: We have often asked you to raise their pay.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, raising their pay is not going to stop them from being beaten.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know how raising their pay is going to keep them from being beaten.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will answer it in my way, the same as the hon. member for York South answers questions in his way.

An hon. member: The Minister does not know the answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have asked for the information—if the hon. member has any further questions?

Mr. Martel: Yes, I think what I would like to talk about now is the fact that the guards, apparently, the custodial officers, the correctional officers, do not know, or are not advised, of the mental stability of the prisoners they are guarding.

As a result I do not know how we can expect these custodian people to know who is behind them. They do not know if behind them there is an oddball. If they are throwing somebody into the maximum security area all the time for opposing them, that there might be something wrong with them psychologically. Should these people not be informed of the mental stability of the people they are guarding, or watching over, so that they can be aware of who is behind them and know the tendencies of the various people they are working with?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that this occurrence happened at the Portage Lake camp and that the correctional officer has available to him a card on the history of the inmate. There is no psychiatric file available to him, of course, because it is confidential. It is a psychiatric file and psychiatric files are not available to correctional officers, except where it is deemed advisable to tell them that they are dealing with a dangerous person. I am advised by Dr. Hutchison that in this case there was no history of dangerous activity on the part of this man, or any reason to believe that he was dangerous. Otherwise the correctional officer would have been advised.

Mr. Martel: Are you talking about the incident last week?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The one the hon. member just referred to.

Mr. Martel: No, I am just talking in generalities, Mr. Chairman. I am going to come to this but I am talking generalities now—I cannot see how the guards can be aware, or know how to deal with the prisoners in their block, if they are not aware of the peculiarities of each of these prisoners. They might be throwing some man into the security hole on three or four occasions because they are not aware that he has a certain tendency. They might be judging this as insubordination when really it is not.

And they keep punishing this one individual or charging him. Unless the men who are watching over these prisoners in, let us say, a given area, know their makeup, I think that there is a tendency to misjudge what some of the prisoners might be doing, and I think that it would only be fair that the custodial people should know the people under their care.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct the impression the hon. member has that the correctional officer himself has the right to put an inmate into detention.

Mr. Martel: No, he has the right to make a charge.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The superintendent does this. It is done under the superintendent's authority only. And I am also advised that the correctional officer has a general knowledge of the problems he should expect to contend with, in respect of a particular inmate. They are usually sorted out as to corridor as to the type of problem, and so on.

Now if there is any evidence that there should be more information given to the correctional officer which can be given to him, if the hon. member has a specific instance in mind, I would very much like to have it.

Mr. Martel: There are two things. I understand that there was a bit of a schemozzle in Burwash last weekend.

Mr. Singer: A bit of a what?

Mr. Martel: Schemozzle. You spell it. But I also understand that the Mr. Wilson who killed a woman in Estaire last year was twice recommended for the maximum security prison in Penetanguishene, and none of the guards, outside of a few from whom I got my information, were aware of this. This type of tendency in a patient, is one that they are quite disturbed about. The prob'em that occurred last week apparently involved an epileptic. And the guards were again not aware or alerted to watch for this sort of thing. I think it puts the officers at a tremendous disadvantage if they are not alerted to watching for it. And I know, in talking to approximately 25 custodial officers, they are not aware. They do not know the psychological make-up of the prisoners they are handling. I think it is a serious problem.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think that the hon. member should know that this man he was referring to is presumably the man who escaped. There was a man who escaped from Burwash and he is being charged with murder. And now he is in the jail. He is not in the reformatory, because obviously when he is under a charge for an offence, he is in the jail awaiting trial, so the correctional officers in Burwash really have no contact with this man now.

Mr. Martel: No, the man I am talking about, the one who killed the woman last summer, has been tried, has he not? He is in Penetanguishene now. A Mr. Wilson, and he killed an elderly old lady at Estaire last year. I am told that he had been twice recommended for the maximum security prison at Penetanguishene.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know how he could be recommended.

Mr. Martel: By the psychiatrist.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well Penetanguishene does not come under our jurisdiction. It is a mental hospital. It comes under The Department of Health.

Mr. Martel: Right!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yet, if he was certifiable—I do not know what the hon. member means by being "recommended"—if they had certified him, he would have gone to Penetanguishene, presumably. So I cannot see how the hon. member can feel that the man was recommended. I do not know what he means by that.

Mr. Martel: Well, the psychiatrist apparently indicated that he should have been in Penetanguishene because he had these homicidal tendencies.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, is the hon. member referring to a psychiatrist who was consulted by the Burwash officials?

Mr. Martel: You have a psychiatrist who goes in, do you not, to Burwash?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the psychiatrist felt this way, he should have certified the man.

Mr. Martel: Apparently it was twice indicated he should have been in Penetanguishene.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I do not know what that means. He should have certified him. I will look this up for the hon. member and give him as much information as I can on it.

Mr. Martel: The other case I am talking about is last Sunday. There was apparently quite a rhubarb in Burwash last Sunday, and they had to, I understand, telephone Queen's Park for permission to use gas to quell this disturbance. And apparently the man responsible for it all was an epileptic who quite frequently has to be tamed down physically. And this is the point I am trying to make, if we have got these types of prisoners in places like Burwash, I think it is only fair that the guards know who they are dealing with.

Mr. Shulman: I am glad I did not visit Burwash or the Minister would say I was responsible.

Mr. Singer: Have your task force look into it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told that this particular inmate, because of his epileptic condition, was being fed pheno-barb. and there is a possibility or suspicion that the amount of pheno-barb. he had been treated with caused him to go berserk, and carry out this action the hon. member refers to. I do not know what the hon. member feels our people should have done on an occasion like this. We have other epileptics, I suppose, in institutions from time to time.

Mr. Martel: I have no objections or any comment on what should have been done. The only thing I am recommending, on behalf of the great number of men I talk to, is that they would like to know the type of people who are under their care, their psychological make-up, so they would have some foreknowledge of what they can expect from each individual prisoner. I think it is only fair that these men know who they are handling.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member has made a very valid point. I am going to look into this, I think there is certain information which the correctional officers should have and I think he is quite right. Now, whether there is sufficient information on that part or not, at this moment, I am unable to ascertain.

There seems to be some doubt about whether this kind of information is put on the card which is available to the correctional officers, and I will certainly look into that. If it is not, I think it is worthwhile considering putting it on the card.

I am glad the hon. member brought it to my attention. This is an area which I will investigate thoroughly.

Mr. Martel: Thank you. I have only a couple of minor points more. Dealing with the training available to prisoners in Burwash, apparently in Burwash there is only one course that is of any value and this is an oil-burner course set up by the prisoners themselves. Apparently the rest of the courses are virtually useless. Ihave talked to the people in charge, I have talked to the guards, I have talked to some of the prisoners. And there is really no programme outside of this oil-burner programme set up by the inmates that is of any value. I am wondering if the Minister could give me any information on this.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have before me a list of the occupations available as of May 14 this year. There are seven inmates engaged at the piggery. I think that is of some use for someone who might be of some use on a farm. There are 15 in the barns, persumably that is for farming, too. There are 22 acting as teamsters, three as groundsmen—do not ask me what that is. There are 20 working in the roothouse and as gardeners. There are ten operating the village supply, that is, delivery to and from the village.

There are 12 engaged as recreational programme assistants. There are 16 engaged in construction; 38 at a saw-mill; 12 as carpenters; 16 as bricklayers; four as electricians; five as plumbers; three as blacksmiths; 20 in the oil-burner course; 23 as engineers; ten as painters; 19 in the laundry; four in institutional stores; 22 on heavy work in the main work party; one in the quarry; eight on maintenance; 42 cleaners; two barbers; 81 in the kitchen; 14 in the garage; seven as village school janitors; 37 as messengers and clerks; 5 as hospital orderlies; 20 in the tailor shop; 41 in the academic school; 10 in the trade school, sheetmetal and machine shop; 8 in the lands and forests branch tree-planting; 32 were on sick parade that day; 11 had been excused from duty; 7 were in reception; 11 were on medical—in segregation for medical or for their own protection; 4 were in detention. That is a pretty good rundown of what happened that day.

If the hon. member wants to make the point that many of these things are not really vocational, I would agree with him, but we are building a new vocational shop up in Burwash at the present time.

I presume that the classification committee and the work committee has found that this is the place where these people will fit in, this is the place where they are prepared to work. I presume there is not much point in telling a man he should go in and learn sheetmetal work if he does not want to. This is the answer.

Mr. Martel: The problem seems to be, Mr. Chairman, not so much with the variety that is there, but with the calibre of people heading them up. As I say, I have talked to the people in charge who are watching the prisoners, and they maintain that the courses really do not teach the men anything. I talked about the bricklaying course and the guards laughed about it and said that it was a farce. We have got to—

An hon. member: It is a good business!

Mr. Martel: Certainly it is a good business, provided that they are learning something from it. But if they are learning nothing other than to play around with a little mortar, unless they can come out of prison, and get a job in these fields; in other words, unless these are good solid courses, they have not got a hope of rehabilitation once they come out. They will never last in a job if they have not got a good basic training, and apparently this is lacking. The courses are there, but there is not real meat in them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is suggesting that the inmates are putting up the building by themselves.

Mr. Martel: Yes, they are. I was there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When I was there, they were doing all the bricklaying for one of the buildings. And then in the winter they do the inside work. Surely, doing all the bricklaying for a building is the best kind of teaching that they could possibly get in bricklaying? As a matter of fact, I recall at the time, I forget when it was, that one of the inmates who was working told me about a friend of his who had been working on that job and was now working on bricklaying on the outside, I think that he said that he was making three dollars and sixty-five cents an hour or some such amount.

Mr. Martel: Well, that is one case. I am saying that the guards, even, Mr. Chairman, are not convinced that most of these courses really serve a purpose, that most prisoners cannot get a job from this training once they get out and I would just ask the Minister if he would check on it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will check on it. As a matter of fact, I am surprised that any of our correctional officers would have that attitude, because attitudes in respect of our correctional officers is something that concerns us. If they feel that way, they should express it to the superintendent, who would hopefully express it to us so that we would know.

It may be that the hon. member has received an opinion from a very small number of correctional officers, or he may have received an opinion from some correctional officers who may be disgruntled, which we have, of course, among our extensive staff.

But I would be amazed that they would take this view. As I say, when I was there, and this was one thing that remained in my mind—when you visit so many of the institutions one begins to meld into the other in your mind. I recall the inmates were very proud of the amount of work that they had done on this bricklaying around this building and I am rather surprised that this would be the attitude of the correctional officers. I guess that I had better make another visit there shortly myself.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if it is usual for the prisoners to load the trucks of the people that come in, and get the wood that comes from Burwash. I understand that a million board feet come out of Burwash per year and I am wondering if it is usual for prisoners to load the trucks for these free enterprisers? Apparently, the prisoners are used for loading the trucks.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am advised that we sold some lumber by tender. The only question that is involved here, I suppose, is: Was it part of the deal that they would do the loading or that we would provide that for them. I will look into that for the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): In Burwash, you have about 450 inmates. How many psychiatrists are there in Burwash?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is only one part-time psychiatrist.

Mr. Sargent: Only one part-time man for 450 inmates? And these are your long-term inmates in this institution?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I doubt whether the general population has that kind of psychiatric service, one to 450, I would doubt it. I mean you do not need a psychiatrist on hand at all times. But when a psychiatrist is needed, he is brought in. This is what happens with the general population.

If the hon. member wants to make the point that we should have more psychiatrists, I think that I have repeated on numerous occasions that we could use more psychiatrists, more social workers, and more psychologists. In every department of every government, all across the world, they could use them.

Mr. Sargent: I appreciate that you are trying to say that you cannot cope. In industry if they need these people, they go out and get them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Sometimes they are able and sometimes not.

Mr. Sargent: Well, there is no doubt, industry could not go if it did not have these people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member telling me that industry could not function without psychiatrists.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about technicians and personnel to make an industry go. They go out and get them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Surely the hon. member would know that there are certain professions where there is greater supply than in others? There is a very great shortage of psychiatrists and psychologists, and all this kind of personnel at the present.

Mr. Sargent: I am trying to make a point that this is one of the most poorly run operations. Your department is one of the most poorly run setups here in Ontario, and this is the largest—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: I would say you are second, but this is the largest you have is it not, in Ontario? Burwash is the largest, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Guelph has over 700 inmates.

Mr. Sargent: But you have a full-time psychiatrist at Don jail, do you not?

Mr. Shulman: No.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Sargent: Well I have been down to Don jail and I have met with him, and I understand that he is there full time.

Mr. Shulman: Dr. Hills is there full time, but he is not a psychiatrist.

Mr. Sargent: But the thing is that this is the institution where you have your long-term prisoners, at Burwash, and you do not have a full-time psychiatrist. You talk about recidivism—I cannot say the word properly—but you talk about your inability; you have such a poor experience in Ontario. This is one of the focal points where you are in trouble and you say that you cannot get staff, so it just shows that you cannot handle the operation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What do you suggest that we do about psychiatrists? Where do we get them?

Mr. Sargent: Train them like you train doctors and everything else.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We cannot train psychiatrists. The hon. member must realize that The Department of Reform Institutions cannot train psychiatrists.

Mr. Sargent: You are paying them $25,000 a year. The most important factor you must have in determining this is that you cannot get the staff.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on this? The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: I would just like to briefly pursue the matter brought up by the member for Sudbury East. Perhaps I misheard. Was gas used because an epileptic went berserk?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, gas was used. The man had armed himself with a knife, and the only way to subdue him, apparently, was by the use of gas, which was harmless. This was used, and I do not see anything wrong with it.

Mr. Shulman: Neither do I. Was this tear gas?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Tear gas, yes.

Mr. Shulman: And it was just on the one prisoner?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to enquire about the Burtch industrial farm. Oh, I am sorry, just before I go into Burtch, there is one thing disturbing me. Why did the superintendent have to phone to Queen's Park to get permission if a man was running amok with a knife. I should not think that you would take time to phone over to Queen's Park to decide what to do.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did someone say he had to phone Queen's Park?

Mr. Shulman: The question was asked of you and you did not deny it—and I gathered that you had replied yes. Is that not correct? Did the superintendent phone Queen's Park and get permission to use the gas.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not hear the reference to gas at all, until the hon. member got up to speak. What I was referring to earlier, and perhaps the hon. member mistook what I had said there, I said that the correctional officer could not put anyone in detention without permission of the superintendent. The superintendent decides this. This is the first reference I have heard of gas. Perhaps it was mentioned by the hon. member when I was trying to get an answer to a previous question.

Mr. Shulman: To settle this confusion. Did the superintendent phone for permission before he used this?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is no.

Mr. Shulman: My colleague's suggestion may be an error. However, we will go on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He phoned and advised head office, that he had used gas.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now let us go to the problem at Burtch, and this is a very serious problem. I am referring now to the industrial farm, and not the training school, under this particular section.

This particular institution was condemned in 1953 by the committee and the dangers at Burtch, Mr. Chairman, are far more serious than those at the Don jail, and believe me, I am not playing down the problems at the Don Jail, which unfortunately I did not get a chance to talk about earlier today.

The situation at Burtch can be a very lethal one, for the simple reason that the buildings are made of frame—one match and away they go. There is no chance of the men inside getting out. Let me stress again, so there will be no confusion. I am not talking of the training school, because there is a new building under construction for the training school. There are no new buildings under construction for the industrial farm, even though way back 15 years ago they were condemned. These buildings were originally received from the air force, I believe.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the member a question? May I ask him whether this is the question he asked two or three weeks ago and which I answered at that time?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, and a little detail now, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What sort of a detail? You know what I am concerned with at the moment. We have admitted what there is to admit, and a great deal of discussion about this in the press does not help out at the institution. We have some pretty disturbed people there. I have already answered the question, when the hon. member asked it.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I intend to elaborate on this problem at some length. And believe me, getting it in the press, or the people at Burtch finding out about the situation, should not be the problem in the Minister's mind. The problem in the Minister's mind should be getting those men out of there, because they are sitting in a very dangerous situation. On a matter of comfort, the buildings are heated by a strange old system that was set up during the war as an emergency measure, so that in winter the heat comes in through a vent, so that the men in the top bunks are roasting, and the men in the bottom bunks are freezing. The reason there are double bunks is because the buildings are overcrowded.

There is approximately one and a half to two times the number of men in each building as the air force had in these buildings. The overcrowding besides being uncomfortable, particularly in the winter, is a very dangerous matter. As a first step, enough men should be taken out of there so that the buildings are down to the number that should be in each room.

I believe there are up to 32 inmates in the bunk beds in each cabin—I guess that is the word to describe them. They use space heaters from a central heating, and because of the situation a guard sits inside each cabin all night long to guard against the danger of fire. If a fire was started from the outside you are going to have a very dangerous situation and, I am quite certain, ending with deaths.

For goodness sakes, as in the preliminary step, get the men out of there and transferred into other institutions that are not overcrowded. Bring it at least down to the number that the air force used to keep in these rooms. And then as an emergency measure, and this should come ahead of all priority and task forces, start building a brick building or a concrete building up there just as you have done for the training school. If you do not, there is going to be a very serious disaster sooner or later at Burtch.

I have another matter about Burtch, unless the Minister wishes to make any comments.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I have none.

Mr. Shulman: Well, the only other matter I wish to mention about Burtch is the same as I did on Millbrook, its absolute and complete inaccessibility. Once again, there is no public transportation. Visitors to the prisoners, and this applies both to the prisoners in the industrial farm and the prisoners in the training school, must come by taxi, both ways, from Brantford, which is an extremely expensive matter, particularly to the parents of children in the training school. As a result many of the prisoners have not been receiving visitors, and I would suggest to the Minister that once again he should put in a bus service to leave at a regular time and come back at a regular time for the convenience of the families.

I would just like to make one other com-

ment about Burtch, and it is in connection with the superintendent of Burtch. I wish to say that this is a very dedicated, magnificent man, and I would like to pay tribute to him, for in spite of these horrible, horrible surroundings, he is doing a magnificent job in that place.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on industrial farms? We will then move to juvenile institutions. Anything on juvenile institutions? The member for Halton West.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Just a few words. We have heard a great deal regarding institutions, and the sad conditions. I would like to refer to one in particular. I had the privilege of attending along with the hon. members for Hamilton West (Mrs. Pritchard), and Halton East (Mr. Snow), at Sprucedale school in White Oaks village, at Hagersville, this year. We were at this institution for about a half a day, and we had the opportunity of going through every building— all the classrooms, shops and whatever recreation facilities were there. We talked with most of the members of the staff, and many of the young men at this institution.

We were impressed first of all with the staff, the training of the staff, the facilities, and the programme in which these boys are involved, and above all we were impressed with the attitude of the young people there.

There seemed to be a lack of unnecessary institutional restraint, at least on the surface. The general efforts to rehabilitate, educate, and make these young people better citizens, or future productive citizens, in my opinion is being done to the best of the ability of those people there.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, it was in many ways like visiting a conventional board school, with an almost tutor student relationship, as part of their curriculum. There seemed to be little or no resentment on the part of the young people there; there was no tension. I would suggest that there was no great desire on the part of any of these boys to leave. Naturally, they probably were homesick, and realized they were required to stay there, but I think they also appreciated the fact that somebody was trying to do something for them.

They were getting the training that they wanted to get, whether it was academic or vocational, or a form of technical training, and above all they had a great deal of respect and admiration for the members of the staff. I would like to commend the department for the work being done there in Hagersville, and I hope that most of the other members, whenever possible, can make a tour such as this.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on juvenile institutions? The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: We are hearing a lot about the task force. Where are you going to locate these area jails? When are we going to have a report on the task force?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would be glad to answer it again, except it is out of order. We have gone through all the votes on jails, and I did answer that I could not tell the hon. members when the task force would finish the job. I think it will be very shortly.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on juvenile institutions? The member for High Park?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, in line with one of the matters brought up by the member for Grey-Bruce, I would like to pursue it, in connection with Brookside school in Cobourg.

As I mentioned a day or two ago in the estimates, the rate of return is quite high at that particular place, and I think I know the reason for this. It is very simple actually. This is a school for disturbed boys, and when I say disturbed I do not mean mentally incompetent or mentally defective; I mean boys who have got into trouble at a very young age and as such, if they ever needed psychiatric help, this is the type of place it should be given.

And yet at this school, which has 175 boys, the psychiatrist visits only two days per week. As a result, he does not see the vast majority of the boys; somewhere over 90 per cent of them receive no therapy whatsoever. I am convinced that this is one of the reasons for the very high rate of recidivism at Brookside and at similar institutions.

The Minister has asked how do we get more psychiatrists in a situation like Cobourg, where a psychiatrist, a full-time psychiatrist is essential with these 175 disturbed boys. You can get them and it is very simple, by paying more money, and $25,000, although it sounds like a huge sum of money, is not in this particular field, because you are competing against the other areas who are bidding for a psychiatrist. You are going to have to pay more because the very youngest psychiatrist, in his first year in practice, can earn that much and more.

I would like to suggest to the Minister that he has acknowledged the problems. There are places like the Don jail, which obviously should have one; there are places like Brookside that must have one. Go out and pay more, if you have to. This is the place where it really would pay off.

If you have to pay $35,000 a year, pay $35,000 a year, but buy them away from the other places where they are not as essential. I would like to suggest to the Minister that this is the answer. If he is willing to pay more money, he will get his psychiatrists.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The psychiatrist who spends half his time at this school and is on call all the rest of the time—this is not really sufficient for the school?

Mr. Shulman: I am suggesting that you can hire full-time psychiatrists.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There really is no point in hiring full-time psychiatrists, no matter what money the hon. member suggests, unless this is necessary.

Does the hon. member, as a medical man, suggest, for a school of 175 youngsters, that a psychiatrist's spending half his time there and being on call the other half is not really sufficient?

Mr. Shulman: For a school of 175 it is sufficient, but this is not a school of 175—this is 175 disturbed youngsters.

If that psychiatrist works eight hours a day, he is only going to see eight youngsters that day; he is going to see 40 youngsters in a week. He is going to see each boy something less than once a month and they should be seen a great deal more than once a month. Of course you need a full-time psychiatrist there.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on this point. This may not have too much intelligence to it, but there are a lot of brains in universities and in high schools that are unemployed in the summer time. I think that you could give these university students summer employment by letting them loose on our institutions. Maybe they could do a job of social work and psychiatry for these people who need help.

I have a daughter who is interested in this career. She would like to have had the chance to go into a reform institution to talk to these people for the summer, but there are no openings for them.

I think that there is a great area of potential people here that could do a job. University students are crying for income and work during the summer months, and there might be a great area of potential here which you could tap, to supplement this field.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can save the hon. member too much talk. We employ quite a few of them for the summer.

If the hon. member knows any competent young lady who has interest in this sort of work, we would love to have her for the summer. We would love to have her full time. We would certainly take her on for the summer. We do this every summer.

Mr. Sargent: I think we are getting someplace now. If there is interest in your department—if there is an area of interest in your department, I think an offering of the Minister to the public, to the university students, who have a concern in this area to come forth and say here is an opening.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have already done this—every university knows this.

Mr. Sargent: I do not know about it, and who else knows about it? You know about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All the universities who have students who are interested in this sort of work, or allied work.

Mr. Sargent: You are keeping it a good secret.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have a complement for summer help and, if the hon. member has anyone else, we will be very glad to help him.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): I do not know about this programme—if you have such a programme. Because I have had letters from university students, requesting work in social work.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: From the school of social work? From which university?

Mr. B. Newman: University of Windsor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman. I will look into that, because we are much surprised to find that out.

Mr. B. Newman: I referred that to The Department of Social and Family Services; had I known of that I would have referred it to your department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will look into that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: Just to pursue this one more moment, Mr. Chairman. How many full-time psychologists are there in Brookside?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We do not have any at this time.

Mr. Shulman: Are there any part time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not at Brookside.

Mr. Shulman: I am almost speechless, Mr. Chairman. Here we have 175—

An hon. member: That is the most ridiculous thing I have heard yet.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Sometime in these estimates, why could we not lock those two fellows in a room together and let them discuss this thing for a week and we could get something done here?

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): It would not take a week.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister agree to this—to making a public statement that—

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order, please! The member rose on a point of order.

Mr. Sargent: Well I do not want to lose the point.

Mr. Chairman: This is no point of order, you made the point of order. The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: May I suggest, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, that he has just revealed a rather shocking fact. With these disturbed boys, if you are unprepared to spend the money and hire a psychiatrist, for goodness sake get in some full-time psychologists. Because, although they are certainly not as well qualified as a psychiatrist, they can do at least some of the good a psychiatrist would do if he were there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Perhaps the hon. member would like to answer where to get those psychologists.

Mr. Shulman: Am I to understand the Minister is not able to hire psychologists throughout the province?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is right.

Mr. Shulman: Then may I ask the Minister, through you, sir, what is the salary schedule that is set out for psychologists, beginning and ending?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will give you that in a moment.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister is going to provide an answer to a question from the member for High Park. I doubt if there is going to be time in between—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would ask him to ask the question again.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister then go so far as to make a public statement that he has an interest in finding people who would make themselves available in the summer months? University trained people?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not want the hon. member to get the impression we are going to take anybody on. Our people, our director of social work, is in constant touch with the schools of social work, asking for their students.

One of the hon. members has told me that at the university he refers to he thinks there is no such contact. I am going to find this out. Because we are constantly on the alert for potential workers in our field.

Mr. Sargent: All right, you have said you are on the alert for these students.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is there anything more public than getting up in the legislature and making an announcement?

As of October 1, 1967, the salary range for psychologists was from $11,558 to $13,801. As of October 1, 1968, starting at $11,923 to a range of $14,349—these are the starting salaries. And they run up to a category from $12,692 to $15,445.

Mr. Shulman: How many psychologists are you short in the system?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: While we are waiting, may I say this: When I used the term "director of social work," I meant the director of psychology.

Perhaps I can get that figure, Mr. Chairman, for the hon. member and let him know directly.

Mr. Shulman: Is it a substantial number?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Probably 10 or 12.

Mr. Shulman: Is the problem, Mr. Chairman, that the salaries schedule is too low? Because certainly a lot of psychologists have been graduating every year from a number of universities in this province, and I am a

little mystified why there is a shortage of psychologists in the service.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is a shortage of psychologists generally in the province. I understand there are only about 500 in the whole province.

I might tell the hon. member that, in addition, practically everyone in the field—everyone in every jurisdiction, everyone that requires psychologists, every kind of agency, any government agency or private agency, which requires psychologists—generally find that they are in short supply. They cannot get sufficient of them, and corrections is not the most glamorous.

This is one of the problems correctional jurisdictions suffer from all over the world. Corrections is not the most glamorous, because, as I mentioned earlier, in correctional work your failures are obvious, your successes are not. People do not like to be constantly harped at as not being able to show some success in their work. They generally want to be in fields where they can say: "Here, we had so many patients and we cured so many."

It is most difficult, if not impossible, in corrections to say: "Here we had so many hundreds of people in our institutions and so many hundreds have been cured"; because they do not write you letters of endorsation, but the failures are always there to come back.

I might add—and the member can take it personally if he likes or not—it is the kind of criticism, the type of criticism that is directed at correctional departments in North America especially, that makes it even more difficult to attract good professional staff. They just say: "Why do I want to come with your department and put up with all that abuse. I can go to some other department, be it The Department of Health or some other place—a private agency—where I do not have to put up with this sort abuse"; because they pick up the paper some day and they find out, all of a sudden, they are in the headlines.

Somebody has said they "allowed brutal conditions" to go on in institutions, that "they allowed this, they are getting no place." It is most difficult, in addition to the shortage in other words of professional staff, it is more difficult for correctional agencies to get them than it is for any other agency.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, just to finish off, I would just like to suggest to the Minister that when we come to these estimates next year I hope that he will not have the same shortage that he has now and I may suggest the answer is very simple. It is to speak to his Cabinet colleagues and get a little more money and pay more for his psychiatrists and his psychologists. He should get what he needs from outside this province if necessary, so that when we come back next year we will not have this same high rate of recidivism, and if the Minister takes this personally, I hope he does.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further on juvenile institutions?

Votes 1903 and 1904 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates for The Department of Reform Institutions.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): The estimates of The Department of Transport I now submit for the fiscal year 1968-69, have more than usual significance. They symbolize the tenth anniversary of this department as a separate unit of government. The estimates of ten years ago, for 1958-59, launched the first full year of operation of the fledgling department that had been set up in 1957.

Today I shall forego any lengthy examination of what the estimates represent. That look at the details will come later, in the item-by-item consideration. Let me now simply and briefly note a few of the highlights of the department's development and plans in order to establish a perpective for considering our submission for 1968-69.

Events of the past ten years have confirmed the concerns that led to the creation of this department. Those concerns could be summed up as a recognition of the enormous significance, implications and complications of the motor vehicle in our modern society along with a recognition of the challenge posed by continuing rapid increases in the number of vehicles on the road.

The number of motor vehicles registered in Ontario has increased by one million in that period. For the licence year 1957 the number of vehicles was just under 1.8 million. For the current licence year it will exceed 2.8 million. All other statistics on vehicles and drivers, and on traffic collisions, have likewise increased.

The Department of Transport has co-ordinated the government's functions in regard to motor vehicles and drivers. The department's task has been to keep pace with the increases and to seek new and improved methods of service in the interests of drivers and pedestrians, and also in the interests of our population and economy as a whole.

The highlights of the department's development in these ten years would include—

For drivers: a uniform and realistic system of driver examination; driver instruction in secondary schools; a comprehensive programme of driver control, including the demerit point system; the introduction of three-year drivers' licences.

For vehicles: controls on vehicle safety through negotiations with manufacturers and through legislation; co-ordination with police in an effective audit system of compulsory vehicle examination, making use of both permanent check lanes and the fleet of pioneering mobile units that go to all parts of the province.

For the users of the road: an orderly evolution of laws and regulations in the interests of safety, the efficiency of traffic movement, and the convenience of users of the road; and a very fine and diversified programme of safety education for people of all ages—from nursery school children to senior citizens.

For the total population and economy: the services, controls and facilities that have made it possible for people in all parts of the province to take full advantage of the motor vehicle.

A further responsibility of this department is to share in the collection of revenues that contribute to the "tax mix" for support of the overall programmes of the government.

It is interesting to note that the expanding role of the department has resulted in an increase of expenditures from $6,742,620 for 1958-59, our first full fiscal year of operation, to the estimates for the year now beginning of $19,506,000. In this same ten-year period, the annual revenues collected by the department have more than doubled, from $60,766,000 in 1958-59 to the estimated figure for this fiscal year of $134,882,000.

Another step forward, which deserves a place in any summary of the department's progress in the past decade, is the establishment of an effective working partnership among all provinces in motor vehicle administration.

This was accomplished through the conferences of Ministers responsible for motor vehicle administration in every province. It was my privilege to convene the first such conference in 1966, resulting from the suggestion by the Premiers' conference which was held in Toronto that year. At our first conference of Ministers here, and at the second conference held in Quebec City in 1967, the provinces reached agreement on our major objectives, and we set in motion a strong continuing liaison that is obtaining across Canada a greater degree of uniformity than ever before in this field.

During the past year my department continued to work for the maximum effectiveness in our programmes, particularly those relating to safety. Three of the highlights were the road safety workshops held in Toronto; a further advance in driver instruction in secondary schools; and another important step in the development of the department's organizational structure.

The workshops in Toronto brought together close to 1,000 delegates—a cross-section of citizens from this region sharing a common concern for traffic safety. The conference demonstrated the participation, the sense of involvement, that is necessary for the achievement of a substantial improvement in the level of safety on our streets and highways.

Instruction in good driving is being given to teenagers in secondary schools across the province. Last year 215 secondary schools offered this extra-curricular course which is endorsed by The Department of Education, and supported and promoted by The Department of Transport. In the current school year, the number of schools offering the course has risen to 303—more than half of the secondary schools in Ontario—and in September, there will be a further increase to well over 350.

The organizational structure of the department is under constant review. During the past year, a re-grouping of functions was put into effect so that all matters relating to drivers were brought together under the new "drivers branch", and all matters related to vehicles became the responsibility of the "vehicles branch". This re-grouping was not as simple as it sounds, but it is proving effective in enhanced administrative efficiency, and smoother service to the motoring public.

This change in structures clearly evidenced in the arrangement of the estimates that are now before you. It is rarely possible, sir, to take a progressive step of this kind without

involving some dislocation or inconvenience. Accordingly, the hon. members may encounter some difficulties in relating these estimates to the form of the public accounts followed heretofore. I will endeavour to help, in any way I can, to make the relationship clear for the members, particularly during consideration of the votes on the drivers branch and the vehicles branch.

Further progress in the current services of the department is illustrated by the legislation that it has been my privilege to bring before the House in the past few weeks.

The amendments to The Highway Traffic Act propose several major changes in regard to drivers and vehicles. Amendments to The Public Commercial Vehicles Act and The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act are concerned with two of our important specialized responsibilities. The Motorized Snow Vehicle Act introduced new controls for a new need; and The Airport Act was a further innovation that demonstrates the department's expanding scope within the larger field of transportation.

This legislation underlines a significant trend. The original functions of The Department of Transport related exclusively to motor vehicles, and the drivers of those vehicles. In the past few years, the department's functions have in fact been broadened to cover transportation in a more general way. I am pleased to announce today that the department's expanded role is advancing a step further by the creation of a transportation planning division.

As Minister of Transport, it has been my honour to be chairman of the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study, a project that has added new dimensions to transportation planning. This study will establish guidelines for other jurisdictions in the modern comprehensive approach to many aspects of transportation.

The work of the transportation study concluded this spring. The wealth of valuable data collected has progressed through the final stages of analysis and collation. The final report is even now being printed and it is my plan to table it in this House and release it to the public on June 13. I am confident that the work of the study will form a strong foundation for efficient transportation planning in the region covered, and will provide invaluable guidelines for further transportation planning in urban areas in all other parts of the province.

Even as this planning is concluded, another kind of transportation planning has taken on new significance for my department. The Airport Act, 1968, received Royal assent on April 11. Our primary aim is to provide all-weather airstrips for wheeled aircraft in northern Ontario, especially in those areas where no other form of transportation is available. Investigations of possible sites began last summer. These investigations are continuing, and it is our hope that it may be feasible to construct airstrips at some locations this summer. The matter of navigational beacons also is being examined.

Among its other responsibilities, the new transportation planning division of my department will direct the provincial government's growing role in connection with the possible abandonment of railway lines, keeping in mind the economic health of the communities affected.

The traditional functions of the department in regard to both motor vehicles and drivers in their ever-growing magnitude will be handled by our motor vehicle division under the new structure. These functions, of course, continue to be of great importance and we will continue to devote to them our close attention.

The re-structuring of the department into two divisions is a further advance in the evolution of our work which carries out the original objectives of 10 years ago, and expands them in order to serve, in the fullest way, the transportation needs of the people of Ontario.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, as I rise to take part in the debate on The Department of Transport, may I at the outset offer my congratulations to the Minister on his presentation. He took exactly ten minutes. And it is very nice to see a Minister of the government here complete his introductory remarks in such a short period of time. I may not be as short as that, but I will not be much longer.

I would like to extend my thanks to the many members of his department for the courtesies extended to me in my attempts to get answers for many constituent problems that I have presented to them.

May I ask rhetorically at the outset, why a Department of Transport? Why can this not be put into its proper place, and that being a division or arm of The Department of Highways. We have gone through this in the past, and it still holds true.

Mr. Chairman, our highway safety record leaves little room for comfort. Even though

there may have been a reduction of 23 per cent in the number of fatalities during January and February of this year, and the number of fatal accidents also dropped by 26 per cent at the same time, the rate of fatalities per number of miles driven was higher. The number of people killed on the highways in 1967 was 1,719, an increase of 123 over the 1966 figures, or an increase of 7.7 per cent.

By the way, car vehicle registrations only went up 3.5 per cent. The number injured was 67,280, an increase of about 2,000, and the number of accidents was 145,000, an increase of more than 5,000.

It is true that in the first two months of this year the accident rate was substantially down. And it is the hope of every hon. member of this House that such progress would continue. However, Mr. Chairman, the credit for this decrease is probably due in main to the fact that there was relatively good driving weather during this January and February.

Budgetary allowances, with very minor increase, are an indication of no substantial change or improvement in our highway safety efforts. In fact, Mr. Chairman, you wonder if there will ever be substantial change or improvement in our highway safety efforts as long as this government under the present Minister will not both face and present in their critical reality the stark facts concerning our accidents.

Comparative statistics for 1966 and 1967 show startling increases over and above the increase in motor vehicle registration. The budget of the department under discussion has risen from $11 million in 1967/68 to $13 million an increase of some $2 million or a percentage increase of 18 per cent.

At the same time the most important branch of this department, the highway safety co-ordination and promotion branch has not received a proportionate increase of 18 per cent, but merely of 10 per cent, clearly indicating that this government's interest in safety is being downgraded.

Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to show the complete disinterest or lack of awareness of the importance of the highway safety co-ordination and promotion by this Minister. The hon. Minister may state that in other votes for items in his overall estimates there are funds expended in various fields of safety. That may be so, but it is not always so. However, in looking back over the estimates, may I prove to you and the hon. members of this House, the point that I was making when I said that there was apathy in the field of safety by this Minister in this department.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. B. Newman: Referring to the estimates back to 1963/64, the amount allocated for safety was $475,000 out of a budget of $6,727,000. In all of these figures, I am eliminating the statutory amounts of funds requested by the department. The amount expended on highway safety was 7 per cent of the budget. In 1964/65, the amount decreased to a little more than 6 per cent. In 1965/66 it was a little more than 5 per cent of the budget.

In 1966/67 it was only 5 per cent; in 1967/68 is was 5 per cent; in 1968/69 it was $606,000 out of a $13 million budget, or only 4.6 per cent.

So, Mr. Chairman, you can see where the moneys allocated to safety have decreased from a total of 7 per cent of the budget in 1963/64 to 4.6 per cent of the budget today. This is conclusive proof of that safety has become a diminishing concern in this department. What is being done is apparently not as effective as it might be. There must be a complete reappraisal as to our methods and approach to this whole problem.

Mr. Chairman, may I read from an editorial in the Windsor *Daily Star*, dated April 10, 1968. I will only quote a few paragraphs from this editorial titled "Highway Hippy Gang":

> Ontario's Transport Minister Irwin Haskett in discussing highway safety says lack of driver courtesy is the main cause of accidents. Mr. Haskett is right but apparently he doesn't believe he is right enough to do anything about it, for you don't hear or see any effort from Mr. Haskett or the provincial government for more courtesy in driving other than the occasional preachment. Impolite drivers are the hippies of our highways and preaching to them won't even make them scratch their heads. To clean them up calls for some force, strong enforcement of our driving laws and strong campaigning to let them know that their habits are bad and won't be tolerated. But our highways hippies are a menace to all of us. They should be a matter of great concern. They are, as Mr. Haskett said, the greatest danger of the road, so much so that the Minister should do something, something really big, about curbing

them. There has been too much complacency and piety about highway safety.

This ends the editorial. Mr. Chairman, only 0.6 per cent of this year's revenue of over $100 million, collected by The Department of Transport, was spent on highway safety coordination and promotion, less than nine cents per capita—a real shame. How can you promote and sell safety in the transportation field with such a mini-budget? This department is like the liquor control board and the liquor licence board, willing to collect but not willing to help lessen the problems created by the commodity or article that they tax.

Mr. Chairman, the progressive balanced economic growth of the province is dependent upon a realistic transportation policy, a policy that must take in all modes of transportation, all commodities that require movement from one location to another. Recent studies undertaken by this department led to the establishment of commuter services, but this only took care of the needs or part of the needs of the Metro area.

In the examination of the estimates, I find no provision for an extension of such studies in any area other than assistance for airstrip development. If the demand for transportation continues to match Ontario's economic growth, it will double by 1980 and double again by the year 2000. If we do not set a policy today, think of the crisis we will be confronted with by the year 1980 or by the year 2000.

Rapid urbanization has vastly complicated both transportation problems and their solutions. Urbanization is a global phenomena. Soon more than half of the world's population will live in crowded cities, but nowhere is it more vivid than in Ontario, which is amidst the sometimes painful process of jamming 85 per cent of its population into 2 per cent of its land, a most amazing change for a province not so long ago considered rural.

Auto population has tripled in 20 years and is now growing almost as fast as human population. Residents of Ontario have sprawled into suburban fringes where they are so dispersed that public transportation is ineffective.

Housewives have become chauffeurs for their children and husbands. Inevitably, as transit services decline and road improve, more autos not only clog the roads to town, but block the streets as well. Freeway tieups have multiplied to the point where air-borne traffic spotters now broadcast on how to dodge them.

It has been found in the United States that frequently a new freeway, built to carry thousands of cars a day no sooner opens up, than it is inundated by twice that many. Besides, one mile of freeway takes 40 acres of what would otherwise be taxpaying property, and a simple interchange often eats up 80 acres.

Just as Metro studies have shown the possible solution to the worsening problem of getting people in and out of town with dispatch, efficiently and safely, so a revival of mass transit is necessary, be it rail or bus. We should strive towards a balanced transportation system, feeding passengers swiftly and smoothly from one mode of travel to another. As it is now, there are practically no links between systems. Until these link-ups actually occur, no truly efficient transportation system will be possible. We will either solve the problem or find our downtowns strangled.

Surely, this is the department that should be more than just a computerized, fee-collecting, licence-issuing department, but a department concerned with transportation problems. I would suggest to the Minister that he undertake a transportation study of some Ontario city with a population of from 100,000 to 200,000. I would suggest that, just as he has commuter trains here in Metro, he experiment with commuter buses in some Ontario city for a given period of time.

I would suggest that he consider the rebate of provincial fuel tax on buses used in some suburban transit systems, or if not the rebate, the dropping of the fuel tax completely.

Try this for a given period of time. Maybe in London, and see if such an experiment is part of the answer to our transportation problem. See if such suggestions would not ease the pressure for more highways. Mr. Chairman, may I once again bring to the attention of the Minister a suggestion that I made a year ago, that we give consideration to a pilot project that would provide free public transit in some Ontario city for a given period of time. There may be substantial merit and savings in both money and lives in such suggestions. Mr. Chairman, I could make mention of airstrip development, hover craft, helicopters and vertical take-off aircraft as methods of transport. But I will leave this to my colleagues when we speak on the later votes.

Mr. Chairman, the case for compulsory

vehicle inspection was more than well discussed recently in one of the members' hours and was agreed to by all members of the House, and the case was well documented. You have admitted the merit of it, by starting some classes of dump trucks. May I ask you now, to stop playing with the lives of the people and become serious in the need for such a safety measure.

Many states now, have such a requisite, and several provinces likewise. I would like to simply read several sentences from an article of May 11, 1968, and this is concerning a check lane held in the city of Windsor.

More than 700 cars had been directed through the lane and, of these, 125 were ordered off the road because of serious mechanical faults. Constable Robinson, who had something to do with the whole procedure, makes this comment:

> There is no doubt that many persons with older, possibly unsafe cars are leaving them at home until the safety lane is over.

So having that type of programme is not sufficient, you must have compulsory vehicle inspection. I know that it would be difficult to have all vehicles inspected annually at this time, but, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the Minister that in adidtion to having mechanical fitness, or the vehicle inspection, that is now required on the sale of vehicles, that in 1968 he require all vehicles, cars, trucks and buses of 1960 or earlier vintage, plus all vehicles regardless of year, whose odometer records at least 75,000 miles, be required to present a certificate of mechanical fitness before a new 1969 licence plate be issued.

Next year, 1969, all vehicles of 1961, 1962 and 1963 vintage and older, plus all vehicles having an odometer reading of over 75,000 miles likewise be required to present certificates of mechanical fitness. Two years from now, in the year 1970, all vehicles from 1964, 1965 and 1966 and older; in 1971—1967, 1968, 1969 and older; in 1972—1970 and 1971 vehicles; so that within five years, Mr. Chairman, all vehicles would have to present certificates of mechanical fitness.

Mr. Chairman, one of the complaints about stricter laws for drinking drivers has always been there has been no proof that the new laws will have the desired effect. Experience in Britain, Mr. Chairman, seems now to have refuted this argument. Compulsory breathalizer tests for suspected drunk drivers have had such marked effect on the driving and drinking habits of the British that I must, for the record, state that the Minister of Transport reported that road deaths were down 579, or 23 per cent, for the first three months after the new law came into effect in October, 1967.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the results of the first breathalizer Christmas for the five festive days in 1967 compared with the same period in 1966 showed 60 fewer deaths on the roads, 497 fewer seriously injured, 1,367 fewer slightly injured, for a total of 1,921 fewer total casualties. Is not this dramatic and convincing proof that Britain's strict new regulations have had their effect, and that similar regulations in Ontario would also have a similar effect?

The Department of Transport's 1967 accident facts book states that the condition of the driver involved in fatal accidents in 22 per cent of 448 cases was that the driver had been drinking or was classed as "ability impaired". If Britain's decrease in road deaths were just as applicable to Ontario's situation, this would have meant 23 per cent of the 448 persons, or about 100 fewer deaths. How about it? Why not follow Britain, seeing that you are not concerned enough to show leadership in this one more important way of curtailing the hazards of the mixture of alcohol with gasoline?

Other members of my group, Mr. Chairman, will make comments in the appropriate vote on this topic. I would just like to make a few suggestions to the Minister.

First, I would once again make a plea that he consider the reflectorization of licence plates. In other years we have had quite a lengthy debate on this. It has been proven meritorious in many jurisdictions and I think it is time now that the Minister stop kidding us and become serious. If he fails to follow this, I would suggest that he require the signs of cars, trucks, buses, trains, freight cars —all types of rolling stock—to contain certain amounts of reflectorized material.

I would also suggest to the Minister that bulbs of greater intensity be compulsory on motor vehicles. It was all right to have a light seen from 500 feet away when the traffic speeds were 30 and 40 miles an hour. But today, with vehicles travelling at practically any speed on the highway, it is needed for them to be recognized much sooner; 500 feet is insufficient. So I would suggest that a bulb of greater intensity would be that much greater a warning to the approaching driver.

I would suggest, likewise, that standard bumper heights be compulsory in the province. You will notice that the latest fad is

for some of the jet set to jack up the back of their car and raise it up to the point where the rear bumper is practically two feet off the ground—even much higher than that—and we know the hazard that would be in a rear end collision.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): That is the Minister of Agriculture and Food's car you have been looking at.

Mr. B. Newman: May I also suggest that the Minister press the manufacturer for a bumper completely around the car and that not only that that bumper be completely around the car, but that it be the part of the car that projects the farthest. In this way we would be copying the dodgem cars that we find at fairs. We know these cars used at fairs do not smash up and do not become damaged as easily as if vehicles did not have that type of protection. This would also cut repair costs and, in turn, decrease our insurance premiums, so I am suggesting a bumper completely around the car— at a standard height—and that it project farther than any other part of the vehicle.

I would suggest to the Minister that splashguards on all sides of all vehicles be compulsory and that the splashguards be low enough so that they would prevent the splashing, especially in inclement weather. We all know the hazards in attempting to pass a vehicle when it is raining.

I would likewise suggest to the Minister that he consider a special coloured licence plate for uninsured drivers. Anyone that does not present a card showing that he has insurance on his vehicle be provided with a special type and a special coloured licence plate, so that the public could easily identify him and treat him with caution.

I would suggest, also, a permanent licence plate, rather than an annual plate. And, if you cannot see your way clear to having a permanent plate, I would suggest that the present plate be valid for a longer period of time than one year. I suggest that they need not be renewed at the same period of time in a year, but that they could be renewed—or that you could buy a new plate—at several times in the year.

You could very easily work this out by different colours in the plates. For example, one half of the plate could be blue and the other half be white in one year; the next year one half of the plate could be white and the other could be red; and the second year the one half of the plate could be red and the other could be green, or any other colour. But you could, by a combination of colours, if you do not intend, or do not wish, to have a permanent licence plate, have a licence plate issued at various times of the year using colour coding.

I would likewise suggest to the Minister that tires should be plainly marked. They should not be marked in codes, but on the tire should be marked the mileage that the tire should give the individual under normal use.

I would suggest, likewise, a special tag or a plate be attached to a car whenever it is being driven by a learner. A type of tag that would be required to be put on the license plate and removed when someone other than the learner is actually using the car. I understand such a scheme is being used in some European countries.

I would likewise suggest to the Minister that he consider some way of identifying drivers that have nine to twelve demerit points, and that is some way on the licence plate. We have attempted to talk to these people concerning safety on the road. They apparently do not want to listen when it comes to the communication. So, if we cannot speak to them, let us identify them on the road.

I would require the manufacturers to paint the inside cover of the trunk a bright fluorescent orange, or some colour, or even reflectorize it, so that a vehicle in trouble on the highway simply has to raise the trunk. There is a method by which you could warn approaching vehicles.

These are but a few of the suggestions that I could make but for the sake of time I am curtailing them. I do ask the Minister to press for greater safety in the manufacture of automobiles. I would ask that he insist that the manufacturers inform his department of the number of vehicles recalled and the reason for recall.

Mr. Chairman, I have just two other comments I would like to make and one is that the Smith report—I could go into a discussion on the Smith report, but I will leave that for someone else for the sake of time. Likewise, I could make comment on automobile insurance, but I know there will be members from my group who will cover that fairly well. I could likewise make mention of the brief presented by a Mr. Dave Elliott of local 880 of the teamsters on the urgent need for highway safety measures—quite a worth-

while brief. I could likewise make mention of fume control and exhaust devices, but for the sake of time I will bypass all of that.

I would like to ask the Minister to seriously consider greater driver control—more stringent driver examination, a greater stress on driver improvement, stricter enforcement, stiffer penalties. And let us get on with the driver education programme in the schools in a much faster fashion; we are not increasing it quickly enough. The young driver is the one that has the greatest incidence of accidents of it is absolutely necessary that he be taught the proper way to drive. In fact, I might even think of making it sort of, in some instances, a compulsory subject in secondary school.

I would like to ask for a review of the point system and, in this instance, I would like to make mention of a law passed in the state of Virginia on April 4 of this year. This Virginia measure I am quoting now:

> Under the terms of the Virginia law, a person convicted of being a habitual offender will be deprived of his driving licence for life and a mandatory jail term of from one to five years will be imposed if he continues to drive after his permit is revoked. To be convicted as a habitual offender, a person must be found guilty and convicted of committing three serious offences during a ten-year period or 12 lesser offences for which a court of law is authorized or the division of motor vehicles is required to suspend the permit for 30 days.
>
> The nine serious offences are manslaughter, drunk driving, impaired driving, driving on a revoked or suspended permit, driving without a permit having been issued, perjury or making a false affidavit when obtaining a driving licence, a commission of a felony while using a motor vehicle, hit and run involving property damage in excess of $250, hit and run involving personal injury or any combination of these offences totalling three in a ten-year period.

Mr. Chairman, I could make mention of a lot of other things concerning this department but I will take them up as the individual votes come up.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I too was very pleased with the brevity of the Minister's statement and congratulate the member for Windsor-Walkerville on the suggestions he has made.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to express the views of the New Democratic Party with regard to the function and the operation of The Department of Transport. I want to make it clear at the outset as I talk of the department I am not talking necessarily about those people involved in the day-to-day operations. I am referring more to the operations themselves as they are laid out in the structure of the department.

The Department of Transport of this particular government functions extremely well as a repository of historical data; but as a driving force in the development of this province, it ranks alongside bathtub gin and raccoon coats. It is a kind of an amusing relic of the past and while it is only ten years old, it really does not serve what I would consider to be a very useful function towards future expansion of this province.

In reviewing the actions taken by this department during the course of the year, I would have to say that its efforts are those of a department which appears to be obsessed with maintaining the status quo, and I will go into that a little later perhaps. The department seems reluctant to undertake any revolutionary change, and if *Hansard* of the past accurately indicates the things that have been suggested in this House, I would be inclined to believe that those few things we have seen over the past years are actually enactments of suggestions that have been made over the years from this side of the House.

If the department is to function properly even in the present conditions, the department as it now is would have to make quite a number of changes. I will name two or three of them for the moment and as the estimates progress we may get into more of them.

The Highway Traffic Act, the administration of which is one of the main functions of the department, should be completely rewritten in my opinion. The Minister introduced his changes earlier this year and I was hoping it was an indication of more radical change within the department. But, alas, it was not that at all; it was typical housekeeping type of change we have seen so many times in so many other departments within the government.

Instead of introducing compulsory inspection of all automobiles licenced in Ontario, the Minister undertook to inspect just a few. He decided, for some reason or other beyond my comprehension, that an automobile that is being sold is more of a menace than one

that has been on the highway for a number of years. Now, it seems plain to me that any automobile that has been driven numbers of times over these highways for many, many years, has as much chance of being in poor mechanical condition as one that just happens to be being sold.

I think this sort of hesitant step in the direction of compulsory inspection is not nearly enough at this time. If we are going to cut down on the number of automobile accidents, if we are going to insure safety on the highways, then we must surely go immediately into compulsory inspection.

The member who spoke ahead of me mentioned a plan that would take some years to reach fruition, and it is not a bad plan at all, perhaps a little long in my opinion. I hope that we might be able to reach this objective in a lesser period of time. I would hate to think that over the next five years many accidents would have occurred due to mechanical failures that could have been avoided had we taken the steps now.

The motor vehicle accident claims fund should be abolished. It should be replaced by legislation making auto insurance compulsory in this province, and providing indemnity without fault. I would say that if past experience with the auto insurance companies is borne out after the legislation making auto insurance compulsory, then it might be necessary for the province to enter into this field in a very real way. I would be reluctant to leave such a captive market in the hands of the present auto insurance companies.

The committee on transport and highways, of which I am a member, does not appear to serve any useful purpose. I sat there during the discussion on Bill 66. This House asked that the bill be referred to committee in order that the various persons interested in the content of the bill would be given the opportunity to present their views. They were given the opportunity but I am of the opinion that many, many members on the government side arrived there determined in advance on how they were going to vote.

I am still convinced, as I was at the time of the hearing, that the case put forward by the truckers of this province who were represented was a much better documented case, a case with much more substance than the case put forward by the Minister. If this is going to be the function of this particular section of the department or rather, the function of this committee, it is not serving a useful function.

Let us get it out of here, let us not pretend any longer that it is there for the purpose of hearing the people's views with an eye to influencing government, because this is not the case. And these are a very few things that I think we could begin by doing. There are many, many more but I do not want to dwell on the function of the department as it is at present. They are small changes and they would not, in my view, bring about the kind of Department of Transport we ought to have.

The Departments of Highways and Transport as they are presently constituted should be molded together to form a whole new department. I realize that ten years ago they were, and I think that the move at that time to separate them was an unwise move.

I am of the opinion there should be a whole new department set-up—a branch of which would be The Department of Transport as it presently exists, and another branch, the one that now exists as The Department of Highways. By so doing, we would not only save money by the administration but it would eliminate this overlap of services. In some cases we would get rid of this lack of communication that appears to exist.

We would correlate the services and we would eliminate the kind of thing that occurred in Welland just recently, where there was a lack of communication between ourselves and the federal government, a lack of communication between The Department of Transport who ought to have some say or some control over planning and The Department of Highways.

The problem that arose at Welland is just a wasting of $750,000; to build an overpass at that cost and then to scrap it within five years indicates that there is a certain lack of communication somewhere along the way.

So I have some suggestions to make for this department. They must have a complete change, complete rebuilding—complete restructuring of the department.

It must have complete and full jurisdiction over all of the transportation media of this province. It must have, under its control, not only The Department of Highways; not only those administrative functions that presently fall within The Department of Transport; not only the licensing and the fee setting structure; but it must have jurisdiction over all means of moving product and mate-

rial, over all means of moving people in this province.

I would view this new department along the following lines. I see it as being a very, very large department, not only in numbers of people involved, but also in the scope of its jurisdiction. Perhaps even a senior Ministry somewhere along the way. A department that would play a very, very important role in the planning of the economy of this province.

The Department of Highways operation would be within this new department. A department dealing with the new methods of transportation, pipelines and the various methods that are not presently being used to the full extent. It would have jurisdiction over the railroads, over airways and waterways. It would have a branch of planning and research and I heard the Minister mention, in his opening remarks, that we were going to have just such a thing.

I would hope that the outcome of the suggested department will be something like what I am going to suggest. When the new department is initially set up, if it ever is, the planning and research branch would delegate to the five branches that I mentioned, the responsibility of stocktaking. We have to be able to determine what we have in this province in the way of transportation media. We would have to know exactly what is available to every area of the province in order that we can determine what we need and, at the present time, I do not see this.

I see it being done in local areas but I do not see it in an overall plan of any kind. It would be in close communication with The Department of Municipal Affairs, The Department of Trade and Development, The Treasury Board, The Department of Energy and Resources Management, The Department of Agriculture and Food and perhaps others. But those particular departments.

And it would be in this close communication in order to determine where the economic growth of this province was likely to take place and where the planning of these departments was likely to bring about additional economic growth.

The entire future of this province rests upon the type of transportation system we evolve. There is no purpose in casting aside the urban sprawl in favour of the satellite city if we are going to have to tear down half of the existing city to provide the super highways to bring the people from the dormitory communities to the place where they must earn their living.

There is no purpose in talking about the development of the north unless we are prepared to provide the necessary transportation media, not only to take out of the north those things that have been taken out before, but to put back into the north the opportunity of establishing the secondary industry so very necessary for its growth.

This planning branch would take a very close look at the possibility of enlarging this mass media transportation that we have. We would, whenever necessary, build the monorail systems required to move people into the cities and out of the cities. We would provide the subway systems that would be required for the same purposes.

The big problem in this province has been that we have never sat down and seriously considered whether the highways that are available now are the best and most economic means of moving the materials and the people from one portion of the province to another. We have never decided whether we are making best use of the railways.

The Minister mentions, or someone mentioned the fact, that we might be thinking of doing away with the railways. What we perhaps ought to be doing is thinking of enlarging the railways and improving and modernizing them in order that we get the very best and the lowest cost transportation of goods and materials.

The northern Ontario railroad does not perform a very meaningful function at this time. It is not properly used and it could be improved on immeasurably.

We have made very little use of air transportation in the province. The Minister talks of the new Act—The Airport Act—but The Airport Act is still paper and unless a very serious appraisal of the needs of the province is undertaken before the establishment of these air strips or landing strips in the north, it will, like all other Acts, serve a very useless purpose.

We must consider the use of moving solids by pipeline. It can be done and it can be done in this province of opportunity if we so desire.

I am sure that one can see in retrospect the massive job that would have to be done by such a department. It would require a Minister with great foresight and ability. It would require the complete restructuring of the things that presently are, into the things that must be, for future growth. As I said previously, this department would play a very

important function in the development of this province. It would play a major role.

The scope available to it would only be dictated by the foresight of the people in charge. A government determined to develop this province, determined to give the kind of equality of opportunity so often referred to in political speeches, should have been able to see the need for such a department long ago and let me say, heaven knows, they have been prompted often enough. It has been suggested by many people prior to my coming here and will probably still be getting suggested long after I have gone.

It should not be up to me, at this time, to be making these suggestions in order that we provide for the people of this province, the kind of economic growth the kind of future that I see.

In review, let me say that the department, as it presently functions, functions fairly well. The job it does is totally inadequate though, but it does it with some degree of efficiency. It handles licences well, issues fees well, administers the Act without changing it but administers it well; and the review boards it has, the administrative functions, the statistical centre, could almost all be replaced with an adequate computerized system.

Its handling of The Traffic Act, as I said, is unimaginative; the new legislation of the department, what little there has been of it, is sort of stopgap; and the only modern function in transportation in this province has been performed without the jurisdiction of The Department of Transport—the very place where it ought to have been the government did not see fit to place it—and this is Go Transit.

I would hope that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Transport would take heed of what is being suggested to him, here tonight by both opposition parties; that you would consider very seriously undertaking these things; that you would have the foresight and imagination to recognize the potential of this province; but that this potential will only be realized if the transportation system is adequate to carry the people and the materials from where they are to where they must be.

I ask you to take some steps, in this direction, now. Do the things that have been suggested to you. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, it has been rather a rewarding evening for me and I think for members, to introduce our estimates in this way, and to be the recipient of two such well prepared, and well delivered addresses on behalf of the Opposition speakers.

I looked forward with some anticipation to hearing from the member for Windsor-Walkerville, because of his long known interest in, and familiarity with, the motor vehicle administration business, coming as he does from the motor centre of the province. He has not disappointed, but he has, as was expected, come forward with some very useful comments, and suggestions.

There are a number of the suggestions that have been put forward by both the speakers thus far, that I think could perhaps be better and more adequately dealt with when we reach the individual items.

As I said in introducing them, we have restructured the set-up of the estimates for this department this year in a manner that I think the House will find very convenient, and useful.

When we come to it, Mr. Chairman, it maybe that when we get to vote 2201, and come to vote 2202 on drivers, vote 2203 on vehicles, vote 2204 on common carriers and such, these votes have, under them, been broken down into the several programmes that are covered by them, and I think, as we look at those programmes, we will find they include all the subjects we want to discuss in detail.

As I look at the comments I have already been offered, I find that a number of them will fit very properly into fuller discussion later. I would like to suggest at this time, Mr. Chairman, that the members look at those votes, and the arrangement of them, and ascertain which of the subjects they want to discuss, and which fall within the clearly noted programmes under votes 2202, 2203, 2204, and speak to them, if it please the House, under programmes, rather than under items that seem to me to be rather meaningless.

That being so, I would suggest that if there are any items the members want to discuss that fall within the purview of my department, that do not seem to properly fit within the votes or within those designated programmes within the votes, rather than the items numbered, that they raise them under vote 401. And if they do fall within the purview of my department, and are not otherwise covered, we can deal with them in 2201, so that all may be satisfied with a full and adequate discussion of matters that come under this department's surveyance.

Mr. MacDonald: Research as such has done a disappearing act in this department It used to be a separate branch. Last year it was a separate estimate under the first vote, and now it is not identifiable as such. Where does one appropriately raise it?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think research as it was referred to in last year's estimates had to do largely with the amount of work associated with Metropolitan Toronto regional transportation study and related research. We do not do pure research of any kind in our department—MTRTS came under that vote, and in the absence of research occurring under any other vote, I think it will quite properly come up in vote 2201, main office.

That is where I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that if members find there is any apparent absence of a topic for a subject they want to raise, it can be brought up in 2201. It will provide a catch-all of anything that is not otherwise indicated in the estimates.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, since you are straightening out some of these matters, there are one or two recommendations from the Smith report having to do with licensing fees, particularly associated with PCV and PV responsibilities; would you prefer those under the main office, or under common carrier.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, if they were to appertain particularly to the licensing of common carriers, or the licensing fees of common carriers, they could come there. It was more general; I think there were three portions in the Smith report concerning our department. You can raise them under vote 2201 if they were of a general nature, but if they were specific to common carriers I think that would be the more appropriate place to raise them.

Mr. Chairman: I believe the Minister made reference to the Metropolitan Toronto and regional transportation study. Do I understand him correctly to say that this should not come under vote 2201; possibly it is another vote?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No. I would think it would seem to fall under transportation planning by the name of it, but it is a programme that is over, and I have intimated to the House that our work is completed, and I am hoping to be able to table the report in this House on June 13, if the printers do not fail us.

Having straightened out the means by which we can follow the estimates in an orderly way, I think there are some matters that were brought up by the hon. members that might not reappear when we are discussing votes and the items. I make reference to a suggestion from both the speakers of the Opposition parties with regard to a more comprehensive programme for transportation, and I think that this is an indication of lifting our sights.

We appreciate the suggestion that transport could comprehend highways and rails and air and pipelines, and so. We understand the division that we follow today is one of convenience, that transport was separated out of highways, as the job of highway building became such a large operation, and the administration of motor vehicles, which transport was primarily in those days, was a good separation. In my opening remarks I sought to emphasize the desirability of that separation of work and the establishment of this department 10 years ago, and the work we have done as justifying it.

Nevertheless, I do appreciate the thoughtful expressions of both members in respect to the broader operation of transport. It is known that air transport is primarily a function of the federal government, and so is rail transportation in its interprovincial and international operation, and pipelines as well. We have no desire to tangle with the federal authorites, but our move into the airport work, and particularly the projected plans to open up some of the north with airstrips so that wheeled aircraft can move it, in all-weather service, is an indication of our recognition of that need.

At the same time we have appreciation of the fact that airports are primarily a federal responsibility. But in these areas where we can meet situations that are not being covered by the federal operation, without offending or impinging on federal authority, and we can do it in a way that is co-operative and useful, we will be doing it under the powers given us by the new Airports Act that received its Royal assent just before Easter.

A number of matters were raised by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville that come specifically under other votes. Highway safety can be dealt with largely under vote 2205. But let us not fall into the error that the hon. member was leading us into when he was suggesting that because the one particular vote, 2205 highway safety co-ordination and promotion, had not increased,

that our work had not increased. We must not assume that that one vote comprehends our entire programme of highway safety. He will be one of the first to recognize, sir, that a large measure of highway safety is being cared for in our driver examination, training, control, and vehicle inspection programmes.

The amount that is represented under vote 2205 is only a part of the moneys being spent and the work being done related to highway safety. These various aspects of highway safety can be discussed under their respective headings. Both members spoke on mechnical fitness and vehicle inspection. We will deal with those when we come to them in subsequent votes where a better opportunity is afforded to specialize on just those items. I do not know if you will want to bring up the breathalyzer test in any particular section, and it is a very important factor in highway safety. We all recognize it as such.

The so-called accident facts clearly indicate the problems related to highway safety. The experience in Great Britain this last year has been a very encouraging one and it was with regret, though, that we saw the federal government dissolve and leave the bill dealing with this matter, the amendment to the criminal code, standing on the order paper.

It is to be hoped that when the government of Canada comes back to Parliament this next session that it will revive that bill and carry through its proposal to make unlawful being in control of a motor vehicle with an alcohol content in the blood of more than a specified amount. I think that I would share with members, the hope that the federal government might see fit to amend its section respecting the impairment level. It was setting the level at 0.1 per cent in the blood, when its own standing committee on justice and legal bills, the Canadian medical association, the Canadian bar association, the British white paper, and many other responsible authorities had urged that the figure be set at .08. I strongly support that figure and hope that we will see the offence established in the criminal code.

We can deal with licence plates where they come up under motor vehicle registration, and I will be happy to speak on it there. There were all kinds of items respecting motor vehicle equipment raised by the member for Windsor-Walkerville, with his particular knowledge of automobiles and automobile manufacture. At the time he was speaking on car safety construction, and recalls. Whether that would come particularly under registration of vehicles or vehicle safety inspection or enforcement, I do not know. But I would like to say to the House at this time that I think that we have pursued a very diligent, and forceful, and forthright, and successful course in the matter of vehicle safety from the time that we first initiated action in this province, even before it was taken in the United States.

In dealing directly with the motor car manufacturers—and I conferred with the presidents of all the companies engaged in car manufacture in Canada—we came to agreements with respect to the installation of safety equipment. I would like to say this in tribute to the car manufacturers: That the undertakings given have been carried out with honesty and in full intent. I have arranged with the manufacturers—and I did this before recall programmes were mandated in the United States—that they would keep me informed, and I released in Canada before they it was released in the United States, the story on recalls in Canada.

Recalls are just a part of the process. The recall information alone is not sufficient. I get recall information from all the reporting companies manufacturing cars in this country in advance of it being made public, but that is not enough. I have checked out and followed through with the manufacturers on their service departments the process of the servicing of the cars whose owners have been notified. I find that there is a certain difficulty there and it is with regard to the lapse time that occurs, from the time that the recall programme is announced and the recall notices go out to owners who have been invited to bring back cars for a recheck, until the time that the reports on rechecks come back to the motor vehicle manufacturers and they report to me. There is a lapse there, which I find is of some concern.

The entire programme of recalls I have available, and if anyone was collecting them from the newspaper he could have them all. But if the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville would like, my department would be happy to supply him with the total story on the recalls from the time they began, the notification of the recall on every item, and each and every recall for servicing.

The member for Wentworth indicated that there seemed to be a reluctance on the part of our department to make revolutionary changes. I think that both he and the previous speaker from Windsor-Walkerville suggested that the good things that we had been doing were adopted from suggestions

from the Opposition. Gentlemen, I am not going to argue about that. I do not care who gets the credit, as long as we do a good job.

Mr. MacDonald: The problem is you have to be prodded so long before you do the job.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That may be, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to the reason that we do not make too many revolutionary changes in this field and it is a very reasonable one. It is that we cannot move alone, for example, with regard to rear end lights, and someone may want to bring up the tail light signalling system.

Because of the mobility of motor vehicles and because of the freedom with which they move from this jurisdiction to others, between provinces, and across international borders, we are just about hog tied. We are limited in what we can do without getting broad acceptance and uniform action from other jurisdictions.

This is the thing that our friend from Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) will appreciate, as it was one of the bugbears of the railway business across America. Because of the inter-changeability of equipment, they were prevented from making the changes and advances that they might have desired. Well, I find that this is one of the frustrating things in this business. We cannot unilaterally change a lighting system. We could not get a company to unilaterally change some factor in its structure without making it common across the industry.

Because of the fact that we have mandated certain equipment for cars and we are now accepting regulations that the United States is laying down for mandating equipment—we are following that in measure for the present, in some respects. As we have foreign cars coming in here, I called the first conference a few months ago of all the importers of cars manufactured overseas. Those people are confronted with the great problem of trying to meet requirements in the United Kingdom and other European and Asiatic countries and the United States, and here. We are trying to iron out the thing in a sensible way, so that we can get uniformity as far as is possible, and not send the economically important motor vehicle industry into a tizzy. That is what we have to worry about.

We had people come all the way from Japan specifically for that meeting and since then I had the director general of the British motor vehicle industry come to Canada to see me. He wants to know what we can do to help them meet our requirements in a reasonable way. His chief concern was not that we would not lay down requirements, nor how they could avoid or evade our requirements, but how we could liaise to the end that, not only the manufacturer, but, back of him, his component suppliers, could learn, a reasonable length of time in advance of the time that the item would be mandated, so that they could follow orderly procurement and manufacturing procedures.

I mention these things that you may understand why we are not able to bring in, as freely as we would like, radical changes in the automobile and in our practices. It is a problem; we try to work it out as best we can; we try to be progressive, and we try to do a good job on behalf of administering motor vehicles.

I leave it at that, sir, and move on into the further work of examining our estimates. I undertake to give what help I can in answering questions. If the members ask me things I cannot answer, we will try to get the answers. I will do my best to be helpful.

On Vote 2201.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: I wonder if I could ask the Minister a question with regard to the Act establishing airports. How much—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I believe that would come under vote 2207.

Mr. Deans: I am sorry. He mentioned it; I was just going to ask him a question with regard to what he said.

Mr. Chairman: I think perhaps we had better stick with the votes. We can deal with that under vote 2207.

Mr. Deans: Transportation—fine!

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the three matters in the Smith report that concern the Minister do not all come under the common carriers vote and he might be prepared to indicate to the House under the first vote where general policy should be considered and just what the reaction of his department is to the recommendations made by the Royal commission on taxation.

The most important one, I suppose, does have to do with The Public Commercial Vehicles Act and The Public Vehicles Act

because the commissioners feel that the statute presently is extracting about four times too much money from those people who require the licences associated with those two Acts. If the Minister is going to continue the policy of using those statutes as revenue statutes, rather than just servicing the licences and policing the licences, perhaps this would be a time when he could express the maintenance of the old policy, or a change to the recommendations that come from the Smith report.

The other two refer to buses and transfer fees and so on, and are of lesser importance I believe but this one is of some considerable interest.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the recommendations of the Smith report are really three in number as I recall them—those which propose that municipalities and other bodies which presently pay token registration fees as a form of subsidy should be required to pay normal fees, and then receive a direct subsidy in compensation; recommendations which relate to the adjustment of existing fees to a level which will cover the administering of other associated costs involved; and recommendations, I think it was 30:10, which would appreciably increase the revenue accruing from the registration of passenger and dual-purpose vehicles and light trucks, and balance them with lighter tax on the PCVs.

I would think it would be reasonable for me to say to the House, sir, that this Smith report has hit us as it has hit many other departments. It requires some very considerable analyzing and consideration, and it will doubtless affect what recommendations I might care to put before the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton). We have been coming increasingly closer to the meeting of that second recommendation, that insofar as services are concerned, we are trying to make revenue cover the costs of services in the normal operation of—

Mr. Nixon: The second recommendation, you mean the one having to do with PCVs?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No; the one having to do with various services such as issuing certificates and that kind of thing. The first one dealt with withdrawing from municipalities the special licence fees they now enjoy, which are disproportionate in some cases, and charging all municipal vehicles and public transit vehicles the normal fee and then making adjustment by way of grants or subsidies, as an offset in part.

In that connection, it was mentioned by one of the speakers earlier that we should be subsidizing public transit. We have been accused of unfairly charging public transit fees, I think of our own Ottawa transportation commission, something like $450,000 a year in taxes. The municipal government charges them something like $90,000 a year in taxes, and the federal government about $190,000. Leaving out what the city and what the federal government charge them, we have been collecting in licence fees, and in fuel tax, about $450,000 a year from the Ottawa transportation commission, which is a municipally-owned system.

But a year ago, hon. members will remember that the Provincial Treasurer in his Budget announced that there would be an increase in the unconditional grant to municipalities of $1.50 per capita; he underlines it, and it was underlined in the printed copy that it could assist municipalities in roads and transportation. Unconditionally, because some municipalities would not want it for that purpose—but for those that had need for assistance for roads and transportation, there was available to them—this additional grant of $1.50 per capita.

With Ottawa's 300,000 population, that grant amounted to exactly $450,000 in round figures which was precisely the amount the public transit system was paying in fees to the province. In other words, we were, through what was designated unconditional grant, but nevertheless, returning it to Ottawa—and it is able now to make payment to the municipal transport system if it wants, that amount of money which was exactly what it was paying in registration fees and fuel taxes.

Mr. B. Newman: It just happened to work out that way.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is what I am saying.

Mr. B. Newman: It was not done intentionally to relieve the bus system in the city of the payment of these additional taxes or these taxes on fuel.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: But it did just work out that way. The hon. leader of the Opposition asked me about the Smith tax. I am not prepared at this time to say how much of the recommendations of Smith we will be seeing implemented. On the other hand, I am not sure I completely agree with the suggestion that we should be raising the registration fee on passenger, dual-purpose vehicles and small

trucks, and reducing the others. I think we have to think of the economic value and the revenue-producing possibilities of these charges. And I think it is a practical matter. We have the Smith report and we have to study it; we also have to think of road-users as providing revenue, at least that has been our approach to it.

Mr. Nixon: So that you really do reject the attitude taken by the commissioners that it should not be revenue-producing, other than meeting the expense of enforcement and policing the statute itself.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think that would be a fair appraisal of my original thought. But I do not think I have given the Smith report as much thought as we may have to do in the days ahead.

Mr. B. Newman: May I suggest to the hon. Minister that he does put in a vote specifically with his estimates on research, because there are so many topics that we could discuss under research that I think there should be one included and I would suggest that it be either the last vote or one of the early votes. Before I ask a question, I wish to commend the Minister and his department on the book that they did put out because it made it very easy to become a critic of this department simply by following the book. I thought it was well set-out and very easy to follow.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I was happy to have the report of the department and also "Accident Facts" in the hands of the hon. members well in advance of my estimates so that if they want they can now throw the book at me. With respect to the research branch, it is a very small branch in our operation. We do, as I say, little pure research; we made studies a year ago on a number of items and, actually, the budget is under the main office administration research section.

Mr. B. Newman: Maintenance?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is not.

Mr. B. Newman: Under the main office, Mr. Chairman, I notice that the maintenance vote has gone up approximately one-half million dollars, and I was just wondering whether that was part of the research.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That would hardly be fair because we do not have anything like that in research, Mr. Chairman. This is the kind of thing that I intimated to the House earlier would undoubtedly cause members some confusion, because there have been operations that have been moved in under the main vote that probably were not collected there before. But in the restructuring of the estimates by programmes, they have been put into that larger vote.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, under main office, relating this year to last year, there is a 19.4 per cent increase in the amount of money requested this year as opposed to last. Now I wonder if the Minister could explain where this almost 20 per cent increase comes in?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is a difficulty I am sure that the House is going to have and there is—

Mr. Deans: Submit a breakdown.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There is just no other way we could avoid it. Increases or decreases? These will be found under the various votes.

Under vote 2201, the total increase—and I will break any vote down into items that the member may wish—the total increase was $283,000. The total increase in the drivers branch is $804,000. The total increase in the vehicles branch is $448,000; under the common carriers $63,000; under highway safety co-ordination and promotion, which is the printing, a $4,000 increase. Under the motor vehicles accident claims branch an increase of $196,000; under transportation planning an increase of $77,000; for a total increase of $1,877,000.

Now if there are any of those totals that the member would like broken down, I will endeavour to give such figures to him.

Mr. Deans: I noticed that the total increase for the entire department is almost 16 per cent this year. I will come back to that in a moment.

I would like to just take the next two minutes to say something about changing the structure of the department. I realize it is something that the Minister may not have complete jurisdiction over. Perhaps the Prime Minister is the one who ought to be requested to answer this but since he is not available for your estimates, you will have to do it for him.

Now I know a number of people in this government have suggested the very changes

that I suggest, and that is the bringing about of a department which is completely responsible for transportation. It was suggested by the Minister of Mines. It was suggested by both of the leaders of the Opposition parties and it was also suggested by the Prime Minister himself, some time ago.

Now do you foresee this happening in the near future, when you are going to have jurisdiction over all of the transportation policies of this province?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think that this is rather a speculation, Mr. Chairman. I can quite conceive of The Department of Transport being responsible for transport *per se* but I would think the likelihood of it including the planning, engineering, construction and maintenance of highways would be unlikely to be in the present thinking of our government because that, in itself, is a pretty specialized operation and a very large one.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, may I carry on with the point on the Smith report? The Smith report attempts to relate the road user charges to the road benefits each user receives; this is the guiding principle in their analysis and recommendations. They also note that it is necessary to divide the beneficiaries of road services into two groups, the road users and others.

The question I would like to ask the Minister is whether or not he considers the disadvantages—or cause of certain things that happen on the roads—as something which should be charged off against the revenue from the users?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Such as?

Mr. T. Reid: Well, a simple example is the question of air pollution and noise pollution of the air. In other words, you are using these roads, there are vehicles on them, and they are contributing to air pollution in certain areas. The big 10-ton Macks, in particular, are contributing to noise pollution. It is a very simple argument. These are so-called external diseconomies of the highways to people who do not necessarily use those highways.

My question is this, in two parts: Do you consider that some of the revenue you receive from people who do use motor vehicles, that contribute to these disadvantages to other members of society, should be charged an amount for that, so that research could be done by your department or research grants made by your department in even greater amounts, if you are now making them, to ways of combating this type of noise pollution and air pollution?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think that is a very reasonable approach to it. I mentioned in my opening remarks that the revenue collected by this department goes into the general mix of taxes and out of that could be drawn moneys to deal with the unwanted by-products, if I can call them that, of motoring, namely, noise and air pollution. But the House will realize, sir, that air pollution is the problem of my colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), and so he could be drawing out of the general revenue for work he was doing in combating air pollution.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to follow this up briefly, Mr. Chairman. I think it would be helpful, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, if The Department of Transport made it known that they were concerned with, as the Minister correctly called them, "the undesirable by-products of the use of motor vehicles" and if the Minister actually stated, as a matter of policy, that he considers this to be one of the costs to society of operating highways with motor vehicles on them, if the Minister could stand up on a public platform and say, "Our highway systems give us advantages, they do not just open up Ontario, but they also carry disadvantages to them." Surely the first priority in the revenue from the highways would be to cure the disadvantages, the waste if you like, the nasty by-products of this type of progress through our highways.

I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister might be another voice in the area of public policy-making to draw this to the attention of the public; to let them know they are not getting their highways for nothing; that there are these wasteful, inhumane by-products, if you like, of technological progress.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is very right about this, and Smith recognized that these are charges that really are laid at the door of the motor vehicle and the user of the road. On the other hand, he recognized the difficulty of assessment.

But this is why I spoke of the revenues collected by our department as going into the general mix and the work that is being done in this connection would be done at the expense of—in measure—revenue from The Department of Transport. But I would agree with the hon. member that we can talk about this and I will not hesitate on occasions to

speak about the disadvantages and the dislocation of our life and the changes that the motor vehicle has brought, for they are not all good.

Mr. T. Reid: A concluding point, Mr. Chairman. May I ask the Minister if he believes that within his department there is the authority to establish decibel levels on certain types of motor vehicles?

What I am really trying to say is, can the Minister, in his department, make laws which will control the noise level, to some extent, effectively? Now, air pollution is a difficult one, but noise level is the thing that is driving people up the walls and sending them down the lakes.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: People and us, because, Mr. Chairman, the noise factor is one of our very real worries. We have laws on noise making and the authorities have tried to enforce them and it just does not seem to work. Yet, in some municipalities, they have had a type of enforcement that did clamp down on the noise makers—those who ride sports cars and motorcycles and such, not as vehicles, but for the noise they make.

Nevertheless, I have to confess that we do not have a good measuring device for noise emission by motor vehicles that is useful in enforcement. The national research council in Ottawa has had the problem on its doorstep for about two years and if it can come up with anything, bless them. We would be happy to see if we could work it into our legislation.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will deal with some of the items on the order paper and return to these estimates and, of course, the private members' hour will be at 1 o'clock, p.m.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, can the Premier tell us what estimates will follow the estimates of this department?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not know what order we will take the two departments that follow.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Presumably we can get clarification of that.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:10 o'clock, p.m.

No. 102



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, May 31, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, May 31, 1968

Motion to appoint select committee to study the report of the Ontario committee on taxation, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3715

Regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, bill to establish, reported 3717

Employment Standards Act, 1968, bill intituled, Mr. Bales, second reading 3735

Wages Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 3741

Industrial Safety Act, 1964, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 3741

Estimates, Department of Transport, Mr. Haskett, continued 3741

Air Pollution Control Act, 1968, bill intituled, on second reading, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Ben, Mr. Jessiman, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Bukator 3749

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3760

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 31, 1968

The House met at 9:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This morning we are going to have some sort of a record in the House with no less than nine schools being represented by pupils visiting us. The early birds who are with us this morning are: In the east gallery, Gladstone Ave. senior public school, Toronto; and in the west gallery, Hodgson senior public school, Toronto, hosting students from Chapleau public school, Chapleau; and students from Our Lady of Peace school, Islington. Later, we will be having students from Clarke public school, Sarnia; E. J. James public school, Oakville; L. G. Lorriman public school, Welland; King Edward public school, Toronto; and Ajax high school, Ajax. I am sure we welcome these young people who were up so early this morning to be here with us.

May I also express to the members who have begun the new regime my appreciation for them being here in time to allow the House to get under way, and also to the staff, because the early opening made quite a difference to the work that had to be done this morning. I am sure that it is a good omen for the accomplishment of business in the Fridays ahead.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I move, seconded by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nixon) that a select committee of this House be appointed to conduct an examination of the recommendations of the report of the Ontario committee on taxation:

To review briefs and submissions that have been made to the government from municipalities, organizations and individuals with respect to the recommendations contained in that report;

To conduct hearings for the purpose of receiving further representations from municipalities, organizations and individuals, with respect to the recommendations contained in that report;

And to report not later than September 17, 1968;

And that the select committee shall consist of 13 members and shall have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to appoint or employ counsel and secretary and such other personnel as may be deemed advisable and to call for persons, papers and things and to examine witnesses under oath, and the assembly doth command and compel attendances before the said select committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the hon. Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants;

The membership of the committee to be as follows: chairman, Mr. White; Messrs. Breithaupt, Deacon, Demers, Jessiman, Kennedy, Lawlor, Lawrence (Carleton East), Meen, Newman (Ontario South), Pilkey, Snow, Trotter.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion be put as read by the mover, the Prime Minister? Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if you will just permit me a word or two on—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps then we would have the mover and seconder speak.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would just say that the terms of reference are so drawn that the intent and purpose of this committee is not to re-do the work of the Smith committee. It really is to take the recommendations from the results of the Smith committee and to examine the comments made about those recommendations by the various individuals and organizations in the province who will be most affected by the implementation of these recommendations when that time comes.

We have a task force of civil servants who have been working on the recommendations of the Smith committee report since last

August and it is our intent that this committee will work very closely with that civil service committee. Then, it seems to me, the joint results of these two bodies should put the committee in a position to make recommendations concerning legislation.

The September 17 deadline which is in the motion, I feel to be necessary if we are to anticipate any action that might be taken in the next session of the Legislature. I do not underestimate for a moment what this committee will have to do between now and September 17, it is going to be a very tight timetable indeed. On the other hand, if we do not put in a deadline of this type, and if the committee goes on for six or seven months, then it will be 1970 before we would be able to bring forward in legislative form some of the recommendations we think are necessary.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, just a comment or two. I agree that the deadline is necessary since all sides of the House agree that the work of the reform of the tax system must proceed as expeditiously as possible. The deadline is going to give a very heavy burden of work to those members who have accepted the responsibility of sitting on the committee.

It has been said that the members of this committee, when their work is completed, will be tax experts, because they will not only have to work with the task force that the Premier has mentioned already this morning, but will have the advantage of hearing and discussing the views of a good many experts across the province.

So that this is not only a heavy responsibility for the members who have committed themselves to do it, but a real opportunity to get into the front lines in the position of experts on an evolving tax situation in Ontario and Canada. In 1968, as you well know, sir, we have the responsiblity of renegotiating our fiscal agreement with the government of Canada, so this is going to be a very important year for our province and our taxpayers.

I am delighted to have the honour of seconding the motion establishing this committee and I believe it is one of the most important ones that has been established in the House for some time.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly. Quite frankly, my reaction to the setting up of this committee has been a bit of a mixed one for reasons which I would like to elaborate briefly.

On the one hand I appreciate an opportunity for members of the Opposition to be involved in the detailed discussion of a report as important as the Smith report, prior to what I presume is going to be the formulation of government policy whether or not that formulation of policy involves the writing of a white paper. To often in the past, I think, important policies like this tend to have been created on the government side on the basis of studies, and the Opposition is a bit in the dark. We are going to be involved and therefore I am grateful for that opportunity.

On the other hand, I was fearful that having set forth a pattern of all these representations in March and April and May for the purpose of the white paper, the government's interjection of this committee in effect was going to postpone the schedule, and that, I think, would be highly undesirable, because we have postponed tax reforms for too long. So I note the fact we have September 17 as a deadline. It is going to be an almost impossible task to do the job and bring it back by then, but quite frankly I agree that the deadline must be put in.

And I assume, Mr. Speaker, that when this House adjourns in July or some time, that deadline is there and they are stuck with it, because they have to come back to the House to get an amendment to the motion. It is all very well for me, as a person who is not going to be on the committee, to point to the excruciating tasks and time limits that have been placed on it, but I think these are necessary if we are going to avoid the delay that I was fearful was going to be part of this new procedure.

Mr. Speaker, those are the comments that I would like to make.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have just one more comment. The reason I wanted to appoint this committee today while the House is still sitting is that it is now formally created. There is a lot of background work. I suppose the first task that every member of the committee perforce must have is to read the Smith committee report from start to finish. There is a good deal that can be done between now and the time the proceedings of this House will be over for the summer, so that was the reason for appointing it now, so the committee could start to work right away and then perhaps its public hearings can be held when the House is not in session.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, in this regard, I think it is important to the taxpayers of Ontario that we have more equity in our assessment picture, and we have repeatedly pointed out the great inequities there are in The Department of Municipal Affairs now. This report states that assessing the government's taxation policy, the committee on taxation found a conspicuous lack of any consistent policy with respect to assessment collection in these new procedures.

We have, as a matter of record, a great amount of work to be done in the reviewing of the assessment now in the department here. Now we are to go another year without these inequities being corrected, with literally thousands of people not being assessed and not on the tax rolls, with complete chaos in this department, do I understand that nothing is going to be done then in reviewing the assessment mess now? I think the Prime Minister should tell us what is going to happen—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can only say the member is completely out of order.

Mr. Sargent: And the department is out of order too. A complete mess in assessment.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Get the punch line in there.

Mr. Sargent: It is early.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, there is one part remaining from my question of the Minister of Highways yesterday that he might be prepared to answer at this time.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): I am not prepared this morning, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 7th order; committee of the whole House, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

RESOLVED:

That the chairman of the council of the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund such revenue as the Lieutenant-Governor in council may determine, and that the expenditures of the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, as approved by The Department of Municipal Affairs, during the year 1968, shall be payable out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill 112, An Act to establish the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

Resolution concurred in.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

House in committee on Bill 112, An Act to establish the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, I think it is in order for me to move that the reprinted bill be considered. There are a number of technical changes and it is the reprinted version which I think will be more helpful.

Motion agreed to.

On section 1:

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister if this is the proper section under which to discuss the question of the relationship of the new regional municipality with the national capital commission and with the islands between Ottawa and Hull?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would think, Mr. Chairman, we might more appropriately consider that under the planning sections, which are farther on.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the Act is not yet through and tomorrow is June 1, I move that section 2, subsection 1, the date herein, to be changed to "the 15th day of June" rather than—I do not have it in writing, I think the legislative council has it—the date should be "the 15th day of June, 1968" in the first line, at any rate.

Motion agreed to.

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, in section 4, under 4 (1) (a) relating to the members

of the regional council, I was wondering if the Minister had considered extending the same type of ex-officio membership to the head of the national capital commission and perhaps even to the national housing corporation. In my opinion, I think these two bodies have a great deal to do with the development of the region, in the area of planning. The Minister will get into this in a separate section—but in the area of planning the regional council has to consult with these people in any event.

Therefore, I was wondering whether the Minister had considered, or whether he would now consider, including representation from these two bodies, which are instrumental to the development of the area.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would not, and I will go into this more under the planning sections. This is an elected council other than the chairman, and the bill states that in four years, of course, the chairman will be elected. I do not think it would be appropriate to put on the council non-elected people.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, section 4, subsection 2 should also be amended to read "the 15th day of June".

Mr. Chairman: May I pass section 3 first?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, all right.

Mr. Chairman: Section 3 agreed to?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We are on 4, I think.

Mr. Chairman: All right, section 4 (1) (a) —and the Minister does have an amendment?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: My amendment is on 4 (2).

Mr. Chairman: All right; section 4 as it stands.

Mr. T. Reid: Could the Minister outline briefly why he is opposed to having a very small number, perhaps just two, non-elected persons on this regional council? It is not as though there would be a great many of them, there would just be two of them. They would be very helpful in the decision-making process in the planning of the area.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think I would be opposed, Mr. Chairman, to having non-elected people in any deliberative body, any democratic body. I would be opposed to having someone here who was ex-officio whether they are one, two or three who were not elected.

Mr. T. Reid: The Minister then draws a parallel between this House and the type of regional body that is being planned in this area?

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the Minister would now like to put his amendment?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes. Section 4, subsection 2, should read the "15th day of June" as well, Mr. Chairman. I would so move.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister moves that section 4, subsection 2, on the second line read "the 15th day of June". Shall the amendment carry?

Section 4 (2), as amended, agreed to.

Sections 4 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 14:

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on section 14, it says:

> The regional council may from time to time establish such standing or other committees and assign to them such duties as it deems expedient.

Again I would like to refer the Minister to the question of representation by the national capital commission and central mortgage and housing corporation.

Two questions.

1. Is there anything specifically in this bill which would exclude these people from being appointed to standing or other committees?

2. Would the Minister himself think it would be wise to include representatives from these two bodies on standing committees or other special committees?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I do not know about central mortgage and housing; I do not see the difference betweeen Ottawa-Carleton and any other municipality in that respect as to whether there should be a representative specifically from central mortgage. I do not think a standing committee is usually composed of members of the body itself and I do not think there would be power for the regional council or any elected body to make a person who is not a member of that council a full member of a standing committee. There is?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): There is no magistrate.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes. However, there is nothing to prevent the regional council, and we get into this in the planning area

in particular. There is nothing to prevent them from appointing an advisory technical committee or whatever kind of committee they want to have. I will get into this on the planning; I am not trying to put it off, but I think that is particularly where the national capital commission representation problem comes in.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to speak on this point. I think, perhaps, what is bothering the hon. member is the plans that have been advanced for the future development of a truly national capital for Canada. As you are aware, there was a committee set up some months ago composed of representatives of the federal government, the province of Quebec and this province to devise ways and means of promoting the development of what would be the truly national capital.

We will ensure that the work of that committee, what it was doing and the plans that it had, will proceed. The precise form which it will take will be dealt with by the Minister when he gets to the planning aspect of this bill. The problem really is, of course, that there was a planning board there for a good many years upon which were represented directly, people from CMHC and people from the national capital commission. That was the Ottawa area planning board, I believe it was called.

That body has disappeared in this and the planning function under this bill has been given to this council as a whole. But I would reassure you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the House, that this change in form does not in any way change the intent we had and the work we were doing in co-operation with the province of Quebec and the federal government. As this organization develops we will have to find a method by which this problem can be dealt with, but here we now have one government representing all these municipalities.

In fact, in the final analysis it will be an easier task with this organization to do what we were planning previously. But perhaps the Minister can deal with the detail of how it will be done when we reach the planning section. My point is simply to assure the House that nothing in this legislation will affect the work we were doing prior to the establishment of this body.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I let section 4, subsection 2, go by without commenting on it. But I think I can make my comments relevant under section 14 (2) which deals with salaries of chairmen of committees and obliquely refers to the salary of the chairman of the whole organization. I saw a report in the newspaper this morning that the chairman is going to be paid $30,000 which will be determined by order in council. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is correct.

Mr. Singer: I wonder if the Minister could tell us something about his ideas of salaries to be paid to these people. That salary is somewhat higher than that now being paid to the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto council. It is certainly substantially higher than that being paid to any other municipal official in the province of Ontario; substantially higher than is being paid to the members of this legislative assembly.

I think it is higher than the leader of the Opposition gets, than Cabinet Ministers get, and so on. I wonder how you can justify a salary of $30,000 for this job, as important as it may be, in relation to other salaries for important service in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In two ways, Mr. Chairman. One is that we did relate it to other salaries—perhaps not to the members of the assembly, which is another problem, I suppose. We related it to what some senior civil servants receive, such as Deputy Ministers, chairmen of some of the commissions and so on.

We did that on the one hand and we are certainly cognizant of what goes on on the outside in terms of directors of education and some of the boroughs and the city of Toronto, and so on. Perhaps the job can be considered comparable in that regard. We also related it to what several of the senior public servants in the Ottawa-Carleton area are receiving and two or three of them are receiving close to $28,000.

More importantly, however, we related this to the fact that it is a contractual arrangement with Mr. Coolican for four and one half years. There is of course no permanency, and no guarantee that this would go on. I have no idea if he would be a candidate at the end of the four and half years. All we could talk about is that four and one half year period, and I think that on that basis, the approach had to be somewhat different. I do not say that we were seeking to have a consultant for that four and one half years, but

I put it in my own mind more in that category than something permanent.

Section 14 to 31, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 32:

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Will the Minister advise the pattern of assessment to be followed in section 32?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether section 32 would be an appropriate section to speak on this. However, the region will be responsible for all assessment. Presently it is being done by the county and the city, the combined assessment of the region, with a commissioner to look after the regional municipality. Assessment is the sole responsibility of the regional municipality.

Mr. Sargent: In other words, there will be complete uniformity across the whole area. Is Mr. Cumming working on this passage? Mr. Lorne Cumming?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Dr. Cumming? Yes he has.

Sections 32 to 38, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 39:

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate hearing the views of the Minister with regard to future establishment of a public utilities commission for the region. Is that something where the province is the deciding body, the province itself? Is it planned not to have any utilities commission at all? Is there a policy of eliminating public utilities commissions in the area, and making it the direct responsibility of the area council?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Perhaps I should explain: The amendment here is different from the original draft, Mr. Chairman. Originally, water, like sewage, was to be divided into a regional level and a local level. During the course of printing the bill and during further discussion, the municipalities themselves said, "Let us put water on one regional level."

This, perhaps arises from the fact that Ottawa has, in fact, run the waterworks—the city of Ottawa—for a number of years, and sold water to the municipalities around Ottawa. So rather than setting up a two-tier waterworks system, it was agreed, I think by all, that all waterworks facilities, both regional and local, would be at the regional level.

Now there has been, as far as I know, no public utilities commission for water. It was never, I think, a part of the discussion at any time, that there might be a public utilities commission. I am not sure whether there is a government policy on it or not.

Frankly, I feel that where it is working well without a commission in water, then I do not see the need to set one up. I would assume that the references probably mean that they would have to come to us to set one up, and I would not be too enthusiastic about doing it.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, it would appear to me that it was logical to include sewage in the same type of system, or body.

It would seem logical for sewage and water to be under the same commission. Then the cost of the sewage operations would be derived in the same way as in many municipalities, where, when they buy the water, it automatically means that they are paying for sewage treatment at the same time.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, I think that we may arrive at that point in time. I do not know. You are quite correct in that the regional sewage work is in fact a two-tier system, as set up in the bill.

Everyone has to have water in a house, somewhere or other. Whether or not you are actually connected to sanitary sewers or not is more a local problem. There are many sections of the area close to the city of Ottawa where septic tanks are in use, and they will be on septic tanks 30 or 40 years from now.

This is more of a local problem, whereas the trunk sewers and collector sewers are, in fact, a regional problem, as are the treatment plants. Having said that, I think that there is considerable logic in saying that the treatment of water and sewage should be followed as a similar pattern. That is the way that the original bill was drawn, with agreement.

Then out of the blue, there came the concensus that water should all be put into one package, which we agreed to. We did not explore fully the possibility of combining the sewage and water control; there just was no time. I think that this will be a development which will happen, but I do not know.

Section 39 agreed to.

On section 40:

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on section 40, I would like to have a number of points clarified by the Minister, if at all possible.

Would this particular regional council be responsible for the industrial wastes of Eddy Match Company? That is one specific question. I guess it is Eddy Paper Company now.

Secondly would, or could, the regional government expropriate the Rideau canal for sewage purposes? You know, if you wanted a new trunk line, could you actually expropriate parts of the Rideau canal for that purpose?

Related to that, of course: Is the municipality responsible for the pollution of the Rideau canal? Would the regional government be responsible for the pollution of the canal, or is that a federal matter?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, are the islands lying between the city of Ottawa bank of the Ottawa river and the Hull side of the river part of the plan of development of the national capital commission; do they lie under Hull, or do they lie under Ottawa; or is it some sort of co-ordinating body?

So, Mr. Chairman, I have asked the Minister a number of specific questions. Who is responsible for the industrial wastes of the Eddy Paper Company, when it flows across both sides of the river? Secondly, could this regional government actually expropriate the Rideau canal or is that impossible under the existing laws of this country? Thirdly, who is responsible for the pollution of the Rideau canal? And, finally, who is responsible for the planning and development of the islands lying between the two cities?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, the Eddy Match Company, to begin with, is on both sides of the river, in both Ottawa and Hull, as I understand it. The local people certainly have a responsibility under the prodding, supervision and urging of the Ontario water resources commission. That is, I suppose, where the prime responsibility rests to clean up all pollution in the province, insofar as it is on our side of the river.

There are arrangements—perhaps my colleague the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), may wish to speak to this—but there are arrangements between Quebec and Ontario, or there is very close co-operation between Quebec and Ontario. Because there is little point, of course, in our taking great steps on our side of any river without corresponding steps being taken on the other side of the river, and the reverse is true as well.

As far as the Rideau canal is concerned, the Rideau canal is a federal canal—I guess under The Department of Transport. Responsibility, I suppose, is vested in the Crown, in the right of Public Works of Canada, or Transport, and neither we nor Ottawa-Carleton would have the power to expropriate that canal from the federal government.

About the pollution, I think I have answered.

Now, those islands. I think a couple of them are in Hull and a couple of them are in Ottawa, and the responsibility would be corresponding. If they are in Ottawa, then the responsibility is Ottawa-Carleton's, as far as pollution is concerned, with the Ontario water resources commission. I am not clear in my own mind just where the local responsibility leaves off and the water resources commission comes in, and I may not be answering the question as well as I should. I think that should be explored with the Minister of Energy and Resources Management during his estimates, I am not entirely clear on that.

Mr. T. Reid: The point I am trying to get clarified here is this: We set up a new regional development, it is a good move, there is no question about that; we are going to try out some new ideas, a new administrative structure. All that is great, but I am concerned again with possible gaps in this. I am trying to look ahead to see what these gaps might be.

Just to let the Minister know my concern, it is the question again of the pollution of the Rideau canal—from seepage, I understand, to some extent—and the question of pollution in the Ottawa river too, because it forms the borders, really, of the region. I am just wondering whether the Minister has gone as far as he could have gone in giving this new regional government, the powers necessary to combat this type of jurisdictional pollution problem.

I recommend that this is an area which must be looked into. The Minister must bring his colleagues along with him if we are to have meaningful regional government to meet issues like pollution.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Of course, there is no way my colleagues or I, or anybody in this House can deal with the Rideau canal, which is a federal responsibility. However, the ultimate responsibility is with the water resources commission because it can order this municipality, or any other municipality, to clean up a particular pollution problem or all their pollution problems. That right is vested in the commission and it would apply here.

The member did ask one other question about the plans of the national capital commission and I frankly do not know those for the islands in the Ottawa river.

Mr. T. Reid: Again on this, the Rideau canal symbolizes, I think, the probable split jurisdiction for regional government in Ontario. It is a peculiar problem because it is Ottawa; it is the capital of Canada, and I just come back to this point again. I hope the Minister will give me some fuller answers —not that I have asked him to give any fuller answers than he already has given— with respect to the integration of the interests of the federal government of Canada as a whole and Ontario and Quebec, in really making this a national capital. We can only do that with the fullest co-operation instituted in the administrative arrangements.

Sections 40 to 47, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 48:

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, on section 48, subsection 2, does the regional corporation under subsection 2 have the legal right to make a contract with a municipality outside of the province of Ontario? For example, Hull?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would not think so. Perhaps my advisors could get the answer to that. The question is, as I understand it, whether, in the terms of sewage treatment works, the regional corporation would have the authority to enter into an agreement with the municipality outside its particular area, and in this case particularly Hull, which would be outside the province as well. Perhaps my advisors could check that point and we could come back to it.

Sections 48 to 57, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 58:

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, in connection with section 58, I was wondering why it was worded under clause 9 that all roads would revert, except those that the regional council took over after they had reverted back to the original municipalities? Why did they not just assume all the county roads directly? What roads are affected by this? Are they very extensive?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the purpose of this particular section is that all roads have to end up somewhere because the county ceases to be. So they either have to become a regional road or revert back to the municipality and I think that is the particular intent of this section, to do that. Yes, the road problems are large, there are extensive considerations, county roads, suburban roads and the Queensway, which is an expressway agreement. All these things, I think, are going to be a matter of extensive negotiation between the regional corporation and The Department of Highways.

I think these sections are drawn as broadly as possible to give them both freedom of movement and which roads will revert either to the township or stay in the regional road system, or which other roads will come in, frankly I do not know. We have not explored that because we think the best people to do that will be the regional corporation itself. But this section gives lots of room for negotiating.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, what concerns me here is the fact that they just did not assume all the county roads and suburban roads directly and then negotiate afterwards. As it is now drawn, it could leave room for plenty of haggling between the members of the council as they decide who is going to have roads taken over by the region and who is not. It seems to me the easiest way would have been just directly transfer them to the region, and I wondered why this was not done.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I suppose this is the biggest reason for the allotment of time between now and January 1, six months. I expect a good part of the time of the next six months is going to be devoted to roads.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, again I would appreciate the Minister replying. Why did the region not just directly assume all the county roads?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Because I think we did not want to start off on that basis. There was to be flexibility on both sides. There have been need studies done in Carleton, and, I think, one or two traffic studies done in Ottawa, and I think, hopefully, these will be put together and a better road system is going to come out of it.

Sections 58 to 75, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 76:

Mr. T. Reid: Just a small point on section 76, subsection 1. The regional corporation passes bylaws prohibiting or regulating the construction or use of any private road entrance and so forth, as to means of access to regional controlled access roads. What

about the Prime Minister's house on Sussex Drive? Suppose he decided he wanted a bigger driveway, and Sussex Drive, I think, is or could well be a regional road. What happens in that event?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think this section comes right out of the Metro Act, so I suppose the same thing is true as to a university on a metro road. I guess it is, I guess we are under—

Mr. Sargent: Depends on whose Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Sargent: It depends on whose Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That would be true, yes. I am not just sure, we are into a pretty tricky area; that is federal property and the right of the Crown is involved and I would suspect that they can do what they want to do in the same way, I guess, that we can do what we want here with this building, these properties. Now, we do not, we negotiate with the city of Toronto and obey their rules.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): On the contrary, we are just doing nothing.

Mr. Sargent: Like everything else.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Right! We do nothing without consultation; we do not play it by ear. That is right!

Sections 76 to 81, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 82:

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, on section 82, this is quite an interesting development, the elimination of planning boards, as such. It is something where the Act varies considerably from The Metropolitan Toronto Act, and I would appreciate hearing from the Minister his thoughts on this aspect of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Without reverting back to the priniciple of the bill, Mr. Chairman, but commenting generally on this section, my friend is right. We have departed here from what has been done in other municipalities, and in particular relation to Metro, although I see no reason why perhaps the same thing cannot at some point be done in Metro.

We started off, I think it is safe to say, by thinking about what would be the best form of planning organization for this region, bearing in mind always that it was the nation's capital, but starting off to try and devise the best planning legislation we could. We came to the conclusion that, in this instance, the regional council could well be the planning board and be vested with the powers of the planning board.

What we were trying to do, of course, is not impose another tier or tiers between local planning boards, local councils, regional planning boards, regional councils, The Department of Municipal Affairs, the Ontario municipal board—how many steps is that? Conceivably, I guess, six, plus building permits, and so on. Now we are trying to reduce that somewhat.

What we have done is to charge the—another interesting part of this particular section—I think this is the first piece of legislation which says that a council shall appoint a planning director. In line with that, we have said that, on or before December 31, 1972, they shall prepare a regional plan—that is the four-and-a-half year period; it coincided roughly, five years—they should prepare a regional plan. And then I suppose subsection 83, or at least section 83, subsection 10, indicates it is a notice of intent more than anything else at this point. I think the regional plan and subsection 10 tie in together.

When the regional plan is developed, then it would be my hope that many of the responsibilities of the Minister of Municipal Affairs would be transferred to the regional council. I think the two things tie in together; regional plan first, and then presumably you would start off by giving them the power to approve minor variances and progress up from there—eliminate 801 Bay Street is the way I would like to put it. Eliminate 801 Bay Street from the picture entirely, with two exceptions. Not, of course, eliminating the Ontario municipal board, because there would be some right of appeal for the citizen himself. But eliminating 801 with two exceptions.

First, the matter of the region itself and how the region ties in with other regions—the neighbours next door. Second, not eliminating this completely because this region is always going to be of special significance because it is the national capital.

We, as a province, I suppose, will always have more interest in it, more inclination to put our nose into what might be regarded as their local business, because it is the nation's capital. We will always have that kind of protective interest and, I suppose,

extra financial interest in that area, because it is the capital of our country.

Now we come back to the point of my friend from Scarborough East, about the national capital commission. The Prime Minister has said that the existing Ottawa and area planning board included someone from the national capital commission and you are quite right, I believe it is somebody from central mortgage. I do not think he was there as much because of his office, but because he was as a person involved—I am not sure of that—he sat on that Ottawa area planning board.

We come back to the point that we are trying to set up something which would be good for Ottawa-Carleton; how it would best work. We have come to this conclusion—and we are by no means certain of this—that the planning function and the governmental function should be one and the same.

We can think of many instances across the province where non-elected planning boards have worked very well, and I think we can all think of instances where they have not worked too terribly well, or how effective they have been. In this case, it is a departure from what we have been doing, and, I suppose, in some ways it is a bit of an experiment. We are looking forward to seeing how it will work.

We have said that the regional council can appoint an advisory planning committee or a technical committee. Presumably, at that point, either technicians, or members of the national capital commission, or any other agency, could give their advice to the regional council at those levels. It also—retreating just a little bit—it says that the council, of course, could appoint a planning committee of council, and we expect this is probably what they would do; they would be made up entirely of members of the council itself.

They, in turn, could have an advisory committee on which members of the national capital commission or their staff might sit We actually see the whole thing as the other way.

The Prime Minister indicated that there have been discussions going on between the federal government and the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario—they are called the tripartite group. My department has been represented, as far as the province of Ontario is concerned, in those discussions.

No one knows just what is going to come out of this—let us call it the national capital commission, for lack of a better name, at this point. It would be our thought that in that new national capital commission, when it is set up, it would be our thought that either the province would be asked to appoint a member, or members, to it, or perhaps Ottawa-Carleton will be asked directly. I do not think it matters. We would say then, automatically, the chairman, or someone from the regional council, would be a member of the national capital commission. We want the liaison upped, rather than reduced.

I do not know how clear I am making myself, but we certainly intend that there should be the fullest co-operation, whatever form the discussions take or lead to, between the three governments. But we want a strong, viable unit in the region of planning purposes and for governmental purposes which, in turn, will represent its own best interests, if I can put it that way, together with the interests of the province.

There may have to be two appointments. Let us say that the provinces decided that they should have two representatives. Then I would think it would be, perhaps, some member from outside the Ottawa area representing the interests of the province as a whole on the national capital commission.

Mr. Sargent: You could not have picked a tougher guinea pig, could you?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is an interesting one. It is an interesting one and it—you are sidetracking me, but it is interesting.

I do not think it is that tough, really; it is also that much more important. It becomes terribly important because of the sort of things which the Prime Minister and member for Scarborough East were talking about. We see this liaison up, rather than down.

We think it is terribly important that whatever the two—I think you are aware now the national capital commission is appointed by the federal government. Ontario and Quebec have really very little to say about it. They have usually appointed the mayor of Ottawa.

The thought is to involve, not only Ottawa, and Hull, and the federal government, it is also to involve the two provinces, and rightly so. We would feel that this new group called the national capital commission are going to be in a much better position to make Ottawa the kind of capital which it is becoming, and which we all want to see it become, even more so, if they deal with one government rather than with 15. We would hope that the chairman, and expect that the chairman of the regional council, or somebody else from

the regional council, would at least be one of the members of the national capital commission or whatever takes its place and that is the way the liaison would be, rather than down.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the Minister for such a fantastic plan but I cannot see why he would pick such an area where there are so many complications—the three areas of government that are concerned.

What was the motivation for this area? Being aware, sir, that Ottawa has gone through extensive annexation plans in the past two years and they have a myriad of planning set up, you are stacking your plan on top of that, and this would supersede everything else. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, there will be a regional plan developed by December 31, 1972. In the meantime, the local plans, of course, are there; they have been approved and are there and are guides. They will have to fit in to the regional plan when it is evolved. It is the first truly regional plan in the province. It is not a stacking process. It is looking at something bigger and when we have something bigger—that is regional plan—then the local plans will fit into that regional plan.

Mr. Sargent: This may be a bit wide on this subsection here, but how many people are involved in this population area? Secondly, this is possibly not on the vote but are there any moneys in the province being used for this programme to subsidize the whole package of putting this together? Any provincial moneys?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, we are way off this section on the principle—

Mr. Sargent: I realize that—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The population is about 500,000. There are no special moneys other than those we are paying in the very last section of the bill. We agree to pay the expenses up until January 1, because they do not have any collections machinery until January 1. It is a relatively small amount and beyond this year, for the first four years, we —the province—pay the salary of the chairman but there are no special moneys.

It may well be, and this comes back to my friend from Scarborough East's point, that in the development of a truly national capital, moneys over and above what would normally be necessary may well be needed. Some of this, we hope, is going to come from federal level. I think probably some of it is going to come from us. That will be developed.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, does the official plan in subsection 6 refer also to the plan of the national capital commission?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Which section, I am sorry?

Mr. T. Reid: Sorry, subsection 6 of section 82, which says nothing in subsections 3 and 4 that affects any official plan in effect in any part of the regional area.

My concern here is, do the lawyers of The Municipal Affairs Department, Mr. Chairman, interpret that as meaning the official plan under federal-provincial jurisdiction, or does it just simply mean the municipal plans within the area?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, those are just official plans under The Planning Act which are not disturbed because of this section. I do not think they would refer to any plans of the national capital commission which, I doubt, have any official status, and this again has been part of their problem. They have done some wonderful work, some very imaginative work.

I see that they and Mr. McIlraith, federal Minister of Public Works, are having a little bit of a tiff at the present time but there is no question that the national capital commission, in my mind, has done wonderful work but they have done it really without any great authority. Really when there is a meshing of the regional plan and perhaps a regional plan across the border with some sort of an NCC thinking, then there will be the planning, tools to carry some of these things out.

Mr. T. Reid: Now if I understand this correctly, Mr. Chairman, whether the plans of the NCC have a legal status or not, they are still plans. The NCC owns property and has expropriated, I believe, massive property within the area here and also, of course, up the Gatineau and around Riviere LaPeche and so forth. But just what happens to the areas that they are planning now under The Planning Act?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is the point really. The work that they have been able to do is in areas which they have either bought or expropriated, and I think they

have been frustrated in doing anything beyond what they do not own. There was a great argument about the green belt and this has been part of the problem—what they have done has largely been on federal land or land owned by the NCC.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, it seems we are now on section 83 as well as 82; the discussion seems to range across the two of them.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think we are considering the four or five sections together, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Young: The question I would like to ask of the Minister is in connection with section 83, subsection 2, which has already been referred to.

Mr. Chairman: —pass 82 and then, if necessary and the members wish to refer to 82, it will be all right if they are going to discuss any other sections. I think we should try to keep it in order.

Mr. Young: Will I leave this until—

Mr. Chairman: It is acceptable now, we will not restrict you from discussing it.

Mr. Young: Right. Well, in connection with the planning of the area, Mr. Chairman, the experience of Metropolitan Toronto has been that while a Metropolitan Toronto plan has been prepared, it has not been adopted and there are real problems there because of the pressures from a dozen different directions to prevent the adoption of that official plan.

The legislation here proposes that the plan shall be prepared by 1972 but there is nothing about it being adopted. It seems to me that unless there is something in the legislation which says that there is necessity, an urgency here, we may have a repetition of the Metropolitan Toronto experience.

The plan may be prepared but because of certain factors within the area, that plan may be delayed indefinitely and so I would expect here that the Minister ought to insert, "it shall prepare and adopt". In other words, the region is given notice that unless it has the plan prepared and legislated by this deadline, that the Minister's own department may well step in and impose the plan.

Now I do not think it would have to happen if that legislation were here, but if we come to this deadline and there is no adoption of the official plan for the region then what happens? Does the Minister simply say well, it is too bad, we are going to have a repetition of Metropolitan Toronto? What does happen in a case like this, I would like to ask the Minister?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The same thing that happens in any other municipality in the province. We say municipalities should draw up, prepare, adopt and hopefully have approved by the department, official plans. If they do not, they do not. There is no penalty for not doing it. However, I think in this particular instance, as I said, subsection 2 ties in with subsection 10, and if they want subsection 10, I think it is implied they get on with subsection 2.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I wish you would take this same inflexible attitude towards the Hardy report.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Subsection 10 is the carrot really, to get 2 done.

Mr. Young: So the Minister feels that 10 is adequate to get the job done.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, it might not be within a year. This is going to be an Act, which, like the Metro Act, is amended many many times, it may be that it has to be strengthened. I think both of those sections now, as much as anything, are a statement of the government's intention. I do not know how much legal value they have. I think legislative counsel might well tell us that we were cluttering up an Act. I want to vote those things in the Act, so that there is a clear statement of the government's intention.

Just while I am on my feet, a question about sewers or treatment works. Apparently, there would be no authority for this municipality, this new regional municipality, or any other municipality to enter into an agreement outside the province. It would have to be the province—I guess under the constitution —who would do this itself.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, if I might just pursue this point a bit further. I think there is a very great difference between this particular legislation, and the legislation that applies to the average municipality in the province, because you are entering into a real experiment here. We are hoping that this will be the kind of legislation which will point the way for other regions.

And since the regional government itself is going to be the planning authority, and the others have left, it is different for Metro, in the sense that Metro boroughs still do the

planning, and while the overall Metro plan may fail of implementation, the boroughs still plan, and their plans are implemented, and moved forward. So that even though Metro may not plan as we would like to see it planned in respect to the implementation of its official plan, the planning is still done.

In this case, I would hope that the planning may not just be on paper, without any force. This is where the danger comes, as I see it, and so I would hope that if the time comes near when the plan should be implemented, that the Minister will look at it very very carefully, and will see to it the whole district is not left without any kind of official guidance.

Mr. Deacon: I am very interested in what the Minister had to say at the beginning of the discussion of this section concerning the hope for the eventual elimination of 801 Bay Street, except to the extent that region is dealing outside with adjacent municipalities, or areas, or regions.

This is a principle that I think is fine to pursue, and especially when municipalities have master plans adopted, not just designed and prepared, but adopted. In this way considerable delay will be eliminated on the part of those seeking to develop areas. It is also an incentive for regions to get their master plans into operation.

The one aspect of this bill that does bother me, though, is that there is no provision that when the municipality so wishes, it can appoint a planning board. I believe, and I may be incorrect, that the legislation generally provides that municipalities must appoint planning boards. That is the general provincial legislation in this regard.

It seems to me this should be changed to where it is within the power of the municipality to appoint or to eliminate planning boards, because if they can use them and if they so wish, they can bring in volunteers who do an awful lot of the day-to-day work of balancing the expert and professional views of the planning directors. They do not take up the time of council in this work, and assist council in giving judgment, certainly preliminary judgment, as to the merits of plans that are developed by the professional staff.

It also enables councils to bring in on a regular basis, and a continuing basis, these volunteers and experts who are citizens of the community that the council feel can bring sound judgment to these plans. Therefore, I would ask the Minister what his views would be to bringing into this section the provision whereby the region may appoint a planning board, if it so wishes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Perhaps it is a matter of wording; subsection 4 of section 83 says they can appoint planning committees. These may well be people outside the regional council, and I do not know whether they will do this or not. I would be opposed to them appointing a planning board *per se* because this is what we are trying to get away from.

If they want to have an advisory committee composed of experts or interested citizens, that is fine. But the whole intent of this section, and I do not think you can have it both ways, is to try and eliminate that one set—I do not want to say that one barrier—but perhaps that one set of an actual planning board. Because this board is defined as the planning board, this council is defined as the planning board. But I think really what you are getting at is covered by 4 of 83.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, as far as the elimination of planning boards as such is concerned, it seems to me that if it is up to the council; when they may do this, it is really not an extra tier of responsibility. I think the elimination of the approval of The Department of Municipal Affairs is the greatest step. That is presently probably the greatest delay in plans. After all, what we are wanting to do is bring in local judgment to plans, a regional judgment rather than the provincial judgment, unless the plans have effect beyond that local area's jurisdiction.

Therefore, it seems to me you have already eliminated in your hope to reduce the involvement of the department, the major delay to the approval of the plans. I still say I would like to see in this the provision whereby a planning board may be appointed if the council finds it is better to have it set up in the same way that we have had in Metropolitan Toronto.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If they do that, they would come for an amendment to the Act.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on subsection 1 of 83. The subsection states that the regional council shall investigate and survey the physical, social and economic conditions in relation to the development of the Ottawa-Carleton planning area, and so forth.

I am interested, and pleased, of course, at the word "social" there. I was wondering if the Minister could give us some idea what he

thinks this word means? Would it mean, for example, studies to show how the development of the area is affecting the relationships between the—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that language is right out of the Metro Act. Is it? Right out of The Planning Act.

Mr. T. Reid: That is fine, but perhaps we could have a fresher interpretation with a fresh new Minister. Would it include, for example, studies of the impact on the social relationships in the English-speaking community and the French-speaking community in the area? Do you see the regional council, which is also the planning council in the real sense, being concerned with the issues of the relationships in the French-speaking community in the area, and the English-speaking community in the area? I feel very strongly about this, because I was brought up in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I do not know whether or not they will directly concern themselves with this in the planning sense. I think that is a matter for them to determine themselves, rather than for us to suggest to them that they should or should not. I would suspect that they would.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, the three words "physical, social, economic", may have come from some neanderthal Act in the past, but that does not bear on the point here today. Why was not the word "historical" also put in there? We are talking about the nation's capital, Mr. Chairman, and here the Minister's advisors just seem to plunk something from an outdated planning Act into something which is rather unique—into an area of Canada which is the nation's capital.

Why have they not simply inserted the word "historical"? Surely Ottawa has some history; we should do what we can to preserve that history. Surely the regional council which the department which it is now setting up should be concerned with giving the regional council power to investigate and survey the historical impact of their planning?

If they are going to smash a road through some historical building, surely they should have some surveys to make sure that what happens in Ottawa is not the same thing that has happened in this city too often where an old historical building is knocked down before anybody found out that it was of some historical value to the citizens of this country.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further in section 82? Might the Chairman direct a question to the Minister? I am wondering if subsection 4—

Mr. T. Reid: I had a comment to make on subsection 3 of section 83.

Mr. Chairman: If the member would not mind, I was in the middle—but go ahead if you have something.

Mr. T. Reid: I thought you were moving on.

Mr. Chairman: No, I was directing a question to the Minister. I was wondering if the date in subsection 4 of section 82 and subsection 8 of section 83 would not be the same as the amended dates in sections 2 and 4?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What were those dates again?

Mr. Chairman: The amended dates in the first two sections, 2 and 4, were amended to June 15. Should these two dates not also be amended?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I see the staff saying that it is not important. Subsection 4, I think, should be changed. I do not think that it is too important, but for the sake of uniformity let us revert to section 82 and change June 1 to read June 15.

Mr. Chairman: And subsection 8 of section 83 as well, as we are discussing the votes together?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, perhaps that should be done in both instances.

Mr. Sargent: He is in a liberal mood!

Mr. Chairman: Did the member for Scarborough East have some further comment?

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves that section 82, subsection 4, and section 83, subsection 8 be amended to read "June 15, 1968" and not "June 1, 1968."

Mr. T. Reid: On subsection 3 of section 83, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister might comment on the context. The subsection states, "The regional council shall appoint a planning director and such other staff as may be deemed necessary." So the regional council needs a planning director, looking back to sub-subsection (b) of subsection 1 of section 83, referring to the regional council holding public meetings in the area. Ottawa in particular is made up of two linguistic groups, and what I would like to have is an opinion from the Minister on this: If the chairman of the regional council cannot speak French, and

if then the regional council appoints a planning director who is also unilingual in English, how in heaven's name can public meetings be held in areas which are predominantly French speaking and not necessarily bilingual?

In other words, is the Minister concerned with this problem of French-English relations in the area of Ottawa proper itself, and would he include a provision in here that either the chairman or the vice-chairman or just simply the planning director should at least be bilingual in order to communicate with two-thirds, I believe, of the population of Ottawa, of which French is its mother tongue? In other words, how in the heck can they hold public meetings if they cannot speak French?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would assume, Mr. Chairman, in exactly the same way that the Ottawa area planning board have been holding public meetings for years without any specific reference and Act to do it. I gather that there is communication. The Ottawa area planning board have worked very well. They have held a number of public meetings which have come to my attention, and I assume that there has been no problem of communication. It happens that the first chairman of the Ottawa-Carleton region is fluently bilingual. He held the second part of a press conference yesterday in French.

Mr. Chairman: Anything more on section 82?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, you are taking these things all together, and this may have been discussed while I was out. Is it the thought that you are not going to have planning boards up there, you are just going to have committees or councils for planning?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have discussed this, Mr. Chairman, but that is correct. I should have brought up this point before. Ottawa wanted to continue within Ottawa a subsidiary planning board, and the Act says so. That really is an unnecessary section, because of course the Minister can designate planning areas. It may be that some of the others will want a subsidiary planning board which could be either appointed or elected. As far as the region is concerned, it is all elected people.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I just wonder if the Minister could not think of carrying through the general legislation and cutting down the time it takes to develop pieces of land. You will get a lecture on that when your estimates come up, but there is an advanced step here.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Before I get the lecture, read *Hansard* for what I just said.

Sections 82 to 91, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 92:

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, section 92 states that on the board of health there shall be both elected people, that is members of the regional council, and non-elected people, who are appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council, upon recommendation from the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond). I was wondering, more out of curiosity, how the Minister justifies his previous statements about needing councils, and what not, composed of people who are elected, with the provisions of subsection 92 that there are appointed people as well.

Does he consider that the question of election, and of people being represented, does not matter in a board of health, whereas it does matter in a council? How does he draw his analogy? Just to extend it a bit, he referred to this wonderful place being like a council; both must be democratic. Does his analogy break down when he goes to the board of health? Now, let us have some logical thinking.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I suppose that the easy way to explain this is that the planning legislation is my legislation, and the board of health legislation falls under another department. This would be fair to say.

Mr. T. Reid: But typical of this government!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, we are making a departure here from what would be normal, because normally the legislation which would apply would be the district board of health legislation, I gather. We have gone a step farther here, and this comes into this whole area, it also comes into the planning area. It comes back to this principle of returning some of the autonomy to the council. For every board or commission that has been set up either at the municipal level or at our level, there has always been good reason, and you can justify it, but collectively at the local level, I think it is fair to say that the powers of the council have been eroded and dissipated in a number of boards and commissions.

Normally, the county would appoint, or the district would appoint, people outside of the council or the board of health. In my own

city, or county, it is a five-man board usually composed of the mayor and I do not think that there is even a councillor on it, it is usually made up of two or three interested citizens. What we have come back to here, I think that it is fair to say, is a compromise between the historic position of The Department of Health, and their and our concern to try and turn as much autonomy as we can to the council. We have said that nine was the appropriate number for this area, and six of those shall be members of the regional council. Then, as always on a five-man board of health, the Lieutenant-Governor in council appoints one person; in this case the proportion is three out of the nine. Whom the Minister of Health appoints or recommends to the Lieutenant-Governor in council I do not know; I would suspect that they will probably be citizens again, drawn from existing boards of health, I would think, in this instance.

It is not going the whole step as we have done in planning but it is going part of the way. The interesting part of this legislation is that there are no local boards set up by this legislation other than the local board of health which has a very heavy involvement from the regional council.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to note that there is an inconsistency in this bill. The Minister is aware of it, I know, but I disagree quite strongly. He states that a standing committee of the council, hence any formally established committee or council, should be composed of elected members only and should not have someone from the national capital commission and so forth. Yet in section 92 he contradicts himself. I will leave it at that.

Sections 92 and 93 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: There is an amendment to section 94.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: On section 94, subsection 2, paragraph (b), the last words are redundant because there will be no welfare officers of area municipalities. This was a change again in our thinking as we went through these. Originally, perhaps I should explain this now, welfare was to be divided into two parts. Mandatory welfare, meaning mainly general welfare assistance, was to be at the regional level; optional services, like day care centres and homemakers' services were to be at the local level, and along the line we developed, putting all the administration at the regional level.

Administration by the region, with the mandatory things being paid for by the region, with the optional things, like the day care centres, being paid for by the particular municipality which wants it under agreement.

So that language—that is a long way of saying—that language is no longer needed. I move that the words, "for the welfare officer of the area municipality in which the applicant resides at the time of his application," be deleted from 94, subsection 2, paragraph b.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the motion of the Minister of Municipal Affairs carry?

Section 94, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 95 to 104, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 105:

Mr. Sargent: I say that we have, I think, the most ambitious bill submitted to the House this session, with about 78 pages in length and 162 provisos. I think it is a compliment to the Minister that he has tackled a programme like this. I think, in total, you have taken the machinery out of a lot of legislation you have there now and you have tried to fit it in here.

The wording may, or may not, fit the exact package at the time, but I do want to say constructively that I object to your policy of the province paying a director $32,000—as mentioned before by a Minister here—to implement a pilot programme in the Ottawa area.

The $30,000 is not the point. It is the fact that you are spending $30,000 there, you are not spending in Owen Sound, or the Grey-Bruce area.

This is a matter of principle. In fact, the main point here, Mr. Chairman, is that we are going to be subsidizing this very handsomely, and at great cost to the taxpayers of this province indirectly, by the focus of your department on making this pilot programme work. We know that you have many, many other problems, insofar as the rest of the province is concerned, in the assessment and tax collection field, and so I think that it is wrong, from the principle of my people, to subsidize a programme that you want to see stand up—a pilot programme.

Mr. Chairman: May I point out that the member is talking about the principle of the bill?

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about financing, sir. I will get to the point—

Mr. Chairman: That is the principle of the bill.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir. You are a hard man, McGee.

Mr. Chairman: That part of the bill is discussed at second reading.

Mr. Sargent: Well, on this section I would like to ask the Minister—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Do not let him sweet talk you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: I thought you would be still in bed today.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I never got there.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to ask the Minister: Is there, in the debt picture in all these municipalities embracing this new regional—is there any allocation of the existing debenture debt? How are you going to resolve this point?

In other words, are you going to take the debt picture and put it into one pot, or are you going to do it broken down in municipalities? How are you going to resolve that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not existing debts. Existing debts are a charge on whoever has incurred the debt, but new debt will be a charge on the regional municipality.

Mr. Chairman: That is section 113—debt.

Mr. Sargent: Well, under the financing here. As I understand it then, any new debt will be put in the pot of the regional? But any old debt will have to be—each municipality will make its own levy to retire the existing debt? So there is no thought in any of these many subsections here of provincial subsidy to retire the debt?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Sargent: Under this section, how many firms of consultants have you working in this job now?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In this?

Mr. Sargent: In this part of the project.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: None. The only outside advice we have had has been some legal advice in drafting the bill.

Sections 105 and 106 agreed to.

On section 107:

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, in section 107 it refers to:

> The regional council shall in each year prepare to adopt estimates that involve sums required during the year for the purposes of the regional corporation.

Surely if we are heading towards a project, or a new form of government, which could lead the way for regional government in Ontario as a whole, we should be willing to write into the initial legislation, with regard to financing, ways in which the finances can be done on a much longer term basis?

In other words, the point is that here again in this whole legislation we are talking about —yearly estimates and levies; that under the sections we talk about each year, the new regional corporation will present its budget, and so forth.

Surely we could write into this legislation now, at least an intention that regional government budgets in this province, as regional government develops over the next 30 years, should be developed on a proper five-year planning basis?

We have moved into this to some extent—the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), has done so—into the area of five-year capital budgeting in our universities, albeit just to a minor extent. But surely here we can say—for goodness' sake, we are talking about regional government; we are talking about regional planning—we are talking about—in this particular case—a very important area of Canada and Ontario. Surely we should write in here—get away from one-year planning, financial planning, and let us get into five-year financial planning. Let us now set up the legal framework whereby we can work toward administrative procedures and techniques whereby five-year capital costing and five-year budgeting and so forth can be worked out in close co-operation with this House, because we have to approve funds granted in the one-year basis.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You are talking about two different things, of course, because this refers to yearly estimates and levies which presumably are for current purposes. I do not think anybody would suggest, for example, that the treasurer should not bring

down a yearly budget for current purposes, although there should be long-term planning for capital purposes. I recall a certain Minister of Finance in another place who felt constrained to bring in three budgets in one year, so I do not think we have arrived at the point where we might budget for two years.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Some years they did not bring in a budget at all.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: True. However, as far as the capital portion is concerned, I suppose this properly comes under the next section—debt. This municipality, like any other, will, of course, be required—if they are going to borrow—to prepare a five-year forecost by the Ontario municipal board. This is being done. Anybody now who wants to borrow has to go on a five-year basis.

I am not so sure that that should not be not only for this municipality, but those sort of financial planning principles. It may be a little difficult, but I am not so sure that those should not be in legislation, rather than a policy of the Ontario municipal board. I think there is some merit in that. I do not know just how you would word it. But we have some other wording in here which, perhaps, legally, does not mean anything but points the intent of it, and I think this is important. However, this might be more appropriately done in The Municipal Board Act or one of our Acts, I do not know.

Mr. Sargent: Under the estimates and letters, Mr. Chairman, because of the fact that Metro Toronto pays its own Metro mayor, I feel that there is a principle involved here and that you might consider an amendment at this point to have the province move out of the payment of the director. Let them pay their own director out of their own funds.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This is certainly the intention when he is elected. They will pay him after this four-year contractional period.

Section 107 agreed to.

On section 108:

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): On section 108, subsection 6:

> If any area in the municipality is not satisfied with the last revised assessment as equalized by the department, and so on, the municipality may appeal.

I am not at all sure whether that referred only to the period between now and 1971 inclusive, or whether it refers to any year, 1972, 1973. In other words, Mr. Chairman, my question to the Minister is: Does subsection 6 of section 108 refer only for the years up to and including 1971, or does it mean from henceforth and evermore?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Go ahead, I am not sure, go ahead!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this is pretty basic, but would the Minister define equalized assessment? Mr. Chairman, I have been mixed up on this assessment for the last 20 years on equalizations, and I think I know what I am talking about. I would like to know what the Minister's version of equalized assessment is.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Equalized assessment, or the equalizing factor, is simply what you have to multiply the local assessment by to arrive at equalized assessment. In Owen Sound I assume that you would say that houses are probably assessed at about a third of values, so therefore to arrive at the equalizing factor in Owen Sound is therefore 33. You multiply the assessed value, or at least, you multiply by—

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry. This is not fair; I should not be doing this but I am trying to find out on what basis you are going to do it. On a present-day value or what, on this programme?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This comes back to your question for which I have the answer now; the equalization factors between the municipalities will not be needed after 1971 because by then, they should have completed, and will have completed, a re-assessment of the whole area, and the whole area will then be on the same basis, which presumably—

Mr. Sargent: It will all be uniform.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, and presumably it will be at market value.

Mr. Sargent: Does this programme plan a yearly equalization? The city of New York has a yearly equalization.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: A yearly re-assessment in other words?

Mr. Sargent: A yearly equalization. We are talking about the most important thing in all our democracy, that a cash-box of a democracy is equalized assessment. We have not got it in this province, and it is a great

lack of uniformity, equity and equality, and we should have a yearly equalized assessment right across the board. There is a very important principle here.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Smith makes recommendations as to re-assessing yearly or keeping up to date yearly, and frankly we have not considered all of the implications of that yet as to whether or not it is practical, or whether there is that much change in a one or two or three year period, that you cannot re-assess, say, every three years.

Mr. Sargent: Tiered debentures.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But certainly they have to be equalized; we equalize now for all municipalities, every year, to the best of our ability. And it is a sampling method—we do not say it is perfect; it is as perfect as the assessment on which it depends will allow it to be.

Mr. Sargent: And personnel?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, there has to be an equalizing each year.

Sections 108 to 112, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 113:

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, in connection with 113, the whole part dealing with debt; in reading through this, I am not clear whether this now precludes all municipalities within the region from doing their own borrowing.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, I see your point; reading 113 I am told that it does preclude them. I suppose they might want to do it on their own, presumably they get a better rate. This is one of the purposes by borrowing as a region rather than as local parts, but they would be precluded—I do not know which section precludes them, but they are precluded.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I am entirely in agreement with the principle of having all the capital borrowing done by the region but I wanted to be sure the bill was definitely precluding the others from doing it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Subsection 3 would preclude them.

Mr. Deacon: Right, I see that. Now, as far as the existing debt is concerned, I see there is provision where they may refinance but do not have to. I suppose that is to prevent any of the present debt-holders forcing the municipalities to redeem their debt at higher than current market levels, which also makes sense, but does give them the right at whatever time, if so desired, to assume the existing debt of the individaul municipalities and re-issue.

Section 113 agreed to.

On section 114:

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, when the municipality within the region wants to issue a debenture, I think you are suggesting that they go through the regional council, but would it be mandatory on the regional government to issue the debenture at the request of that municipality within the region? Obviously, they cannot do it but is it mandatory on the overall council to issue the debentures?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Wait until I find the right section.

Mr. Pilkey: Well it is under section 114 here.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The answer is "yes" but I just want to—

Mr. Stokes: Would not subsection 4 of 113 cover that? It says "shall pass by bylaw"; section 113, subsection 4, clause (d).

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, that is right. And presumably the arena that this is settled in—you are right, 4A of 113—brings in the Ontario municipal board. And if there was a dispute between the region and one of its parts, it would be up to the board to sort it out. Neither one has the absolute right, of course, to issue debentures; no municipality does now anyway; it is subject to the approval of the board, so the board would be called in to settle the dispute.

Sections 114 to 137, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 138:

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if I am correct in the following statement.

Is it true that in the single Bill 112, that people who are eligible for election to the divisional board of education under subsection 138, must be Canadian citizens, whereas people who are eligible to the new divisional-regional council in other sections of the bill can be British subjects but not Canadian citizens?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is a very interesting point. The Department of Education amended their legislation relating to this two or three years ago, I guess, and in so doing I think disenfranchised a certain group of people. They did not do it intentionally but they have done it and have not changed it back and I guess it does not create any problem—and I am referring to British citizens who are not necessarily Canadian citizens. We have not done that in our legislation and we are following it on here. I think we have got it straightened away.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, I would like to follow up on this if I might. Some of us on the education committee feel that people running for public office in Canada should be Canadians and I certainly feel this personally. Now I would like to ask the Minister how he can justify having inconsistent legislation in the same bill?

Hon Mr. McKeough: Because this is what is in our general legislation and we follow the same pattern.

Mr. T. Reid: Would now not be the time to change it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, because I am not prepared to change it in the general legislation at this point. That is not an amendment which is before us. I will be glad to discuss it then when The Municipal Act comes in but we do not have it under consideration.

Mr. T. Reid: That means that if the Minister does bring forward legislation changing The Municipal Act, we are going to have to go back to amend this Act to suit the new legislation.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would think it would logically be done. I think it is probably The Assessment Act which is not correct—it would not be The Municipal Act. But if you were going to do something then the logical thing to do would be to amend The Municipal Act first, that being the principal bill, and then you would amend this Act, and presumably you would also amend—since I assume it contains the same provision—The Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think you would start with The Municipal Act.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister this. He mentioned The Department of Education had disenfranchised certain people living in Canada. I suppose—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not disenfranchised; disqualified certain people from running for office.

Mr. T. Reid: Disqualified, okay. So we will change *Hansard* on that point.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. T. Reid: But I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, whether he believes that people who are not Canadian citizens should be eligible for public office under his jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I have not really thought about it, Mr. Chairman. I do not think this has anything to do with this particular section of the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose one can blame the Minister, but one can blame the government that they are now caught in their own tardiness. The hon. member for Scarborough East may be interested to know that the origins of the inconsistency which has emerged were to be found in a standing committee of this Legislature. I happened to be on that standing committee and somebody took a look at this bill that was going through—maybe it was myself, I have forgotten—

Mr. Sargent: You do not forget—

Mr. MacDonald: —took a look at the bill and said, "Now surely it is ludicrous in Canada, some 30 plush years after the statute of Westminster, that we should say you must be a British subject and that a Canadian citizen could not run." So they made an amendment, and I will say, Mr. Chairman, quite frankly, that we were astounded that all the Tories on the committee supported it and it went through unanimously. Now I would judge, in view of the Minister's—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why were you astounded?

Mr. MacDonald: I was astounded at such an air of enlightenment on this issue—30 years after the statute of Westminster had been accepted—by the Tories who were at that committee that morning.

My point is that apparently the same enlightenment does not exist in the whole government, because surely the government did not have the face to veto the decision

of the standing committee. I mean that would have been a little bit ludicrous to have gone back to British citizenship after the standing committee had unanimously, with the support of the government party, made this change.

But you have not followed through four or five years afterwards, because I think it is four or five years since that happened. So you have got two parallel pieces of legislation that are inconsistent and now you bring in a bill which brings these two parallel pieces of legislation into the one, and inconsistencies clash head on. Surely without too much passage of time the government can clarify this issue.

There is one case, that I happen to be personally familiar with, of a person who was a British subject and came to Canada. He wanted to run for the school board and discovered at the last moment that he was not eligible; he had to be a Canadian citizen. While he succeeded in getting Canadian citizenship in Ottawa in what is regarded as absolutely record time, he was not able to persuade the politically oriented local clerk to accept his nomination and so he was disqualified.

Sections 138 to 158, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 159:

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, regarding 159 subsection (a). The regional corporation of an ordinary area municipality, or the regional corporation of one or more area municipalities, may acquire land for the purposes of constructing a municipal building. I would like to ask the Minister again, for my own clarification, does the word "acquire" mean expropriation; does it include the powers of expropriation?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Sections 159 to 162, inclusive, agreed to.

Forms on page 80 agreed to.

Bill 112 reported.

Hon. Mr. Haskett moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report a certain resolution and one bill with certain amendments and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report a certain resolution and one bill with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THE EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ACT, 1968

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour) moves second reading of Bill 130, The Employment Standards Act, 1968.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour in moving second reading of this bill would, I presume, be prepared later in the discussion to have something more specific to say about their decisions associated with minimum wages? In the first reading of the bill, he said the department was undertaking some considerable research as to how this might be established and improved some time in the future.

I am quite concerned that through the Minister's announcement we are going to be treated to another formula which sees minimum wages a patchwork across the province, with a number of different levels depending upon the economic attainments of the particular area. There has been some complaint about that approach in the past, and since it is associated with this particular matter, I thought perhaps the Minister might be able to make some further comment on the principle of applying a minimum wage across the province.

Beyond that, this bill is supposed to deal with the rights of those workers who are not themselves able to organize unions in any convenient way. For that reason, I believe it is a very important bill because there are so many of the labourers across the province, and others who by reason of being dispersed and the type of industry they are involved in, cannot have the advantages of their own organization in the normal sense.

The ones we have heard about most recently are those that have been employed by companies, usually in large urban centres, which have signs out on a continuing basis for anyone who is without employment at that particular time to come in and register. They are then found what amount to part-time jobs by these particular companies and a fairly large percentage of their wages is taken by the company for the services they render. This kind of jobbery is one that is of some considerable concern, and it appears that these bills the Minister has brought in, which are designed to provide this protection

for this class of people, might perhaps have been more pointed in this connection.

I heartily approve of the acceptance of our responsibility to order the affairs of those people who cannot organize themselves, and give them as much protection and assistance as possible so that they will not be subjected to exploitation that has gone on in the past, and in my view is continuing in the type of labour practices that I have just described.

I would like to hear the Minister's comments in general on these matters, and I presume there will be, what, three bills brought in and discussed at this time? Right.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that these changes are very necessary. The one thing that concerns me is the change in the overtime pay, under part (b) of overtime pay, where it discusses an employee working on a holiday and does not make any allowance for any employee who happens to have his day off on that holiday. Quite obviously, if an employee's regular day off is on the holiday, he should also receive time and a half for that day, since he will have to work a normal shift during the course of the following week. Surely an employee who happens to be on a rotating shift basis should not be penalized because his day off falls on a statutory holiday, and I would ask that the Minister of Labour consider making a change in that portion of the bill.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, on the bill itself I would also like to make a point on the question of the minimum wage. The Minister, in presenting the bill, said that the government intends to establish a new and higher minimum wage rate this year. He said that this step will be taken during the next few months on the basis of surveys and studies in the course of preparation. He also made a comment that this survey would be taken in light of wage and price increases and other economic factors; and the other economic factors, I would suggest, are the increase in the cost of living.

It has been rumoured, and I hope this is not correct, that the minimum wage would be somewhere in the area of $1.35 per hour. Let me point out to the Minister that if he makes the survey in light of the economic factors and takes the increase in the cost of living in relationship to the minimum wage when it was originally put in effect or went to $1, then I would suggest to him that the increase should be beyond $1.35 to bring these people in line with the present-day cost of living from where it was at $1. So they are going to have to go beyond this question of $1.35 an hour if they are going to relate this in those three areas—the wages and price increases, and the question of the cost of living.

I also want to say that on this question of the time-and-a-half overtime payment on statutory holidays, really I do not think this is giving the unorganized workers in this province anything. Obviously the employer is going to close his establishment down; in my opinion the great majority would close their establishment down during these statutory holiday periods, and they would not be working anyway. It is like negotiating a wage classification in an agreement. You negotiate a $6 rate per hour but there is nobody working in the classification, so really you have not done anything as far as negotiating wage increases for the people; it is just on paper, and really it does not mean anything.

If the Minister had come in and said that, "We are making it mandatory that the employers pay the seven statutory holidays if they do not work, and if they do work they pay time and a half," then I think he would be bringing in some progressive type of legislation. But this type of legislation is meaningless, it does not mean anything and will not reflect in the economic well-being of the unorganized workers of this province.

In addition to that, I do agree that the Minister's position under the Ontario human rights code requires that men and women receive equal pay for equal work. I would think that this was a good point; if the women are doing equal work to men, obviously they should receive the rate, but in this regard I had hoped the Minister would have people working in this area to investigate not just on the basis of complaints, but to make sure that the employers in this province are treating the women on an equal basis to men where the job content is identical. I would not think it would be good enough just to work in the area of complaints.

Also, I would like the Minister to indicate to this House in this area of time and a half after 48 hours, what he meant when he made the point that he would hope that this would create additional employment if we cut down on excessive overtime. This again brings me back to one point, and I would hope that the interpretation on that section under the new Employment Standards Act is that no employee in this province is required to work

in excess of 48 hours a week. That is eight hours per day and six days a week on the basis of overtime. Many of the employers, and I talk specifically of the auto industry, do put in excessive overtime schedules for those employees, working ten hours a day and six days a week in some cases.

If you refuse to work the overtime, then your job is in jeopardy and this is the point that I am making. If this is going to be meaningful, then they should not be required to work this overtime. It should be on a voluntary basis, and if they work for eight hours, then they should be in a position to say, "I have had enough and I am going home." I hope that this is what this legislation means, as far as the overtime schedule is concerned—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Pilkey: No, the union agreements do not agree to that. The union agreements call for time and one half for overtime and you will find very few agreements where overtime is on a voluntary basis. This is one that the companies in this province guard very jealously, this area of overtime. They like to schedule it and have the employees work it, and I think that you would be in for a great fight with many of the companies in this province if you try to inject voluntary overtime into a collective bargaining agreement.

Obviously, most of the demands that are made on the company initially call for that, but they have not had the ability to negotiate it into the collective baragaining agreement, and I am talking about overtime above 40 hours on a voluntary basis. The province calls for a 48-hour work week, and I am suggesting to the Minister that it should not be mandatory that an employee work more than 48 hours a week, and if he does, he does it on a voluntary basis.

My last point was that I would like the Minister to enlarge a little on the transfer from the industry and labour branch of the minimum wage rates to the Lieutenant-Governor to establish from time to time the regulations, and I would like to know why he is bringing in that type of legislation as well.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, there is one principle of the bill that concerns me and that is the one of equal pay for equal work. I am just worried about the fact that possibly some types of industries that may have both male and female employees may simply put a door or wall between the portion in which the women and the men work and in that way, evade the principle of the equal pay for equal work.

I would like the Minister's views on this when he does get up and make his concluding comments. I hope that industry would not try and use this type of approach to evade the principle of equal pay for equal work.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to speak on the generalities of what this bill may or may not include here, but I think that there is a great area for intervention on the part of the Minister for the slave labour that is going on in some resorts by university and high school students during the summer time.

They are employing youth at greatly reduced wages and an aside here is that if the large corporations at Banff and Lake Louise, which may be outside of our territory here, or on the CPR and CNR, they get these university students and they have them—

Mr. Speaker: Order, the member must speak to the bill. He is speaking to a matter which is entirely beyond the jurisdiction. This bill is effective only in Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: There is no legislation as I understand it to protect people from 16 to 18 years of age who are working in resorts during the summer, and there should be some minimum wage that should be paid to them, like everyone else.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Yorkview has the floor.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of this bill, and I would like to hear the Minister's comment, is the unorganized worker who is fearful of asserting his rights. Certainly the increase of the minimum wage, the time and one half and the other rights which the bill provides for, are all to the good and we would hope that the minimum wage would be set at adequate levels.

But so many of our small plants in particular are unorganized, and workers in small stores and businesses have no union to protect them, and while they may have rights under this legislation the problem is going to be in asserting those rights so that the protection is actually afforded. Perhaps the worker has rights in the courts, but the little person who is working in that small plant, or the person who is working in the store or the small business knows what his rights are,

perhaps, but he is afraid that if he demands his rights, he will immediately be told that he is dismissed.

This is where the problem lies, I think, in the enforcement and the affording of the protection this bill is aimed to give. Perhaps the Minister will have some advice here for us as to how the person actually can achieve that protection if he does not have the protection of an organization behind him. This, I think, is the answer that must be given before this legislation can be adequate and enforced. In other words, if we are leaving to the unorganized employee, the burden of enforcement, then in many cases, the employee will fear to enforce it because of the economic consequences that will fall upon his head.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member for Dovercourt will adjourn this debate? And depending on the agreement of the House are you going to the private members' hour at 1? It would be excellent if the Speaker were to be advised of these changes. The member for Dovercourt has the floor.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Thank you. Mr. Speaker, it seems to be that what the Minister of Labour is really attempting to do is to bring the unorganized worker and give him some rights that are usually obtained through the collective bargaining procedure. In my opinion, the Act does not go far enough. For instance, and I do not wish to get at any one specific part of the Act, it provides that the employer must pay overtime for any hours worked over 48 hours per week.

It is my impression that most collective bargaining agreements pay time and a half for hours worked over 40 hours. Now, I ask the Minister to tell the House when he makes his final address on this bill, why he has not looked closer at the agreements made by workers in Ontario in the past to guide him for an Act to cover unorganized workers.

I particularly ask the Minister to look at time and one half over 40 hours instead of the 48 hours. What we are asking is for the unorganized worker to be paid for overtime if he works more than six normal days a week. In other words, a worker could work every day from Monday to Saturday, eight hours a day, and still not have any right to time and a half for overtime and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the normal working week for people other than parliamentarians is 40 hours.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak?

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister. I do not know when he is going to reply but maybe he could answer it.

Mr. Speaker: Normally in a debate a member speaks only once.

Mr. Pilkey: I just want to ask a question, I do not want to speak.

Mr. Speaker: That, in my opinion, is speaking but I think the Minister would have no objection to a question which might help him elucidate the Act further.

Mr. Pilkey: Do I understand that the bill requires an employer to pay overtime on a daily basis—anything over eight hours? It does not. In other words, he has to have his 48 hours in before he then becomes eligible for overtime.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who now wishes to speak to the bill before the Minister replies and closes the debate? The Minister of Labour has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments made by the various members and—since this is second reading—I shall endeavour to deal with them in rather broad ways, and perhaps not in the specific manner we might when we deal with the bill section by section in committee.

I want to reiterate that the basic principle behind the bill is to give further assistance to that very broad segment of our work force that exists throughout this province, and to combine these protective measures into one statute. We also wish to increase this protection and their standards from time to time in the future.

I would reiterate one particular point. That this is not an average wage level or employment standard, but rather this is a basic level which the government can improve from time to time. There are many people employed throughout this province in small industry and otherwise, who require this basic protection and it will come from this statute. There have been various measures in the past and under this bill we are combining those for greater clarification, both for the employers and the employees.

I would also remind the hon. members that speed of application is not the only thing to be considered in social legislation. We have constantly to keep in mind the overall picture, so that the greatest good accrues to the greatest number of our people.

When I say that, Mr. Speaker, I have in mind that one of the prime responsibilities of this government is to do all we can to ensure that the economy continues to move ahead, so that enough new jobs are created each year to provide work and pay cheques for the young people of this province, and the newcomers to the province.

In this year we require some 100,000 new jobs for people in this province and, in the search and creation of them, we are quite literally in competition with other provinces and also with the economy of the United States. Under these circumstances we must constantly bear in mind that we cannot burden the economy to a greater degree than do other jurisdictions. This is especially true when we remember that 95 per cent of the industry of this province employs 20 or fewer people, so that in many instances we are not dealing with large industries or large employee groups.

In some situations we can afford to make social progress faster than in other places, and this government has done so. But in other areas, we must bear in mind that improvements in employment standards must also be in line so that industry can be attracted to and maintained in this province. One thing that I want to make extremely clear is that this is not a final position in reference to this matter. We look on this bill as one that we can develop and compare as circumstances and other factors in this economy permit.

In dealing with some of the particular matters raised by the hon. members, questions have been raised concerning the minimum wage. I would deal with it in this way—that initially the minimum wage was adopted throughout the province on a zone basis, because it was felt that it must be done in that way, so that the economy of the different sections could have time to adjust. That served its purpose at that time.

At the present time the minimum wage is uniform throughout the province and it is our expectation it will remain so.

In reference to establishing the minimum wage, we have been conducting a very thorough survey of wage levels throughout the province. It is not complete as yet. The reports are being worked on and it is on that information that we will be able, ultimately, to establish what should be the new minimum wage for this time. But I would make it very clear that we contemplate an increase in the minimum wage.

In the matter of the industry and labour board establishing the minimum wage, as against the new system of the Cabinet—this was a question that was dealt with by Mr. McRuer and his committee. It was felt by the committee that the responsibility for that decision should not rest with a civil service board, but rather with the Cabinet through the Lieutenant-Governor in council.

There have been matters raised about overtime pay and particularly it should be effective at 40 hours, rather than 48. As I said in the beginning, this is basic protective legislation. We realize that many people in this province will have a standard higher than this and we encourage that, but we wish, through this legislation, to raise the standards of employment for others who do not have a higher level at the present time.

We feel that this is the type of legislation that can be adapted from time to time and it will improve situations for many people in this province. That is the reason it is being brought in now. I may say it will bring it in line with a number of jurisdictions in this country.

The question of labour contracting firms, wherein they employ people and make their services available to other companies. I reiterate what I said a few days ago, that this matter is being investigated by my department through a study. Largely it is a case of one company employing people at various rates—and they must pay the minimum wage for their employees and then making their services available on a temporary basis to another company. That company pays the labour contracting firm—it is a contract between the person or company who requires the service and that who makes it available. As I say, it is not a system of deduction of pay from the individual worker.

The hon. member for Yorkview raised a question as to what protections there are for the individual. I can only say to him that my department has a large staff for this and we will have to increase it under this legislation, for inspection purposes. When a person complains that he may be receiving less than his due for minimum wage or holiday pay, our people make an investigation they have substantial powers under this new Act; if he would refer particularly to section 35 in the enforcement part, he would find therein improvements in that regard.

Our people are able to look at the books to see if the person has received his, or her proper pay, and we are able to collect if he

has not. We are enlarging that provision under this Act, so that the department, through my officials, can collect up to $1,000 on behalf of employees for moneys that they have not received and that, perhaps, we have found they are entitled to.

We have endeavoured, on a broad basis, to improve the employment standards of people throughout this province. I am particularly pleased, of course, with the comments in reference to equal pay for equal work provisions. I would say that whereas before a complaint had been made before an investigation was started, now it will be brought under the labour standards or the employment standards branch and our people will be inspecting situations as they go throughout the province. Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered the main points raised in the debate.

Mr. Sargent: What about the students?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Oh yes, in reference to the question of the hon. member about students, I simply point out that there is, at the present time, a minimum wage for students in the province just as there is for other people. It is at a lower rate, because it is seasonal employment and, of course it is often of a different nature than adult employment.

Mr. Sargent: That is discrimination right there!

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, it is not. The hon. member raised particular questions at the time of my estimates—and he has asked questions before—there was justification for it, because you were concerned about university students and other students obtaining temporary work. This is an important point, because the summer resort industries frequently could not afford to pay on the minimum wage basis.

Mr. Sargent: Who says that?

Hon. Mr. Bales: There is a basic minimum wage that must be paid to temporary employees for the summer tourist industry; that protects them and helps them.

So these are the general points, Mr. Speaker, in reference to this bill. I think it is a forward looking measure and it is one on which we will extend from time to time as the years progress.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, the Minister did not answer the question I asked.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! The custom that has been established here are that questions which wish debate, which the members wish to engage in, come before the Minister's statement. Then, if there is something that is not clarified, usually in the committee of the whole, or in the standing committee, those matters can be dealt with because normally they are matters not of principle but of some particular item with respect to the estimates. And I would hope that the member's question would fall into that category and it could be asked and clarified either in the committee of the whole or in the standing committee. The motion is for second reading.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, excuse me, on a point of order. For some time, I have been wondering to what extent your repeated statement about the rules—that it is always in order for a member to ask a question of a Minister—would carry.

I think that at the conclusion of the Minister's speech on second reading, it is not at all impractical or a matter of wasting the time of the House—if the member has a question to ask of the Minister at the conclusion of his speech; whether it is a question of information, a question to ask when the Minister is going to reply to a question asked earlier in the debate, or whether it is argumentative, or a question of a debating nature. Is it not so, Mr. Speaker, that the member may ask such a question?

Mr. Speaker: Well, I would suggest that the House allow this matter to stand for the moment so that either the party whips or the party leaders may decide whether there is any change in what I understand to be the procedure here. The problem, which I think Mr. Speaker or the House leader would have in the event that we would allow unrestricted questions after the close of the debate, would be that not only would the member for Windsor West be entitled to ask his question but any one of 116 other members would also and we would never conclude a debate

If the member will allow me, and the House agree, I will be glad to take the matter up with the whips and the party leaders and see if there is any change in the custom. Because, so far as Mr. Speaker is concerned, while his duty is to see that the House operates properly, it is also to see that matters proceed in the manner which the members of the House feel best. I will be glad to take that under advisement, to contact the party leaders and the whips and see if we

have any amendment which needs to be made. If that is agreeable to the member?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would abide by your ruling; I would only say in reference to the hon. member that he did mention one point which I did not cover in my remarks, and I would be glad to do so but without—

Mr. Speaker: Well, the Minister is the last speaker; if he would care to clarify the answer to the member's question.

Hon. Mr. Bales: It is simply that the hon. member did ask a matter in reference to overtime pay and about adjustment for a day off. I would say that that is a matter that we would deal with under regulations, and we would certainly take it under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: I will still discuss the matter with the party leaders and whips, as raised by this debate.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that what has happened indicates we do not need to discuss it. Because what has happened here is that the hon. member for Grey-Bruce interjected a question, and because he interjected and did not ask to get the floor the Minister dealt with it. My colleague rose and said, "I asked a question; the Minister did not deal with it; can I ask it now?" And the Speaker began to lower the bar a little and said, "No, we will keep it until later."

I think it was clearly in order; it was inadvertently missed by the Speaker and by the Minister, and I think we have wasted five or ten minutes that we could have used more usefully otherwise.

Mr. Speaker: Judging by previous experience in the House, I doubt if the time was wasted. The motion is for second reading of Bill 130. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE WAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 131, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE INDUSTRIAL SAFETY ACT, 1964

Hon. Mr. Bales moves second reading of Bill 132, An Act to amend The Industrial Safety Act, 1964.

Mr. Nixon: It is not printed.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): It is being distributed this morning.

Mr. Speaker: I might point out for the information of the members that because of the 9:30 opening it is very difficult to know whether the printing will be up or not because it normally comes up at 9:30. So I asked the Clerk and we discussed it and we decided they would not likely be up and would be shown as not printed. If they came up they would be distributed and the House leader would be advised and then we could deal with those bills. So that is what I believe has happened, Mr. Prime Minister, with respect to this bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 25th order; House in committee of supply, Mr. R. J. Boyer in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT
(Continued)

On vote 2201:

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): With regard to research, in the course of his reply to other questions yesterday, the Minister said that it would be inaccurate to give the House the impression that the figure of $516,000 for maintenance was in any great part for research, although I think he conceded that research now has become sort of buried in that figure.

May I ask the Minister, specifically, how much is, under the head office estimate, devoted to research, and what is the nature of the research that remains in this dwindling aspect of the department's work.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Chairman, the amount in these estimates for the research section of the main office this year will amount to $18,000.

Mr. MacDonald: May I repeat my question? What is the nature of the research, particularly in the light of the Minister's comment again yesterday to the effect that you do not do pure research.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that it is more in the nature of studies and correlation of information on vehicles and vehicle studies, and there will be increasing work in this field. It is mostly in the nature of vehicle statistics and equipment and that sort of thing.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a brief comment because I think this is pretty important. Quite frankly it raises in my mind serious questions as to what exactly is the purpose of this department present, past and future. What the Minister in effect has said is that the research department has disappeared completely. Eighteen thousand dollars to be spent on research is peanuts. If it is being spent on collating studies, this is just another aspect of the department's statistical figures with regard to one and another aspect of the compilation which is the main work of the department at the present time.

Interestingly enough, if one goes back two or three years, there used to be a research branch. Last year that disappeared; it got buried in the head office estimates with a specific item to deal with research, and as I recall, it was a fairly significant figure. In fact, it was fees and expenses for special studies and research, $410,000. Admittedly, that may well have been with specific reference to the regional transportation study for the Toronto area.

But you see, Mr. Chairman, this raises the whole question in relation to what is the purpose, direction and the future jurisdiction of this department. I cannot make up my mind whether the government started a department with a certain concept of its functions and then changed its mind, or whether the government has lost confidence in this Minister so that when anything of a research nature comes up, they place it under the jurisdiction of somebody else. What happened when we got into the regional transportation study for the Metro area, was that it was shifted off under the chairmanship of a committee that was headed by the then Highways Minister, now the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton). In effect, the Minister who under any assessment of the departmental terms of reference should have been doing the job, was deprived of the opportunity of doing the job. And now whoever is responsible—and I suppose it must be the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) or somebody else at the Cabinet level—has really stripped this department of all of its research functions and has switched them over, I presume, to the economic and research branch of the Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Chairman, I am not objecting to that, I think I could make a case that research with regard to transportation is so intimately tied in with economic development of the province, that maybe that is the appropriate place to put it. But if, in fact, The Department of Transport is now stripped of its research function, reduced to being a statistical compilation department, then I suggest to you that the case that was put forward by the Liberal lead-off critic and by my own colleague is a valid one, that the *raison d'être* of the department has been eliminated.

There is another tangent one could go off on, and it is one that was suggested by my colleague in the lead-off on behalf of this party: If the government can make up its mind—and it seems to have been waffling back and forth, but generally back, in terms of what the functions of this department are—if the government can make up its mind to create a genuine transport department and bring under it, conceivably, the ONR, because this is part of the transportation system. Such pipeline developments as might be in the province, and the airstrips that the Minister says now come under his jurisdiction, almost as a sop to give some justification for the continued existence of the department, I think a case can be made for a transport department.

Indeed, what puzzles me and leads me to believe that both the Minister and the government do not know exactly where they are going, is that somebody asked the question yesterday—it was my colleague, the member for Wentworth—"What exactly is your future concept of what comes under transport?"; and I think *Hansard* will record the Minister said, "Well, I do not think that the construction of highways should come under The Transport Department." But he implied all these other things legitimately might.

Maybe he is dreaming; maybe the Prime Minister is not on his side and the facts suggest this is the case. One would agree that the construction and the maintenance of highways is a monumental task and clearly should be off into another department, but all of these other transport items in my view could be put into a meaningful, purposeful substantative Department of Transport. But at the moment, since the government set it up ten years ago, it has been dwindling, it is withering on the vine; the main job is highway safety and the Minister now gives us

very extensive rationalization as to why he cannot move radically or revolutionarily.

This Minister moving in a radical and revolutionary fashion just sort of silences me; I boggle at the thought of it, so there is no danger of that happening. But the proposition of this province moving ahead on some of these vital things that affect human lives is something that could be done even in this very limited department, but it is not being done.

To sum up, I think the government has to make up its mind what The Department of Transport is or is going to be. If it is going to be only what it now is and is becoming less and less, then I think the best thing to do is a little bit of mercy killing, and put it back as a branch in The Department of Highways or somewhere for compilation of statistics, and let the research work be done in the new department of the Provincial Treasurer.

There is one final and specific item that I return to and I am going to attempt not to repeat at greater length than is necessary to present it to the House once again, but I return to it with a particular and specific purpose in mind. If research has disappeared from this department, I suppose I am talking about a closed chapter and then the Minister is not in a position to speak. Maybe all the files from that former research branch have been taken away from him and he is like the little boy who has lost the candies; he has not got them now.

However, I go back to that important study that was done on motor vehicle taxation by this department when it did have a research branch. It was an important study, as I have said so many times in the House, because it was a follow-up study from a select committee headed by the now Prime Minister, on the question of weight-distance taxes and toll roads. In effect, a more accurate name for it is highway revenues. We came up with specific proposals in that committee. The government saw fit not to implement the porposals—such as, for example, implementation of a weight-distance tax—and they launched into further studies. Those studies went on for four or five years and strange things happened.

For example, back about 1963 or 1964, both of the Toronto afternoon papers, if I recall correctly, suddenly came out with extensive stories suggesting what was in the report that had been completed by the research branch of the department. At that time, we sought to have the report published and the explanation of the Minister of Transport, now the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld), was that the report was only an interim report, they were waiting for the actual tests to be completed in the United States for making certain revisions, and there would be a final report. But when the final report was done, it still did not become available.

As I have already recounted to the House, last fall, when spokesmen for all of the parties were asked to come to the automotive transport association annual meeting and present our views, we were very interested to learn through somebody from the floor, who apparently had previously been associated with the research branch, informing this assembled gathering that I was wrong in saying that the government had not done studies, that they had in fact done studies, that the studies had been completed in 1963 or 1964, indeed the studies had been circulated to appropriate departments in the United States and that the officials there believed them to be one of the most authoritative studies in this field. I was wrong. Well, I was very interested to learn that I was wrong, but I made the point then that if these studies had been completed with public moneys, that surely we were entitled to have them.

The next rather interesting revelation is that the Smith report—and I shall not repeat the details of this because I put it on the record when we were debating the fuel tax and the gasoline tax bills—but on pages 273 to 275 and thereabouts in volume 3 of the Smith report it is stated very clearly that the conclusions they came to, and which they included in their recommendations, were conclusions based on information which they got from The Department of Transport. So once again, this secret report that everybody is keeping hidden for whatever reason, was made available to the Smith committee and their research people.

Now with that background, I ask the Minister why cannot we have this report, so that we can assess it in light of the studies of the publicly financed study? Why can we not have it so that we can assess what the government is doing, a little bit more intelligently, on the basis of the information that is in your files.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The report that was made to me, or to my predecessor, was a study made in our department on road user costs, and the sharing of them back in 1963.

It was a report that was prepared for the use of this department and the government in apportioning the charges on the users of the road. The hon. member has asked before if we would release that report, and I had intimated to him that it was my view that it was a departmental report and I thought it should stay there.

I will take issue with him on the suggestion, perhaps a report by the chap who made the study, that it had been distributed to departments of government in the United States. To my knowledge, there were several copies of the report, and those were in my keeping, and they were numbered.

I delivered one to the Prime Minister, and I loaned one to the Provincial Treasurer for use by the Smith committee. As far as I know, those are the only copies of the report that went out. That so-called copies of the report were sent to various departments of the United States government, I think is an erroneous statement. There was a paper presented by the author of the road-user tax, or cost sharing report; there was a paper given by that author to the Canadian good roads association, at a meeting in Winnipeg.

It was not on the findings of the report, but on the method by which the report was compiled, his approach to the subject of analyzing road user costs. The actual report, I say, was made available to the Provincial Treasurer, for the Smith committee, and used properly by them. We now see in the Smith report the use it made of the facts in that report. I think the members have seen the benefit of the department report, and I think we are all sharing in that benefit.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, just to emphasize to the House that the Minister—to put it in frank and blunt terms—does not know what he is talking about, since this document in part or in whole got into the hands of newspaper people and was published in the afternoon papers, I just do not accept the Minister's statement that it was not circulated to places in the United States, and I repeat that it went and became available to the Smith committee. I now inform the Minister, that I have got a copy of it here because I am sick and tired of this government hiding documents for their own political purposes.

Two or three years ago, we had the same thing with Krueger report, a report on regional government that just revealed this government to be a laughing stock in terms of its conflicting departments, and everything of this nature. The result is that we had to go out and get a copy of the report, and we got a copy of the report, and I have done the same in this instance.

The reason why the government has been hiding the report, is that the report says it is legitimate to raise 68 per cent of the revenue for highways from the highway users, and the rest of it should come out of the general Treasury.

Yesterday, my friend from Scarborough began to raise questions about what he called the unfortunate by-products of cars and things of this nature, and therefore, to what extent should the cost come from highway users to be able to meet some of these unfortunate by-products.

The Minister said he was interested in this topic. He should be interested in this topic when the Smith report repeats what was in this study, that highway users should be paying between 65 and 75 per cent, no more, and the government is now extracting out of highway users 106 per cent. That is why he did not want the report to come out in the view of the experts.

You have been soaking the people who are using the highways, not 60 to 75 per cent of your highway expenditures, but over 100 per cent of your highway expenditures. This is the reason why you want to hide it, and it is a straight political reason.

You have misled the ATA, you have misled the public, you have kept the members of this Legislature in the dark. Mr. Chairman, I leave the matter there for the moment, because this is entitled "motor vehicle taxation" and the appropriate time to go into the substance of the report will be in the Provincial Treasurer's estimates when they come up, because that is the place that it is to be dealt with, not now.

This department is wasting the time and money of the province of Ontario. It spends most of its time hiding information that the public should have, and we in fulfillment of our responsibilities must dig it out, which we have done once again.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Resign!

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add to the discussion that we have had, what I said last night that we were not bound by this type of report. That if we decide to use revenues from users of the road, for other purposes, that was part of the tax mix that this government collected, and our department's report was used in a very proper way, it was prepared not only to be used by our

department, but to be used by this government in determining its taxing.

Mr. MacDonald: The Provincial Treasurer did not even know of its existence.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The Smith committee did, for it based its report on it; and the furtherance of that report was very proper. We collected the information, we made it available to those who were assessing costs and the appointment of taxes, and it has been made public through the Smith report in a very proper way.

Mr. MacDonald: We will make it available to the House.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Transport is quite right when he said that they are not bound by any report. As a matter of fact, you cannot tie this government or any of its Ministers down to anything, so I believe the Minister's statement. But there are a lot of things that have been omitted in the Minister's department which would make this a safer province to live in as far as the people are concerned, but which this government just will not implement, nor will this Minister's department.

For instance, we have an extremely high accident rate. There are a lot of unsafe cars on the highway, but the only way we can put a stop to people speeding is by chasing them and by apprehending the drivers, in order that the police can identify the driver, and thus bringing them to justice.

At one time you were able to summons the owner of the motor vehicle, but with the point system now you must identify the operator in order to be able to charge points against him in case of a conviction. I think what we sadly need here is a law which would enable us to summons the car owner, and it will be up to the car owner to prove, if he was not operating the car, who was operating the car. At any rate I think the owner ought to be penalized for putting his car into unsafe or dangerous hands.

Another suggestion, something that has not come forward so far, is the compulsory training of all of our youth in the operation of a motor vehicle—that is driver examination and the compulsory training of drivers. As you may recall, Mr. Chairman, last year or the year before I advocated that licences ought not to be given to anybody under the age of 18. This government has not seen fit to adopt my suggestion. But there are pro drivers' courses in high schools, which do produce better-than-average drivers, and which is evidenced by the fact that insurance companies give those drivers a lower rate of premium.

Mr. Chairman: I hesitate to interrupt the member, but I think he can see that the qualification for driver examinations would more appropriately come in the next vote.

Mr. Ben: It could come under either licensing of drivers or driver control. Fine, I am content to leave it there, but I would suggest on this particular vote that there be a mandatory jail sentence for those people who operate motor vehicles in this province while their licence is under suspension. This is something, I think, that the government ought to implement as soon as possible. Furthermore, and I think I can speak with some authority now, in applying for renewal of a licence, one of the questions asked is, "Has the bearer of the licence ever had epileptic fits?"

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is driver control.

Mr. Ben: Is that driver control too? Well, I do not know whether it would actually be under driver control because my suggestion, Mr. Chairman, is that it should become compulsory for all doctors in the province to report, to The Department of Highways, any patients who are either heart victims, victims of epilepsy or who have mental aberrations which would make them unsafe drivers. That might come under driver control, it may not. At any rate, I make that suggestion and when a person is applying for a renewal of a licence or for a licence, those questions ought to be asked of him.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is covered in section 145 of The Highway Traffic Act now.

Mr. Ben: I am not sure that it is to the degree that it should be. I think that those questions should be asked on the driver's licence, on the application as I have stated, Mr. Chairman. Among the questions asked should be, "Have you ever had a heart disease? Have you had any mental illness?"—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is under driving licences.

Mr. Ben: —when you are applying for a licence. Then I also suggest that perhaps again it may come under driver control, but I think every licence ought to have a picture of the owner on it.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the member—

Mr. Ben: It should come under driver control and perhaps I may leave it until we reach that point.

Another aspect where I think this department ought to take the initiative is for the installation of international signs throughout the province. You now read in the paper where some community puts up a sign partly in French and partly in English and then the signs go down. You have the situation where people go putting shotgun pellets into these signs because they do not approve of them. I think the sane and simple solution would be to have the international signs on all our roads and perhaps the province of Ontario ought to give a lead in this respect. I trust that the Minister will take up that suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in respect of the comments made by the hon. member for Humber that I quite agree with him that the offence of driving while under suspension might very well have a penalty of a jail sentence, and I have so recommended to my colleague, the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). It is a matter that comes under the criminal code.

Furthermore, the hon. member will find the provisions of section 145 (a) are meeting his objections with regard to licensing people who are physical—

Mr. Ben: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I was distracted. Could the Minister please repeat—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I was saying the hon. member's comments with regard to the licensing of people who are not physically capable of driving, such as those suffering from epilepsy and the like, that they are required to report such condition to us. Sufferers of epilepsy probably constitute by far the largest group of those whose licences are suspended because of physical condition.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Chairman, on May 28 I directed a series of questions to the hon. Minister in connection with the location of the driver examination centre at the city of Sarnia.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Vote 2202.

Mr. Bullbrook: In connection with the order of this matter at the present time, I intend to use this series of questions as an example of the administration of this department under vote 2201, especially at the Ministerial level. I recognize—

Mr. Chairman: It would more appropriately come under the next vote, however.

Mr. Bullbrook: I submit to you, sir, if you would listen to my submission and what I put forward to you before, out of necesisty I am going to comment on the location of that driver examination centre at the city of Sarnia. I want to relate that to the general administration of this department especially at the Ministerial level. I ask to be permitted to continue.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest, then, that the member continue since this evidently is a matter of head office administration.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is a question of the general administration at the Ministerial level.

Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, you will recall I had directed a letter on November 2, 1967, to the hon. Minister of Transport relating to the very question of the location of the driver examination centre at the city of Sarnia. You will recall perhaps that my concern was this.

There had been intimated to me, perhaps correctly or incorrectly, that the hon. Attorney General and his department were considering the establishment of a new magistrate's court facility at the city of Sarnia. We in the city of Sarnia, in connection with our core area, are undertaking an urban renewal study and it came to my mind that perhaps the best interest of the province of Ontario from the fiscal point of view might well be served if we considered the possibility of a provincial building in that core area. That is, rather than just subsidizing through provincial funds, to the tune of, I believe 37.5 per cent of the contribution of private enterprise, why do we not attempt to upgrade the area of Sarnia concerned by putting therein a provincial building?

I directed a letter to the hon. Minister and a letter to the hon. Attorney General in connection with this. What I asked of the hon. Minister was to consider the appropriateness of putting your centre in that area. What you did in effect was this—and I say this most respectfully to you, but as exemplified on May 28 in the hon. Minister's answers to my questions, he completely missed the point entirely, never came even close to my point—the hon. Minister wrote back to me and assured me in effect that he had taken the advice of the city officials in Sarnia that the location of this centre would in no way, in effect, adversely affect the urban renewal scheme. I was absolutely astounded and I replied to the hon. Minister.

But to shorten that point and to bring it in perhaps more appropriately, Mr. Chairman, to vote 2201. I find it almost impossible to conceive, first of all, that the only official in the city of Sarnia with whom you would consider taking up this location is the planning director of the city of Sarnia. You only did that after I asked you to locate it under the urban renewal scheme in the core area of the city. I cannot, for the life of me, understand how the Minister, in properly administering his department, could fail at least to contact the chief of police, the head of our traffic advisory committee, the sergeant in charge of traffic for the Ontario Provincial Police detachment in Sarnia, and the sergeant in charge of traffic of the city of Sarnia police department.

I submit to you, sir, most respectfully, that you should also have asked me about it, perhaps, aside from asking the people of the city of Sarnia where they thought it might be appropriate to locate it. You might well have had the courtesy of asking me where I thought it might be appropriately located. the point of this—and I am not going to dwell on it unduly; but it must be said, it has to be said—is that it is located right next door to the OPP and right next door to the Brewers' Retail. You follow me, the same owner; the same owner, right? They did not tender this location, and I objected to giving it to this owner without public advertisement and after—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Some Tory gravy.

Mr. Bullbrook: This is a fact. If I am incorrect I will take my seat. I insisted that this department do advertise this possible facility and they did advertise it and do you know who got it? The same fellow who was going to get it in the first place. Really an exercise in frustration, this was. But then, and this is historically beyond belief, I could tell you other things about this particular gentleman too and some of the facilities that he has acquired over the years, but we will not, I think, just divert it too much from 2201.

But after this, we find that the OPP are going to Petrolia. There were some reasons for that and I will make mention of those again, when the hon. the Attorney General answers my questions. So what does this man do? He makes an application to change this building to a hotel, right? I asked the hon. Minister of Transport on Tuesday about it, and he said—and this I suggest in the vernacular is beautiful, this is beautiful—"If there was an existing hotel there, Mr. Chairman, we would not have permitted the driver examination centre to be located beside an existing licenced premises." He also answered that he was not aware that the common owner was making an application to have these premises licenced. I pointed out to him that day that this was being done. I contacted the liquor licensing board yesterday, but still there are no objections from the hon. Minister of Transport in connection with this.

This to me, sir, is ineptitude at the Ministerial level. I, of course, do not mean this personally at all; it goes without saying that I have the highest personal regard for the Minister. He has been nothing but a gentleman with me since I entered this House. I must say one other thing. It just smells to high heaven of political patronage and this is exactly what it is. It is time that *Hansard* recorded something of this nature. I put it to you, sir, that it is incumbent upon you now to make sure that those premises are not licenced. I request most respectfully of you that you will let me have some undertaking that The Department of Transport will communicate forthwith, if it has not been done today or yesterday afternoon, its objection to the licencing of the premises.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief comment on the matter the member for Sarnia has raised. I think that he has to be fair in his approach to this. We had looked at and turned down no less than nine locations before we decided upon this one. We accepted this because it met, in the main, our chief criteria. It was proximate to the built-up area and it was away from the most heavily congested traffic area. It had adequate parking space for those arriving and it afforded opportunity for motorcycle testing.

These other problems raised by the hon. member have developed since this matter was undertaken for us as a project by The Department of Public Works. As I said the other day, we checked with the director of planning of the city, to assure ourselves that it would meet the city's bylaws and not run counter to its urban renewal plan, and further that it was in keeping with the findings of the traffic study that had been made in Sarnia.

This being so, sir, I think that we have proceeded with this matter in a very fit and proper way. It may not have met the local member's feelings entirely, and I am sorry, but I think that our chief concern is to get a suitable site. We have been looking for a

site there for some time, and we have decided on this one. I hope that it does not prove an unsatisfactory one.

Mr. Bullbrook: Am I correct in assuming from what you just said, Mr. Minister, and that *Hansard* has properly recorded it, that your department looked at nine separate sites—prior to my coming into the picture—and advertised nine separate sites and you chose this one? Is this what you are saying?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I am not able to answer the member. I do not know whether the sites were looked at prior to advertising, or some prior to and some subsequently.

Mr. Bullbrook: This is most germane to the position I am taking in connection with this. My position and my understanding is that your department bi-laterally dealt with this common owner and came to the conclusion, and then I came into the picture. After the necessity was appropriately advertised in our area, you had other people come to you and offer services. This is my understanding.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, in fairness I cannot tell the member whether it was prior to or subsequent to, because I do not know.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the Minister if regulations were published in languages other than the English language—and I will specifically mention French—and if an individual from Quebec who operated a transport fleet, asked for the regulation in the French language, would it be supplied to him by the hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that up to now the regulations have been printed in French.

Mr. B. Newman: Up to now? Thank you, sir.

Vote 2201 agreed to.

On vote 2202:

Mr. Chairman: I believe the Minister, in his opening remarks, had stated that perhaps we could deal with 2202 and 2203 on the basis of the programmes which are detailed on page 134; for example, on the driver's branch. Perhaps we could proceed first of all with the driver examination programme.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I suggested this last night because I thought that the items in votes 2202 and 2203 and 2204 were not meaningful, but the votes were divided into programmes which I thought did make meaning and would help the members to advance their presentations in an orderly way, and so instead of passing the vote by items, we would pass it by programmes. I thought that it would be a help to the House.

Mr. Chairman: If this is agreeable, perhaps—

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am just going to read something here that takes two minutes, to point out how impossible it is. I was at one time doing some editorials and this is one of them that I wrote. I would just like to show how all these cannot be discussed item by item.

> Mounting motorcycle deaths and injuries on our roads have finally reached proportions that are close to epidemic. This wanton and needless slaughter of youthful riders points incontestably to the fact that the motorcycle is the deadliest vehicle on the highway.
>
> Almost every day, new names are added to the already too long list of victims; victims who played the deadly game of gambling with their young lives for the passing thrill of riding a motorcycle at high speed.
>
> Any untimely death is a waste. The untimely death of the young is nothing short of tragic. This sense of tragedy deepens when we examine the coroners' and police reports. The ages of victims of motorcycle slaughter are mostly young men between the ages of 17 and 22. Frequently their girl friends riding on passenger seats, fall victim to this mechanical carnage. A study by the University of Iowa this year brought some interesting statistics to light. One motorcyclist in 13 is injured every year, compared with only one motorist in 50, almost four times as many.
>
> Of every 100 persons killed on the highway, three are motorcyclists. The study showed that the chances of a motorcyclist being killed are 20 times greater than for the driver of a car. Let us face it, the appeal of the motorcycle is to the young, who seem to have a love for speed and danger. Manufacturers and dealers who understandably slant all their advertising to the young contend that there is nothing deadly or dangerous about the motorcycle, providing it is ridden with care and skill.

Few young people are concerned with using care and skill. They just want to get the limit out of their machine.

I might point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that already we have covered three of the items that are listed under driver's branch. I quote:

Until a few short months ago, anyone with a beginner's permit could jump on a motorcycle and go, whether or not he could handle the machine or knew how to ride it. Thank goodness that ridiculous and asinine law permitting this one-way ride to death or injury has been changed. It is now illegal to ride with only a beginner's permit. Unfortunately this change in the law has had little deterrent effect. the number of motorcycles registered in Canada increased in 1966 to nearly 108,000, which was an increase of 34,000 over the previous year and registrations are still on the increase.

In the light of these figures, it hardly seems likely that the motorcycle is in danger of being banned from Canadian roads, as it should be. What we hope for, and what I urge, is legislation to force manufacturers to equip their machines with safety devices, and legislation to force would-be riders to take proper and comprehensive instruction on the handling of motorcycles, preferably at government-run or sponsored training establishments; legislation to force riders to wear protective clothing and safety helmets. In short, legislation with teeth in it in order to put an end to this two-wheel death.

The police, those who see the mangled young bodies, have a nickname for motorcycles. They call them murder cycles. There is no room on any Canadian road for a murder cycle.

Mr. Chairman, that is the end of it, but the fact remains that in that two-minute speech, I covered driver examinations, licensing of drivers, and driver control and even safety.

Mr. Chairman: Do I take it that the member is opposed to—

Mr. Ben: I am proposing that we be able to take vote 2202, and not be restricted to simply driver examination for one debate or the licensing of drivers for another debate, or data processing as another debate.

Mr. Chairman: There was no intention of restriction, I would say to the member. The thought was that it would be an easier and orderly disposition of the vote, rather than to try to deal with the total vote. I would think that we should have the concurrence of the House, unanimously, one way or the other. So, if the member is opposed to dealing with this programme by programme, I suppose the only alternative is to take the total vote. Vote 2202—the member for Wentworth.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee of supply rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has adopted a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, 1968

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park) moves second reading of Bill 113, The Air Pollution Control Act, 1968.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with Bill 113, I do not want to take up the time of the House unnecessarily, but I thought I should remind members of the House that the whips have come to certain agreement as to what subject would be introduced for private members' hour.

Contrary to what we have done formerly, we have arranged for a schedule that will take care of all subjects within a period of, say, a month. So that this is not used as a criterion, it should be pointed out to the members of the House that in future, if there should be any switch of subjects, it should take place within the proposed schedule so that we do not dip into the order paper and take a subject from the order paper, but rather that we transfer subjects from the prearranged schedule.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, speaking to that point of order I do not want to get into an extended argument at this point. It is true that the whips have agreed on a whole month's scheduling. The bill that was originally going to be discussed was withdrawn, I think, at the suggestion of the other side of the House because I think most of it was covered by the legislation which has been introduced by the Minister

of Labour (Mr. Bales). Therefore, we were free to make another choice. We exercised the freedom which is ours, 72 hours at least in advance of the time, to choose what we wanted. All the government whip is saying is that we are now restricted to choosing what we originally had in that month's schedule and cannot go back to the order paper.

I submit that this is his interpretation and I do not think it is one that need be accepted. Certainly it can be discussed further. I give him fair warning that I do not think we are going to be bound by the position that we cannot go back to the order paper if something is washed out because of government legislation.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, I think I should make the position of this party clear in this particular regard. While I agree with the comments of the government whip to some extent, this party's position that we take is that, subject to the required notice, the party introducing the resolution technically was within its rights to bring in the resolution of its choice.

The reason for this sudden change has been quite obvious, of course, even if a little bit ridiculous, and I do not feel that the time of the House needs to be taken to discuss a matter that should have been taken care of by the whips out in the corridor in the ordinary way, by consultation, and by agreement, especially since this party is prepared to debate anything on the order paper at any time as always. Mr. Speaker, we just do not care.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has the floor to speak on the motion.

Mr. Shulman: This bill, Mr. Speaker, I submit is a very timely and an extremely important one. Perhaps this subject is the most important subject that will be discussed in this Legislature. I do not wish to waste the time of this House rediscussing matters that were discussed under the health estimates—the importance of the problem of air pollution was explored fully at that time.

I just once again wish to stress that if we, as legislators, do not take action to control the problem of air pollution, it is no longer a matter of not being able to fish in our streams, or not being able to swim in our lakes, not being able to breathe our air; we are going to run into the problem of people dying. This is already beginning. We see this in Sudbury where the rate of bronchitis and asthma is rising higher than in the rest of the province. We see it here in sections of Toronto, where the people are developing emphysema and other respiratory ailments if they live in certain areas that are more polluted than others. And I submit to you, sir, that the government has done practically nothing about this problem.

We have a bill which is now in effect—The Air Pollution Control Act, 1967—which contains some ten pages of ineffectual print. The key phrases are, the Minister may do this, the Minister may do that. If there is a complaint of air pollution the Minister may cause an investigation. Nowhere in here do we have standards set out for what industry must do, for what government must do. That is what I have here today, a very definite set of standards, a very definite set of rules and regulations for industry, for government, for individuals.

I say again, and I said when introducing the bill for the first time, if we are prepared to follow the rules in this bill you can clear up the air pollution problem absolutely within a period of three years in this province, with one exception—automobiles.

May I say the problem of air pollution has two aspects. The first is the problem of the automobile and this bill does not attempt to deal with that problem—that is a separate problem and there will be a separate bill introduced to deal with that problem. The major problem of air pollution has to do with the fuels that we are using in this province and the pollution that is coming out of the industrial production that is occurring in this province.

Let us say furthermore that this is not theory—this bill is modelled on the principles of a bill passed in New York two and a half years ago which has proved workable. It worked in New York, the pollution problem is being cleaned up there. We can do the same thing here this session if we are willing. I would like to refer back to the final report of the select committee on air pollution and smoke control of this Legislature in 1957, which was headed by the former member for High Park. I would like to quote one line from this report on page 61 and it read, "Almost without exception every industry can clean itself up if it will take the trouble and spend the money."

That was written 11 years ago and as we know, industry has not cleaned itself up because it was not prepared to spend the money. And if we continue to give pious hopes and pious requests we are going to wait another 11 years and instead of things getting better

they will continue to get worse as they have in the past 11 years.

So I ask you not to rely on hopes or requests, not to rely on The Air Pollution Control Act of 1967, which is completely ineffectual, but to bring in a bill with teeth. I am not going to go through this bill in detail, I just wish to point out the two or three essential parts. First is section 10 which I wish to draw to your attention and I would like to read the first part of section 10:

> No person shall cause or permit the use of fuel that contains more than the following percentages of sulphur by weight:
>
> 1. For a period of two years and four months commencing eight months after this Act comes into force—coal, 2.2 per cent; and residual fuel oil, 2.2 per cent. 2. For a period of two years commencing three years after the Act comes into force—coal 2 per cent; and fuel oil 2 per cent.

And after the period mentioned in item 2 expires, then coal, 1 per cent; fuel oil, 1 per cent.

An exception can be made. You can use fuel containing a higher sulphur content if the industry involved is prepared to put a scrubber, which is an apparatus which removes the sulphur from the stacks, onto its particular stack. This gives industry a very reasonable period of time. They do not have to do anything for eight months after the Act comes into effect.

They have then a period of a number of years in which to change the type of fuel they are using or if it is not economical to change the type of fuel, and they wish to continue to use the cheaper American coal, which is polluting our atmosphere, then they have the alternative of putting a scrubber into their plants, which will remove the poisoning which is occurring. And I submit to you, sir, that this is a very reasonable approach and an approach which we should take at the present time. The other key section in this bill is section 11 and I would like to read this section also:

> Commencing three years after this Act comes into force, no person shall use bituminous coal and fuel-burning equipment until he installs, uses and continuously maintains control apparatus capable of continuously preventing the emission of at least 99 per cent of all solid, particulate matter that would otherwise be emitted from the use of such coal in the fuel-burning equipment.

This will take out—and I am not talking about sulphur; I am now on the aspect of the other types of pollution that come from coal—fly-ash, things of this nature. This will solve this problem; this is the type of pollution that we see with our eyes, drifting from the chimneys, these black clouds of smoke. This is not as dangerous to health as the other types of pollution which are not visible. But it is a definite hazard to growth of certain types of vegetables and our crops, and it is unsightly, it is dirty, it causes tremendous expense in itself, just in cleaning it, just in carrying out the aspect of removing it from our cities and from our homes. I would like also to draw your attention to section 5 of this bill—which is also a key section, the third key section and the last one which I am going to read—which reads as follows:

> Commencing one year after this Act comes into force, no person shall cause or permit the use or operation of fuel-burning equipment using residual fuel oil until an operating certificate has been issued by the department. A certificate shall not be issued unless the applicant's fuel-burning equipment includes the installation and use of a combustion controller, an automatic oil temperature maintenance device and an automatic water temperature maintenance device or the equivalent of such devices, and in addition thereto, such other requirements as may be specified.
>
> Commencing two years after this Act comes into force, no person shall cause or permit the use or operation of fuel-burning equipment using coal as fuel until an operating certificate has been issued, and such a certificate shall not be issued unless the applicant's fuel-burning equipment includes the installation and use of a combustion controller and an automatic water-temperature device or the equivalent of such devices, in addition to such other requirements.

To sum up, if we are prepared to pass such a law—if the government is prepared to pass such a law, I am sure we are prepared to pass such a law—we will, within a period of five years, completely eradicate this problem which is a tremendous hazard to the health and—even more so—the welfare of the people in the province. It is going to cost money to begin with but in the long run it is going to be free. There has been study after study done in the United States and in Europe which have indicated that the ultimate saving in greater crops and greater health, in less need of hospitals and less need of all the medical care

that is needed for our people who are suffering the chest illnesses which come from air pollution, will more than repay the initial cost of putting in this equipment.

The equipment would be put in intially at a cost to industry, not a cost to government, let me stress that. Numerous studies by the President's board on this matter in the United States have agreed that financial incentives should not be given by the public, because ultimately everyone benefits, and industry should make the initial expenditure. And let me say that in relation to the profits of the industries involved, these expenditures are miniscule. Once again I would like to take the example of Sudbury, where International Nickel Company is netting some $140 million a year and where it is estimated that to clean up this problem which is ruining that city, they would have to spend some $5 million.

So let me, to sum up, say in one sentence, we can lick this problem very simply, very quickly, and over a period of ten years at no cost to the government, no cost to the people, and no ultimate cost to industry. I ask the government—I am not asking them to lead; I know that this government does not like leading, doing things that other jurisdictions have not done—but this has already been done in populations which are just as dense, with just the same problems as we have. We have seen it done in Europe; we have seen it done in California; now we have seen it done in New York. If you are not willing to lead, at least follow. Do what they have done and clean this problem up.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member for Humber yield Mr. Speaker the floor for a moment because I have had it drawn to my attention by the member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman) that in the west gallery, unannounced and unheralded, are pupils from the R. A. Hutchison public school in Whitby.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the hon. member for High Park for introducing this bill, and secondly I want to thank him for having offered to me early today any unexpended time that he may have had. He said he was going to keep his speech short, and he said that I could make use of any time that he had left over. Thirdly, I would like to apologize to the hon. member for looking into the future, and it is a dark and smoky future. I am afraid that this bill has about as much chance of getting anywhere in this House as a speckled trout in the open sewer we call the Humber River.

The hon. Minister, who is so proud of his departmental budget, may think I am being dramatic, but I have found him to be like a physician—in fact he is a physician—who tells a patient in the throes of some fatal disease, not to be dramatic after prescribing aspirin. And that is all this government has done in the past, with reference to this pollution disease that is killing and crippling our people left, right and centre—they prescribe aspirin. They moved it to the present, to be sure, but they have only moved it to the present with bylaws or statutes after they have been pushed into it. After they have been pushed into it, we find that when we go to court, their bylaws are so vague that the charges are dismissed.

This bill has many points. I do not think it goes far enough, not by a long shot. As a matter of fact, I am afraid that in many respects they are simply regulations. The fact is that we have a very serious problem, and since we are supposed to be speaking on the principle of the bill, I want to speak on the topic of air pollution because this is what the bill is intended to remedy.

As I said, the government has moved, but not far enough, not far enough by any search of the imagination. All we really get from them is lip service, and it is their lips that are the only things they have not covered up. They keep monkeying around with the whole thing—in the traditional monkey pose—only in their case, it is seeing no evil, hearing no evil, and smelling no evil.

We have the hon. Minister of Health making such statements as, "It is not possible at the present time to establish air quality criteria which are meaningful." Last year we had him saying of his own so-called "comprehensive" programme for air pollution control, "It should be stressed that this is not a crash programme." I know it is not a crash programme; the only crash connected with that programme was a dull thud.

Another great complacent aristocrat was fiddling while his environment burned. Now we have a case of thumb-twiddling while ours poisons itself to death—death, yes, and that is what I am talking about. I am talking about the 750 people who were killed just six years ago in one dramatic display of what air pollution can do in London, England. They were buried beside the 1,000—that is 1,000, Mr. Speaker—killed by the same poison in the same city just six years before that. And they, sir, were laid to rest beside the 4,000 human beings who fell to the killer smog in that same city just four years before that.

Look at those rows of bodies, Mr. Speaker, and add to them the 240 killed in New York by smog in 1953. Since 1880 there have been at least nine well-documented cases of mass death adding up to nearly 8,000 fatalities. And there have been thousands upon thousands hospitalized. And this is what I am talking about. And do not say it cannot happen here, because it is happening here.

Those statistics I gave you were only the obvious ones; the abrupt ones; the weak, the aged, the very young, the ones who just could not continue to live under the poisons being spewed from the chimneys and the exhausts of the cars and trucks and buses; the ones who died at about the same time, from obviously so-called "special" pollution situations. There are all the others—the ones who have died and who are being slowly killed by pollution as we know it now. We worry about the mushroom cloud of the atomic bomb; we should be worrying more about the squat evil cloud that crouches over every one of our cities today.

Alarmist? Sure, I am being an alarmist. I want to sound an alarm siren call that will wake up the government to what is happening now and to what the future holds. And do you not think there is need for awakening?

The hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), one of the Ministers with the resources, if not the energy, to come to the aid of his doctor colleague, said at a government air pollution conference, "The problem is one of creating no more pollution than we are prepared to tolerate." Well, now, is that not nice? That is about the same as saying someone can get a little bit pregnant.

But he made it more clear what he meant when he went on to say that a balance must be found between requiring industry to undertake pollution controls that price them out of business, and allowing industries to market cheap products and at the same time pollute the human environment. You can easily see where the stress is there—on industry, not on air-breathing human beings.

It is like the legislation which allows a negotiation procedure to be implemented when it is considered that air pollution has caused damage to agricultural crops or livestock. But what negotiation procedure is there for those people on those streets in the central west end of Toronto who are suffering in numbers far beyond the normal from various lung diseases?

But for a moment, let us play it by their terms. Let us stick to the more comfortable, less emotional and trying facts, like those involving just dollars and cents. Where is our pollution? First of all, in our urban areas.

Steel corrodes from two to four times as fast in urban areas as it does in the cleanliness of rural air. Nickel in industrial areas corrodes 25 times as fast—25 times as fast. Copper has to be replaced five times as fast. If the government was as quick to point that out as it is to dodge its responsibilities, it might even have industry siding with it in a real effort to cut down pollution.

In New York City a study revealed that pollution adds about $600 a year to the budget of a family with two or three children for such things as washing, cleaning, repairing, repainting. You can add to that all the hidden charges that same family is paying to finance the same kind of costs in government and private enterprise because we persist in pumping poisons into our air that not only kill humans but wreck our phsyical environment.

Let us say New York is in a worse state than we are in Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton, Windsor, Sudbury and other cities. You can still figure that the cost is a high one; as high or higher than the average person is paying in property tax. Think what the province and all the fine citizens of this province could do with that kind of money. And that kind of money will eventually be available if the government will finally do something about our pollution.

You can take even the figures compiled by the federation of Ontario naturalists and it is too bad they do not have a lobbying power in this province as strong as the industrialists. They estimated last year that pollution cost every person in Ontario $72. That adds up to about $500 million. Are these the kind of figures you people understand—dollars and cents?

Or how about this: Dr. Alfred Bernhart, an associate professor of engineering at the University of Toronto, estimates that 95 per cent of Metro Toronto pollution could be eliminated for a total cost of $540 million. Sounds impossible? That, my friends, is only about $270 per person. Compare that price tag with those figures from New York, a cost of $600 per year every year for a family with two or three children. Compare it, even, with the annual $72 cost provided by the federation of naturalists.

Or take another estimate that has been made. The hon. Minister of Health, of course, will be sure to say that more research is required. But it is suggested that pollution in Toronto is costing $120 million a year in the deterioration of building materials, deterioration of vehicles, clothing and, of course, medical bills for emphysema, bronchitis, asthma and so on. The plain and simple two-plus-two mathematics of the matter is that a clean-up of pollution would pay for itself. We do not have to have pollution.

But let us take a little closer look at those costs. We were talking about the cost of replacing corroding metals, flaking paint, soiled clothing, mostly that type of thing. Let us assume, as the government seems to assume, that in this affluent society the citizens can not only afford to pay higher and higher taxes but also can afford to pay to replace and repaint *ad nauseam*.

Fine, for the sake of argument, but let us for the moment buy their argument. The heck with the expense. The chimneys have to keep smoking because we do not want to bother some little industrialist too much We do not want to be too hard on the car manufacturers. And those big business friends, of course, of the government on the other side, we do not want them to scream and complain about dumping their airborne garbage into the air we have to breathe.

L. F. Wills, president of Honeywell Controls Limited and speaking as Ontario chairman of the Canadian manufacturers' association, was quoted as saying:

> Industry is not the prime culprit on the pollution scene, but has probably made the most progress in meeting its responsibility.

I would like to insert an aside here, by the way, Mr. Speaker. One industry—a paper mill in that part of the province the government forgets except at election time—showed one of the things it had done to the Prime Minister when he was unsuccessfully campaigning up there. They gave him a kit of their products and it included a cute little fuzzy skunk, the kind of thing that would make a novelty brooch. It has sort of become their symbol. It epitomizes that sweet smell of success. They may not have gotten rid of the stink in which they envelop their entire area, but they have prettied it up by saying, "Look, the more you smell, the more you know we are making money."

And continuing my interjection further, I would like to point to a comment made by an Oregon housewife testifying in a lawsuit against—you have guessed it, a pulp mill—involving pollution. She said, "How many times have I heard it: 'It smells like money'." She added pointedly, "To me, it smells like death." Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, she and her husband were awarded $2,147 in that case.

But back to our friends' friend from the Canadian manufacturers' association who was bragging about how much industry has done to fight pollution. Speaking of criticism of pollution, he was quoted as saying:

> One detects an intensity going beyond the bounds of constructive criticism—a bitterness and vindictiveness of an emotional nature.

Well, you are darn right, it is bitter and it is emotional. The executives of Noranda mines do not have to work in their smelters where the sulphur content is so high that those legendary stokers with the horns and arrowed tails could likely learn a lesson. And the executives in the cities do not have to live out their lives in the airless houses of the slums. They can get away to their homes in the suburbs or in the country and to their summer homes. Sure, it is bitter and emotional and why should it not be?

The alleged great contribution of industry reminds me of the proud comments made by D. P. Caplice, director of the Ontario water resources commission's division of industrial waste. He said that 1,800 firms under OWRC surveillance had spent $117 million in ten years to fight pollution. That sounds like a pretty munificent figure when you say it that way. It is enough to want to pass around the hat and take up a collection for the poor industries doing so much for our welfare. It is, that is, until you use a piece of paper and a pencil and work out the fact that it works out to an average per industry of $6,500 a year, the price of a janitor or two. Now, that is really a big deal!

And meanwhile, the average family could be paying out of its small budget something like maybe $600 a year because of the pollution these firms—looked on so beneficently by this government—are pumping into the atmosphere. And the only reason there is not more of a public outcry than there is, is because the government and its pollution-pumping friends are lucky. A good deal of the pollution is invisible. It is not all black smoke. It is fine particles of suspended invisible poison hanging in the air, filtering downwards, and into our lungs.

There are more than 50 seperate pollutants which have been identified in big city air. In Metro, they estimate one-third of them come direct from industrial sources, one-third from residences and one-third from vehicular exhausts. Some authorities jack up the amount of pollution from vehicles to close to half of the total. But no matter how you slice it—it is there and it stinks. And it kills.

Maybe with their new taxes on cigarettes, the government think they are going to save lives by making people cut down or cut out smoking. Let us say they do. Let us be agreeable on a most disagreeable subject for a moment.

And then let us take a look at a study performed by Drs. Sadamu Ishikawa and D. H. Bowden of the University of Manitoba. They compiled tests on lungs from 300 autopsies in St. Louis and 300 autopsies in Winnipeg. St. Louis, it should be pointed out, has a much worse air pollution problem than does Winnipeg. They found that 35 per cent of the non-smokers in St. Louis had mild or moderate—moderate means up to 70 per cent of the lung tissue destroyed—cases of emphysema. In Winnipeg, only 12 per cent of the non-smokers had mild or moderate cases.

The conclusion, and I am sure the Minister will probably again say it requires more research, is that pollution is as much to blame as cigarettes for lung diseases, especially emphysema. It does not matter if you are a non-smoker, if you are living in our cities, which are protected by the cloak of government air pollution legislation and covered by a cloak of pollution—the legislatve cloak is a threadbare one—if you live in our cities, you might as well be puffing happily away.

To those who wonder what emphysema is, well, it is more common in older persons and usually follows years of chronic bronchitis. Shortness of breath after slight exertion is one of the most prominent symptoms. The victims are susceptible to chest colds that persist, sometimes, for several weeks if not treated. The trouble is caused by the walls of the air sacs weakening and ballooning out and the bronchi becoming thickened and narrowed. It is the kind of thing that you get from pollution. It is the lingering death —along with other lung diseases that I am talking about and about which the government prefers to remain silent.

Among all those poisons I talked about—another one among those poisons I talked about is benzopyrene. It is a cute little item that is highly suspected of causing lung cancer. Dr. Milton Feldstein, director of technical services of the San Francisco Bay area pollution control district, includes it when he says the resident of any big city, over a three-month period, breathes in as much as a pack-a-day smoker inhales in a year. That is also the kind of death I am talking about.

And, faced by facts like these, what sort of reaction have we been getting from the complacent compilation we are compelled to call a government? They pass an Act that the courts say cannot be enforced.

An apologist, T. W. Gross, an engineer with the government's air pollution control service, pointed out in a recent issue of the *Municipal World*:

> The Minister has the power, after investigation, to order the discontinuance of the discharge of any air contaminant in unusual cases where such discharge creates an immediate and serious danger to the health of the public.

My goodness, they are the greatest barn door closers since Mrs. Murphy locked in her cow with the lantern. That is like passing a law about murder, saying that a police officer has the power to stop a would-be murderer if he is going to kill someone stone dead with a bullet, but that if he is just slowly strangling the victim to death, he has to set up a committee to study the situation. And we are being strangled to death.

Just a few months ago, in Buffalo, that great world thinker, Buckminster Fuller, the man hired by a newspaper—well, it is the Toronto *Telegram*, may as well give them a plug; they hired him to do what the government should be doing, studying satellite city development—had something to say about what we are talking about.

Here is a man who has always been looking into the future, not backing into it, like our friends across the way, who are always getting a little behind in their work. Here is a man whose prophecies on many subjects during his 72 years of life have been proved true. Over there, in Buffalo, he said mankind is running out of time fast in pollution of our environment. He said if action is not taken, we will reach the point of no return in 10 years.

Is this some crackpot being emotional, being bitter, being vindictive? I say no, Mr. Speaker. This is a world figure who has been honoured around the world for his power of thought.

And he is not alone. Austin N. Heller, the New York air pollution commissioner, which is the source of this particular bill here, said recently that if the United States does not get the upper hand in 10 years, it will have lost the battle for clean air. And U.S. Surgeon General Stewart has declared that the government there has "an abundance of compelling evidence which demonstrates beyond reasonable doubt that air pollution is guilty of killing and disabling people."

Now the Minister charged with responsibility of controlling pollution is also charged with the responsibility for hospital and medical bills. While they have been increasing the hospital and medical bills of the citizens of Ontario, they have been ignoring one of the issues that is putting people into the doctors' offices and into the hospitals.

We do not need more research. We do not need to wait for the United States to lead the way in virtually every effort to combat the killer poisons. If we must wait we will wait ourselves into an even earlier grave than we are heading for now.

With that, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the government had better give serious consideration to the implementation of the facts contained in Bill 113. I myself believe that many of them could be added as regulations under The Energies Act, which is chapter 112 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario.

The bill in itself would be dangerous if it rescinded all other bills, because it does not provide penalties for the pollution of the environment, it simply sets criteria for equipment to be used. It permits regulations to be made under it, but I believe that, in itself, it is a good set of regulations to be incorporated into The Energy Act. I would say that our party, therefore, in principle supports the bill.

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker: with reference to Bill 113. It is admitted by its author that it is a reprint of a local law the city of New York passed in 1966, which the member for High Park has introduced as a new bill. The only thing new about Bill 113 is that it is almost 100 per cent American content, but printed by the Queen's Printer and using captions from our own bills passed on December 20, 1967, known as The Air Pollution Control Act. The author of Bill 113, the member for High Park—

Mr. MacDonald: Has this been written by Bill Lee too?

Mr. Jessiman: Six o'clock this morning, I did it myself, with your indulgence, sir.

The author of Bill 113, I might reiterate—the member for High Park—has removed the teeth from our existing bill, possibly with intent. He has included kitchen garbage grinder and I will refer you to page 7, item 12, paragraph 4.

Surprisingly, Bill 113 omitted any reference to the control of automobile emissions, even though it is admitted to be based on U.S. principles and the U.S. federal government have made the control of automotive emissions mandatory. Automobile emissions must be controlled, especially in larger urban areas. Various estimates of the quantity of emission from these sources state that it accounts for 30 per cent of the total pollution burden.

The present Air Pollution Control Act, section 12, contains the provisions for such control and the motor vehicle manufacturers and the importers have been advised that emission controls will be mandatory with the 1969 model year and I quote:

> No person shall sell, offer or expose for sale a new motor vehicle or a new motor vehicle engine of a class or type that is required by the regulations to have installed on or incorporated in any of its system or device to prevent or lessen the emission into the outdoor atmosphere of any air contaminant or contaminants unless such motor vehicle complies with the regulations and the offence—every person who contravenes any provision of this section is guilty of an offence and on summary conviction is liable to a fine of not less than $50 or not more than $500.

Item 13:

> No person shall operate a motor vehicle of a class or type that is required by the regulations to have installed on or incorporated in any system or device to prevent or lessen the emission into the outdoor atmosphere of any air contaminant or contaminants unless such motor vehicle has installed on or incorporated in such system or device and makes use of such system or device—

And the same convictions for an offence.

I would like to make a remark to the member for Humber regarding paper mills. We have four at the Lakehead—

But we are trying to cure it.

I will draw your attention to the annual report of Great Lakes Paper Company Limited at the end of 1967. They have spent $4.2 million on affluent and odour pollution

control with the concurrence and co-operation of The Department of Health, and The Department of Energy and Resources Management. They have completed primary treatment, both in air and stream—or water—pollution, while expanding newsprint and kraft production and, believe me, I am sure that they will eventually control kraft production smell, as we have on many of the mills in northwest Ontario, but not fully.

They are working on it—they are working desperately on it, and they are spending time and money on it. At the same time as they are expanding the newsprint and kraft production, some $37 million in the last four years—employing over 1,000 persons in northwest Ontario—and I am not just speaking of the Fort William-Port Arthur area, I am talking about the whole northwest, and this is just one of four companies I am speaking of. I think it is a very dramatic contribution, both in co-operation and control of pollution.

Further, I make reference to the May issue of the *Resource*, if you will bear with me. This is a federal publication, you all receive it, issued by the Canadian council of Resource Ministers. Reference to the bottom of page 1—it says:

> Waste treatment cost of Ontario industries approaches $120 million. Ontario firms have invested close to $120 million since 1957—

Granted it is ten years, but it is a tremendous stride in industrial waste treatment facilities.

> —with over $11 million of this amount accounted for in 1967, according to figures released by the Ontario water resources commission.
>
> Also, a record number of Ontario industries were taken to court in 1967 on water pollution charges, laid under The OWRC Act. Eight firms were charged compared to three in 1966, and all prosecutions resulted in convictions. In all, 127 applicants for approval of industrial waste treatment facilites were received by the OWRC in 1967, and 65 were approved compared to only 48 in 1966. In addition, 27 applications for works valued at nearly $1 million were under way, and under review at the end of this year.
>
> The OWRC reports that all operating uranium mines in Ontario have installed satisfactory control measures for removal of radium and have planned for future disposal needs. Good progress by industries in the chemical manufacturing, petroleum and steel classifications also is noted, and the OWRC receives applications from the pulp and paper industry for approval of treatment facilities worth several million dollars.

Back to Bill 113. It does not provide that the department shall have the right of entry to inspect premises, nor does the department have the right to request information necessary for the purpose of the Act. There is no right of appeal from any decision made by the department, and paradoxically there is no power for the department to issue orders included in Bill 113.

No provision has been made in the bill to assist the agriculturalist should he suffer economic loss due to air pollution. Nor is there even any provision to set up investigations should any such damage occur. With so much of our province devoted to agriculture, such provisions are mandatory.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): In every bill?

Mr. Jessiman: Section 3 of Bill 113 provides for the eschewance of operating certificates, which ordinarily will be valid for a period of three years. Our Act does not contain a parallel provision. Unsatisfactory operation is to be controlled under section 8 of our Act, which deals with the survey of and recommendations for existing sources. This provides a degree of flexibility since the operations may be suveyed at will and changes are recommended as required.

Sections 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of Bill 113 all deal with fuel and refuse burning equipment. All items covered in these sections, with the exception of section 14, can be dealt with under the regulatory powers of the present Act.

Section 14 deals with courses of instruction and air pollution control for operators of fuel and refuse burning equipment, including boilers, water heaters, stoves, kilns, and so on. Presumably such courses would be supplementary to requirements of The Department of Labour—for example, stationary engineers' certificates. Section 10 of Bill 113 spells out in detail sulphur restrictions on fuels, and would make them mandatory across the province.

The same results can be obtained under the regulatory section of the present Air Pollution Control Act. In fact the present permits much more flexibility in that it permits the needs of the individual regions and the areas to be met. One would get the impression that the only pollutent that is of any importance is sulphur dioxide, since many

sections of the bill are devoted to it. This is definitely not so; there are many other pollutants which are just as important.

Section 12 of Bill 113 provides for the prohibition two years after the bill comes into force of the construction of incinerators, except for municipalities or local boards. The prohibition would make no provision for the disposal of industrial waste material.

Section 15 of Bill 113 provides authority for the department to seal any equipment installed or operated in contravention of this Act. This can be accomplished under present legislation by requesting an injunction.

Section 17 of Bill 113 is a regulatory section and is woefully inadequate for the purposes of a comprehensive Act which Bill 113 certainly is not. Section 18 of the bill makes no provision for an orderly and progressive implementation of an air pollution control programme. It assumes that there are instant people available, and that all are adequately trained.

Mr. Young: The hon. member's party has not been in power for 25 years.

Mr. Jessiman: In general, the provisions for Bill 113 will closely resemble a municipal bylaw, without the broad concept of an Act, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I disagree with Bill 113, and support the government's present legislation and programme which is both realistic and practical.

Mr. Speaker: There is five minutes of time left for the New Democratic Party if they have a speaker, and thereafter five minutes of government time. I understand they do not wish to speak and yield the floor to the member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, having listened this morning to the production of my hon. friend who works so assiduously at six o'clock by candlelight, I am provoked to add a bit to this debate since we have the time. There are two or three points that I would like to make.

The first one is, if we are going to solve the problem of air pollution there must be a will to do it on the part of the government. The record indicates very clearly that this government has not had the will down through the years. Events have had to push it, cajole it, prod it, and finally they recognize that the ludicrous situation of having each municipality looking after air pollution made a mockery of the whole objective of cleaning it up. There are no invisible barriers between two different municipalities, so the government has moved now to take over the thing themselves.

In taking it over, the will to really solve it is not yet evident, because it is a piecemeal takeover. It is going to be some years before the whole of the province is encompassed, and time alone will tell whether or not there is a real will on the part of the government to impose the regulations and make certain that they are lived up to.

We had a striking example in another context from the Minister of Energy and Resources Management just a couple of days ago with reference to the government's actions in connection with pollution up in the Dryden or the Kenora area. After all, if the government finally moved to lay charges, obviously they must have been pressured by events. And yet after the charges are laid, the company belatedly indicates that it is willing to do something—so a soft-hearted government withdraws the charges to give them another few years to live up to the spirit of the regulations and the law in Ontario.

There is one interesting thing in this bill. The hon. member for Fort William can nit-pick and go through it and say that this and that is not included. His nit-picking prepared at 6 o'clock by candlelight this morning did not take into account what the hon. member for High Park said. The hon. member for High Park, for example, indicated that with the problem of pollution from cars, you would have to have a separate bill.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member indicated it, but he indicated that it was not in the bill, and it—

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member wished to raise a point of order.

Mr. Jessiman: I have read the bill very thoroughly that has been prepared by the hon. member, and I find no reference anywhere, spoken or read, pertaining to automobiles. Please correct me if I am wrong. I am right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. member had listened, he would have gotten the point that I am making, which is that the hon. member for High Park explained, when he introduced the bill, that automobile pollution was not included because it required a separate bill to deal with it. But that information was not available to the hon. member when he was

doing his work at 6 o'clock this morning. But he got it in the House and ignored it.

Mr. Speaker, let me come back to standards. The chief worry that I had with regard to the government's legislation and its implementation is (a) the stringency of the standards, and (b) the willingness to implement them. I shall never forget that very useful conference that we had on pollution at the Inn on the Park last December when the rotation of speakers appeared to be so handled that the last man who spoke at the end of the conference was an expert from Britain whose name escapes me for the moment—P. G. Lawther, or some such name as that—who indicated that you could not have standards. It was impossible to have standards.

For a government which indicates that their chief concern is to clean up pollution, to end a conference by bringing in an expert whose main thrust is the argument that you cannot have standards, it is impossible. You might have thrown in the towel at the outset and quit kidding the public, because you must have standards or it is impossible to have regulations and it is impossible to have them enforced.

Admittedly, the government itself has moved with the establishment of standards in their regulations that have been promulgated under the existing legislation, but we have got to wait to see whether the standards are stringent enough and, secondly, and even more important, whether there is the will to make certain that they are lived up to.

The next point that I would like to touch on briefly, Mr. Speaker, is the costs, As my hon. colleague from High Park has pointed out, 11 years ago a committee that studied this problem in the province of Ontario indicated that there were very few of the industries who really could not handle the cost. We have had a lot of experience in the intervening 11 years to indicate that in many instances, when industries were pushed by public outcry, and they spent a little bit of money, they actually ended up by making money, because the anti-pollution devices that were installed resulted in the catching of a byproduct which more than paid for the installation cost.

In some instances there may be costs involved, but the simple point in principle here, Mr. Speaker, is that we have reached a stage when the accumulated pollution of the environment in which we live is such that we simply cannot tolerate pollution. I think that this is an invisible principle, even to the point, and I make my point with this underlining—that there may well be industries which cause so much pollution that society will have to come to the conclusion that they sacrifice those industries.

They will simply have to find other ways of providing employment if they cannot clean up a pollution situation which is fouling the environment to the extent that has been the case in the past. However, the important point is that in 99.9 per cent of them, I think a solution can be found. I recall your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that each of us take five minutes, so I shall conclude my remarks here.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate simply because I agree with Bill 113. Anything is better than what we have at the moment. If the regulations of the government and the bills that exist today have the necessary teeth in them to clean up the problem that we are discussing here this morning, then one thing of two has happened: Either they have not used the necessary persuasion on the industry to clean up the problem, or they are ignoring their own statute.

I have reason to believe that this bill, at least, being discussed here today, will get to the ears of some of the people in the industry who are still polluting the air that we breathe. I was flying in from Sudbury not too many months ago and the International Nickel plant there, where the wind was blowing to the south, and I would say that for at least 100 miles, the air was polluted to the extent that on occasion you could hardly see the earth below.

I was thinking of my stay at one of the better hotels in the city here. I opened my window and the following morning I found soot and dust that was not there the night before. I am not going to talk about the hotel, but I am going to talk about the plant that I believe is bringing about that contamination.

If the wind happens to change and come a bit from the southeast, you will see pollution from the Richard Hearn thermal power plant or hydro project that we have visited, with its many tons of coal that they must burn in a matter of minutes to bring about the necessary power needed. I do not think that Hydro are doing too well about cleaning up the air and they are a big public project. I am also thinking of the Port Credit plant, sending 72,000 tons of pollutant into our air. I do not know how that figures, but there

was quite a lot on my window sill. That I can understand.

If you are lost along some of our highways and you want to locate Toronto, all you have to do is to look into the air and see the Port Credit plant, the thermal plant that is polluting our air, and doing a beautiful job. They are almost in competition with the Richard Hearn, and maybe better! But let me take you a little closer to home where I am a little better acquainted.

If this bill will bring about the type of relief that the people are looking for then naturally we all ought to support this bill. I might dwell for just a moment on that one issue. Mr. Speaker there are some things in the United States that we ought to look to. When a bill is presented whether it be by a member of the Opposition or the government if it is good, it ought to be implemented. This makes sense to me. We do it on principle and conscience rather than because we go on party line.

There are four or five industries in the area that I represent that are polluting the air, and have done so for many years. I realize that they are giving a lot of people work, and I realize that they are in competition with others to sell their products. But they are polluting the air and they ought to have tax incentives from our government if no other thing. The government can persuade them by assisting them financially to put in the necessary equipment to clean up the air. I would like to touch on another change of the wind.

Usually, we have a prevailing wind from the west, but if it comes from the east, and this bill is based on some legislation from the American side, then they do not abide by their laws either because I have seen pollution come across that Niagara River to the point where you could hardly bear it. I do not know how the people live in that on the American side.

This is a major problem that the government has to reckon with. This bill ought to be implemented in some fashion, and if not, the ones that you have ought to be brought about and the people should be made to live up to the laws of the province.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when we finish the estimates of The Department of Transport, we then will deal with Education, followed by University Affairs, followed by Energy and Resources Management, followed by Trade and Development. On Monday, we are going to deal with the motion of the leader of the Opposition, which strangely enough, deals with this same subject which is on the order paper. That debate will be completed at 6 o'clock, and on Monday evening we will resume the estimates of The Department of Transport.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 2 o'clock, p.m.

No. 103



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, June 3, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 3, 1968

Presenting report, Province of Ontario Council for 1967-1968, Mr. Davis 3763

Ontario Labour-Management Arbitration Commission Act, 1968, bill intituled, Mr. Bales, first reading 3763

Statement re interprovincial consumer protection conference, Mr. Rowntree 3764

Debate on amendment to the motion that the House resolve itself into committee of supply, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. Root, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Boyer, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. J. R. Smith, Mr. Burr, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Simonett, Mr. Pilkey, Mr. T. Reid, Mr. Pitman, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Young, Mr. Bukator, Mr. Dymond 3765

Recess, 6 o'clock 3802

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, JUNE 3, 1968

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today, in the east gallery, we have visiting us, students from the Mackenzie public school in Kleinburg; and we are to be joined by Parkway vocational school pupils from Toronto. We welcome these young people here today.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and University Affairs): I beg leave to present the report of the Province of Ontario Council for the year 1967-68.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ONTARIO LABOUR-MANAGEMENT ARBITRATION COMMISSION ACT, 1968

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour) moves first reading of bill intituled, The Ontario Labour-Management Arbitration Commission Act, 1968.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, this bill will establish a new system to facilitate the arbitration of labour-management grievances arising under collective agreements. It represents a very significant step forward in industrial relations in this province.

The Act provides for the appointment of the Ontario labour-management arbitration commission, which will consist of an impartial chairman and six members, equally representative of labour and management. The commission will recruit, train and maintain a panel of acceptable arbitrators and arbitration board chairmen. It will assist arbitrators by way of such administrative services as arranging meeting dates and facilities, producing and distributing awards and so forth. It will also sponsor research into the arbitration process and will publish awards and information concerning arbitration.

The parties will, of course, continue to be free to agree mutually on the choice of an arbitrator or arbitration board chairman. Where they cannot agree, they will continue to apply to The Department of Labour for an appointment in accordance with The Labour Relations Act. However, we expect that these choices, or appointments, will be made from the roster of persons maintained by the commission.

The establishment of this panel will help to guarantee the availability of knowledgeable and independent arbitrators who can handle grievances expeditiously. The cost of arbitration will continue to be paid jointly by the parties. However, the commission will be empowered to establish a standard schedule of fees and expenses.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps you would allow me to outline the background of this step.

As hon. members are undoubtedly aware, strikes and lockouts are prohibited during the life of a collective agreement. All grievances and disputes over the interpretation, application or alleged violation of an agreement, if not settled directly by the parties, are subject to final and binding adjudication through arbitration. This is done, in some cases, by a single arbitrator, or through a tripartite arbitration board chaired by an independent person.

The arbitration of grievances, without resort to strike or lockout action, is one of the most important features of our industrial relations system. It functions effectively only to the extent that arbitrators are readily available and are respected for competence and impartiality. Over the years, a large proportion of Ontario's 2,000 or so arbitration cases, each year, have been decided by county judges. Last year, Parliament amended The Judges Act, and effectively removed judges from the field. While my department has built up a panel of arbitration personnel, the removal of the judges has proved to be a serious blow. The Ontario union-management council considered this to be one of the prime current problems in industrial relations in Ontario. I asked the council to suggest a solution, which it did on a unanimous basis. This bill reflects the council's recommendations.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I wonder if I can ask the Minister a question?

What is this bill saying about The Arbitrators and Official Referees Act that we were talking about—the 1962 bill which was never proclaimed?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, there will be a further bill introduced in the House, with reference to that particular Act.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that arrangements have been completed—I am sorry, are there other bills?

Mr. Speaker: Any further bills?

The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that arrangements have been completed for an interprovincial consumer protection conference, sponsored by the government of Ontario, through The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, to take place at the Skyline hotel in Toronto, from Monday, June 10 through Thursday, June 13.

Efforts have been under way for some weeks in an attempt to bring together appropriate officials and political persons, both federal and provincial, so that many of the problems facing us, all in the area of consumer protection, might be aired in an informal manner.

As I have often indicated to the House, Mr. Speaker, there are several areas, such as price control, where jurisdiction in a constitutional sense may be clearly outlined, but in fact, does not lend itself to easy applications in a practical sense. It is our hope, through this first conference of its type to be convened by The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, that a greater understanding of the entire area of consumer protection will result.

It is possible, sir, that a conference such as this could help us begin the complex task of trying to define areas where some degree of uniformity in approach might be desirable. Response to Ontario's invitation has been excellent. The government of Canada has signified its interest, and will be represented. Seven provincial Ministers have indicated that they will attend, and confirmation from an eighth is anticipated. In addition, senior officials from every province will be on hand.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have a question for the Minister of Reform Institutions, Mr. Speaker.

Has the Minister investigated charges by Matron Shirley "H" regarding the cause of the sitdown strike of female prisoners at the Don jail on May 19, 1968 and will the Minister reveal the results of that investigation to the House?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I also have two questions of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs:

1. Why was Ord Wallington and Company Limited allowed to accept funds for payment of securities from public clients on April 23, 1968, which date was subsequent to the hearing of the Ontario securities commission which stated, "The company is permitted to complete the trades for which it has already contracted and to make delivery of securities to its public clients." Yet public clients who paid in full for stocks on that date have been unable to obtain their securities and have been told that they are merely unsecured creditors of the company.

2. Will the Minister intervene with the securities commission and with the trustee to see that public clients in this position have their securities delivered to them?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice but in the meantime I have asked the securities commission for a report as to the circumstances and the facts of the matter.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. J. P. Robarts moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee of supply.

Mr. R. F. Nixon moves, seconded by Mr. V. M. Singer, that the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of supply, be amended by adding thereto the following words:

> That this House regrets the inadequacy of government policy involving research, regulation, intergovernmental co-operation, and community planning to deal with the growing effects of pollution of the air, water and land of Ontario.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY DEBATE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this is the first occasion during this present session when the Opposition has offered an amendment to the government's supply motion and we have selected a topic for discussion this afternoon which is of great importance, indeed. I know that the hon. Premier never likes to have political matters from other jurisdictions brought in to this House, and yet he should surely be aware of one of the recent polls conducted by the CBC on a phone-in programme in which we are told that for every five people that communicated their interest in federal issues, four of them felt that anti-pollution measures were of great importance.

There seems to be a great deal of confusion not only in the minds of the electorate but of politicians themselves as to where the responsibility lies for the control of pollution in Ontario. We in this province have accepted the largest share of this responsibility as far as the imperative programmes that have been accomplished and are in the process of being accomplished in this part of Canada. But our understanding of pollution and the accelerating damage we do to our own environment has been slow to develop.

Most of us remember the passing references in our schooldays to the importance of erosion control, tree cover and not picking trilliums. It took hurricane Hazel in 1954 to awaken this government to the need for public programmes to control our rivers which over a century had been denuded of natural runoff control. Then, as the no swimming and pollution warnings went up around our rivers and lakes, there was the growing awareness that through sheer neglect and passivity, we were allowing industry and mushrooming municipalities to foul our community nest.

These feelings of alarm had centred at various times on dead fish counts, debris floating in rivers and lakes, foaming detergents and pictures of our sewage disposal installations being rendered almost inoperative by foam from phosphate detergents, red worms and frightening statements from scientists that we were approaching the point of no return with regard to pollution in the Great Lakes basin.

Now we have, I suppose, been treated on many occasions to statements by scientists and others in high places that have been responded to by this government as if these scientists were crying wolf.

I have two statements with me today that I want to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, one of which was generally received by all members, and the other as a result of a recent conference. Both of these are statements from scientists of general acceptance and repute and do bear on the problem that I have brought before the Legislature this afternoon. The first is a letter signed by John N. Jackson, professor and head of the department of geography at the Brock University. It is addressed to Dr. J. A. Vance, the chairman of the Ontario water resources commission and reads as follows, and I quote:

> Dear Dr. Vance,
>
> I am perturbed and seek adequate reassurance. It is a fact that many cities and smaller communities along the Canadian shores of Lake Erie and inland from the lake along the Niagara River and along the Welland ship canal obtain all their domestic water supplies direct from the lake. This lake water also flows into Lake Ontario, and further communities then depend upon this water source for their regular supplies for drinking purposes.
>
> In all these situations, we drink without thought or worry, water which is derived from Lake Erie. Against these facts I quote in full from the bulletin of the conservation council of Ontario for Spring 1968, which has just recently been published. Lake Erie: The US public health service has warned shippers in Lake Erie that water within five miles of the shoreline should not be used for drinking or cooking purposes. This stretch of near-shore water is so polluted that even boiling or chlorination will not remove the contamination. This is a serious and threatening comment to our very existence in southern Ontario and the consequences are of serious and vital importance to the future of all citizens in this region.
>
> If the water in the lake has been condemned as being unfit by the responsible American authorities, is it fit for Canadian consumption? Do we endanger our own health by drinking contaminated water?
>
> Yours sincerely,
> John N. Jackson.

That is the end of the quote from the letter. Mr. Speaker, the date of that letter was May 22, 1968, and it outlines a problem that is

of great concern to the people living in that part of Ontario.

The second matter that I want to bring to your attention was reported in the Brantford *Expositor* of May 23, 1968. As you know, I have the opportunity to read that paper regularly and carefully, and they quote some comments made by Dr. Robert S. Dorney, professor of geography and planning at the University of Waterloo. He was speaking to a meeting conducted, I believe, by the Niagara-Iroquois tourist association, and here are some of his comments, and I quote: "The Grand River is a river which is a biological sewer."

We have heard professors, politicians, and many others use quotations like that. "Hamilton harbour is the biggest septic tank in the Great Lakes system."—things like that, which tend to obscure more than assist the need for a rational and reasonable approach to a problem that is definitely approaching the point of no return. But he does give some more interesting features of the problem as it relates to the Grand River, which I would inform you is the largest single drainage basin in southern Ontario, exclusive of the Great Lakes system itself.

He says that there are two solutions: The government of Ontario can either institute effective treatment plants at all industrial and municipal locations in the river valley, or it can construct a sewage pipeline which will run down the river valley and collect this material and dump it into Lake Erie. Naturally there was some objection particularly to this second proposal, which would seem to transfer the problem away from the territory that he was discussing, and would in fact use Lake Erie as a great septic tank. But his response to this complaint was as follows, and I quote:

> Much of Lake Erie is without oxygen and operating presently as a septic tank. It is one of the biggest cesspools in the world.

These are phrases which, of course, the reporter for the Brantford *Expositor* was quick to set upon and extract for his stories, and yet they were said before a responsible body by the professor from the University of Waterloo. He went on to say, and I quote:

> Two thirds of Lake Erie is biologically sterile and Lake Ontario is going the same way.

Mr. Speaker, Ontario has a place of special importance, being the jurisdiction with by far the largest shoreline on the Great Lakes system. We share this with eight states of the union, but we deal through the federal governments of Canada and the United States when attempting to co-ordinate our efforts concerning water pollution. Our attempts at co-ordinating or even understanding this pollution have been a pitiful failure from the standpoint of Ontario, which is, I would say, the most important jurisdiction not only because we live in it but because it controls the shores of the Great Lakes system on the Canadian side.

I want to concentrate on the problem of pollution in the Great Lakes system with particular reference to Lake Erie. The unwitting destruction of this body of water is a tragic example of how man's lack of knowledge of his natural environment can rob him of the precious resource on which human survival depends. The lake has deteriorated so badly that the game fish are almost gone and beaches are open only occasionally. Swimming is often curtailed by high bacterial counts in the water and the revolting stench of rotting algae and dead fish on the beaches. Each summer sees the formation of algae blooms covering 800 square miles of the lake to a depth of two feet.

If you have done any research in this, Mr. Speaker, you will know that Lake Erie is the shallowest of the Great Lakes. Its deepest area is just off Long Point towards the eastern end of the lake; the western end, being relatively shallow, has to suffer most of the problems associated with pollution. There are many specific areas where the problem is well known to individual members of the House.

The one area which I have visited fairly recently is Nickel beach at Port Colborne and it gets its name because it is right under the stacks of the International Nickel refinery, which is located in that town. It has been leased through the generosity of the company for $1 a year to the local municipality and for many years there has been good use made of the excellent bathing and recreation facilities. But in the last two or three years, the effluent of dead fish and dead algae particularly has made the beach practically unusable. The bacteria counts have resulted, on some occasions, in it being posted as "no swimming." And it is normal to look to the great nickel refinery and say: "Well, there is the centre of the difficulty." And yet examination shows that this is not so. We find that Nickel beach is closed much of the time not because of pollution from local industry, but because of the general devastated condition of the lake from pollution, mainly from

the United States side. Detroit and Windsor dump waste from automobile, chemical, paper, steel and petroleum industries; Toledo, Cleveland, Erie and Buffalo are major polluting centres; while the Grand River—and I mentioned it just a moment ago—having the largest drainage basin of any river in southern Ontario, carries a heavy load of industrial, municipal and agricultural pollutants. Experts say little relief is in sight and expanding knowledge of the problem reduces hope for meaningful improvement.

I understand the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) is going to take part in this debate, some time this afternoon; I know he will be quick to recall what has been achieved by the government through the Ontario water resources commission by putting in expensive capital installations for the control of municipal sewage.

The problem, however, has gone considerably beyond that, Mr. Speaker, as you may well know. While we have an opportunity as members to look at these facilities in our local municipalities and constituencies and marvel at the efficiency with which the ones that are installed operate, we should now be aware of the fact that the effluent—even from our most modern plants—contains dissolved solutes of nitrate and phosphate extraction which are made mobile by the sewage disposal process. They are dumped into the rivers in a very clear and acceptable form but, as they enter Lake Erie, are now the major contributory cause to modern pollution as it is understood.

This super-fertility, that is dumping into the lakes at ever-increasing rates, is going to be the chief problem associated with pollution that the Ontario water resources commission, and this government, and governments in every jurisdiction, must face in the immediate future. It is this super-fertility, as it is sometimes called, which is making possible the tremendous growth of algae and other plant life in the lake, rendering it practically useless as far as the recreational aspects of the lake is concerned and, in fact, is using up the oxygen that has been available, and should be available, in this tremendous and important body of fresh water.

It is the invisible menace then that constitutes the real pollution danger, not the human excrement thrown up on the shore, but the clear and apparently harmless liquids which, while free from disease organisms, are actually super-fertilizers of a very special kind. They are now known as fertility pollutants, and it is these liquids that are making Lake Erie, for example, what it is today.

When people read about Lake Erie being an "open sewer" or a septic tank—as I have just quoted a moment ago—and then drive down to look at the situation, they are often surprised to see nothing out of the ordinary. Many of these people have grown accustomed to the excessive growth of algae and the fact that it washes up on the beaches, rendering much of the area unfit for recreational use. Yet, Lake Erie is an organic chemical vat which may threaten our health in a most serious fashion.

The same is more or less true of all the Great Lakes and all of the major river systems of the populated areas of North America. As a matter of fact, it is interesting that the drainage system flowing directly into Lake Erie has one of the largest population concentrations of any particular lake. It is estimated that between 12 and 15 million people live in the drainage area and it is further interesting to note that pollution of the type I have described—dissolved nitrates and phosphates leeched out of farmlands—is equivalent to a population at least as large in addition. This sort of pollution is not derived from the source that you might at first expect, but chiefly from commercial fertilizers that are being used in an ever-increasing concentration. Up-to-date farmers are now aware that the very best use of their dollar is in the purchase of commercial fertilizers to improve their cropping position and this, in turn, through leeching and through situations that are associated with the problem that I have been describing to you, sir, is leading to an increase in the difficulty of the pollution problem. It is very difficult to see how it can be reasonably controlled.

What we have done is to make organic wastes mobile. They are no longer trapped in septic tanks. They are all liquid now, free to move and mix.

One of the most important studies in this matter was carried out by the state of Wisconsin around the city of Madison, where funds were made available for a very careful study of the movement of these pollutants; and a small city like Madison, Wisconsin, puts into its lake outlet, the daily equivalent of 1,500 tons of ammonium nitrate and 1,000 tons of superphosphate. That is from a city of 130,000 people. Multiply by 15 for Metro Toronto alone. Multiply by 30 for the golden horseshoe and lakefront communities. Since it costs so much to remove the phosphorus,

little further progress in sewage treatment technique is seen in the near future. The sewage engineer now recognizes that his role is to remove, from water, organic wastes and associated toxic bacteria, but we are only a little way along the road to the solution of the problem.

However, these solutions must be found. It is possible, using modern chemical processes, to extract a large percentage of the nitrate and phosphate pollutants, but it is estimated that this would increase, by a factor of five, the cost of operating sewage treatment facilities. And, of course, the capital cost in the first instance would be extremely high.

The growth of algae in our lakes is like the eruptions that follow a disease of the blood in a human, the parallel, we are told, is an exact one. If algae are seen to be blooming, then the lake is sick, and this is what has happened in Lake Erie to the extent that I have already described. The sickness can be periodic, in which case the parallel is with the common cold experienced from time to time by every healthy person. Under those circumstances a large body of water, through its own purification processes, is able to overcome the difficulties that are more and more noticed. But the algae growth, that is characteristic of the Great Lakes today, is approaching a permanent situation. According to Dr. Langford, who used to be in charge of the Great Lakes institute, it is probably a terminal illness, so far as these inland waters are concerned.

In addition to clear pollutants orginating in conventional ways, modern industry produces clear, pure, basteria-free effluents that nevertheless contain complex organic and inorganic chemicals—chromium and sulphur salts, phenolic compounds and often mildly radioactive wastes. These affect the algae, usually by stimulating dormant forms to unexpected growth.

The economy and people of our province will not only accept, but are demanding, rigorous controls to be imposed on industrial and municipal pollution. We are prepared to pay for the remedies that are known, and for research that must be undertaken to solve the problem.

I, therefore, have three specific proposals that I would put to the House, Mr. Speaker, in completing my introduction of this amendment.

First, stringent regulation of pollution backed up by subsidized loans for industry so that the expensive, purifying equipment can be installed.

In commenting on my first point here, Mr. Speaker, we have been assured by the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), that Ontario is, in fact, undertaking the improvement of our regulation. But, there is always the case of the industry which can prove to the satisfaction of any reasonable judge, that if they were to undertake real anti-pollution measures—effective anti-pollution measures—they could not maintain themselves economically. Now, here is where the public interest must come to the fore. We must be prepared to make available subsidized loans, so that these industries can accomplish the anti-pollution measures that are essential, if we are to clean up our environment.

Now, there are associated things that could go along with it; that is, assistance by sales tax rebates, both federal and provincial, for this sort of purchase. My main point is, that government must step in with a subsidy programme of the type that I have described.

Secondly, an improvement of the OWRC programme, so that the economy and tax base of the whole province will share the cost of water grids and sewage systems. This may well be a part of the reform of our whole tax system.

I would say further that I should spend a considerable time on this; as you know Mr. Speaker, my time is limited by other speakers who wish to follow. All of us as members, I would say, are aware of small communities which require sewage disposal plants. It has been put to them by officials of the OWRC that they must take steps to introduce the sewage disposal systems or they will turn over the information to the community planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs, and they will no longer have severances granted in that particular town site.

This is true of a good many areas now, and when they want to proceed with the kind of sewage disposal plant that is recommended, they find that their credit is not good enough for Ontario municipal board approval. They have at least one alternative, that the OWRC will install it for them and it is put on their tax bill as a user payment.

In a good many of these towns, we find that this user payment amounts to $150 to $200 per dwelling per year which will extend for 40 years. You can see why these communities are reluctant to take on that kind of responsibility which, in fact, would double the tax load for a 40-year period. Surely there has to be some other answer than the one that

the OWRC is presently using in a good many of these communities.

It is not for me to say, off the top of my head, that we have to finance these payments over the whole province, because it is closely associated with general tax reform. If the communities were relieved of their share of the cost of education or a large part of it, then it might very well be that we could leave at the community level the responsibility to pay for these expensive installations which simply must come about.

But if there is going to be no change in education finance, then surely we must accept this at the provincial level. We had some alternatives. Unfortunately, all of them are expensive and unfortunately one of them must be accepted.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you know of the problems that municipalities face, that individual taxpayers face, that those who are applying for plans of subdivision are facing. We have not seen the answers forthcoming from this administration and we must have some answers.

These particular programmes of abatement —and I am coming to my last point, Mr. Speaker—are only meaningful if they apply throughout the whole Great Lakes system. There is no sense in Ontario undertaking an expensive and expansive programme if pollution from Ohio and Michigan is going to continue unabated. That is why there must be the dependence on an international agreement that will be needed if the Great Lakes basin is going to be saved. With this in mind, I come to my third and last point.

I call on the government to convene a conference to the international joint commission, but under the initiative of Ontario, at which the Premier and the governors of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York can examine the problem of water pollution in the Great Lakes basin; pinpoint pollution responsibilities; co-ordinate the many provincial, state and federal programmes to timetable what must be our top commitment of research and capital costs.

It sounds like an impossible conference to convene. We have had one in the past when the Premier of Ontario was concerned about either high lake levels or low lake levels, I forget which, but under those circumstances he did convene such a conference. We know that political exigencies in the United States are tremendous right now. How are you going to get these Republican and Democratic governors to leave in an election year and sit down and discuss what has got to be one of the biggest problems they face and that we face?

Nevertheless, I believe we must make a start. The Premier will be sympathetic when I say it has got to be done through the international joint commission. I do not believe they have effectively taken the initiative in this sort of work. They have held a number of studies. The government of the United States has taken the lead. The government of the state of New York has had certain researches undertaken. But in Ontario we are the people who stand to lose the most and to gain the most. Such a study can be implemented on a timetable basis which will set goals that we must meet. I have said already it will be expensive, but it is our most important commitment of research and capital cost.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, in rising to enter this debate on pollution I think I am very well able to discuss the matter since I come from a part of this province that has pollution in abundance.

There is no doubt in my mind that the city of Hamilton probably has as much pollution of all three types as any other city in this province and, perhaps, even this country. The Hamilton bay, as was referred to by the leader of the Opposition, is indeed a cesspool. It is almost beyond recall at the present time.

One does not have to be an expert on pollution to drive across the Burlington bay skyway and be overcome with the horrible smell that emits from the Burlington bay or the Hamilton bay, depending on which side you happen to live on; to recognize that we must take some action right away to resolve this filthy mess.

But as one drives in the daytime around the city of Hamilton, you would get the impression that something was being done about the smoke pollution from the many industrial complexes which surround the bay area. It is unfortunate that the majority of people checking into these things do not do their checking at night, because that is the time when the flues are opened, the pipes are cleaned, and the worst pollution is emitted into the air.

I am sure that this takes place not only in the city of Hamilton but also in most industrial areas of this province. I know it does. I would say first off, that we recognize this is not purely a provincial responsibility, that

a great share of the cost, a great share of the administration, a great portion of the work must be done at the federal and international level.

We must have co-operation between all of the provinces and indeed all of the various states and provinces in the North American continent, if we are going to achieve any measure of success. We have had quite a bit of research done into the pollution field, and the only picture that comes through very clearly is that even with all of the research we have still not been able to decide at what level the atmospheric pollution, the water pollution, even the soil pollution, will reach a point at which humans can no longer absorb it.

What I am afraid will happen is that unless we take some action now, we are some day going to find out how much the human can absorb. And when we find this out it will then be too late for us to take the necessary steps to resolve the problem.

In the field of water pollution a great many things can be said and a great many things have been said in the past. The pollution that we have is directly related to the industrial development along the shores of the Great Lakes; it is related directly to the vacation land development that is taking place along the Great Lakes without any kind of control. It is related to the municipalities who for years have been allowing the raw sewage and the semi-raw sewage to drift out into the lakes and to create unsanitary conditions.

The Ontario water resources commission have taken some steps in this direction. They have made attempts, some with success, to put an end to some of this pollution, but the big problem is that they have not taken the very necessary step of insisting on secondary sewage treatment. One way that we could help eliminate the continued erosion of our waters would be if we were to insist in this province on secondary sewage treatment and thereby eliminate by far the greatest portion of raw sewage and semi-raw sewage, and sewage in a state that will influence the calibre and state of the water.

We should be doing this now, and we have not been doing it. In fact, the township that I represent requested permission for a sewage works programme study, and it was turned down by the Ontario water resources commission. It is a very sad thing when the township is prepared and asks for the assistance that will bring about the necessary changes and the Ontario water resources commission does not see fit to assist it along the way.

The Hamilton area, as I said, is one that lends itself well to discussion when we are talking about pollution, because there we have all of the various things—the little red worms that the leader of the Opposition talked about—the Hamilton harbour that some day, I suppose, will wash itself into the lake and create problems for the entire lake area.

We had in the Hamilton area just recently a study which it points out the city itself has been doing a great deal towards polluting the lake, and the only way that this can be stopped is with the assistance of this government. There is no municipality that I know of that has the financial resources to undertake the type of programme that would be necessary to rid itself of the pollution that takes place, and the only way that we will be able to do this is if this government undertakes, if not to do it for them, at least to make available in the form of grants, in the form of subsidies, money to do it. When a municipality, such as Saltfleet township, asks for assistance, it is very necessary that it get the assistance that it asks for.

The pollution, as I said, is a direct result of the society in which we live and the advances that we have made, and we have made many advances. Our affluence which we presently enjoy is a direct result of all of the many industrial advances that have been made, but together with these advances we have been put in a position of having to absorb a lot of the cost, and much of the cost is in pollution of land, air and water.

The largest industrial areas of this country, and you could name them if you wish, are situated right in this province, and therefore it would require the federal government to take a very great interest in providing financial backing to assist these corporations to eliminate, or at least to cut down drastically, the pollution that presently is emitted out of their chimneys and the pollution that they are dumping into the lakes. And they are actually just dumping it—driving it down in trucks and dumping it into the rivers and lakes. It has been seen, it has been photographed, it has been brought to the attention of the various organizations that deal with these things, and the end result is that they get a fine and they continue doing it.

It has been said that Lake Erie is beyond assistance but I do not believe this is true. If this little article that I picked out of one

of the newspapers by a gentleman by the name of Matthew E. Walsh, the chairman of the U.S. section, international joint commission, and his observations are true, it would take us something like 30 years in which to clean it up, but we must start. The fact that it is going to take 30 years should in no way inhibit us from beginning in this great move towards clearing it up, and the start must be made with the sewage that is dumped into the lake continuously. It must be stopped. We must eliminate this flushing out of the great summer resorts continuously into the lake.

There are those who would wonder about the Lake Ontario situation and I was among them. I look at the Lake Ontario situation and I read in the newspapers, as most do, that the centre of the lake is relatively clear but the shoreline is where all of the pollution lies, and it lies there for a very obvious reason. It lies there because, as I said, the municipalities are being allowed to dump this garbage into the lakes. This can be stopped. It can be stopped in a number of ways. We can begin by getting rid of the land fill programmes that are going on in most municipalities, and in particular, the Niagara peninsula, where there is a tendency to fill ravines with garbage and allow the natural fluids that flow from the garbage as it comes under pressure to flow into the lake. We have to eliminate this. We have to pay heed to the warnings that have been brought to our attention by many people, including Allan Prince, who says that unless we take these steps now, even Lake Ontario will be beyond reclaim within ten years.

We have to start now to ensure that every automobile, and this may take five years or ten years even, but we must start now to ensure that every automobile in this province is equipped with the proper exhaust devices that will cut down on the air pollution in the area. We say that while we might do it, others may not, but because others are not prepared to do it, should not in any way preclude us from doing these things.

As you read in the papers you find that more and more people are suffering from lung diseases; more and more people are suffering from respiratory diseases, and most of the problem lies in the air we breathe. It says that the air pollution is directly linked with lung and breathing diseases. The only way that we can resolve these things is with a massive government intervention; is with a regulation that says, regardless, we must stop people from polluting the air and it can only be done if we pass the necessary legislation, and put teeth in it. There have been people who have been fined in the last two or three years, and there have been people who have been fined within the last year for polluting the atmosphere, but the amount of the fine was ridiculous in comparison to the amount of pollution that was being poured into this atmosphere.

What we do not want to see is a repetition of what happened two years ago at the Grey Cup game when we had so much smog in this area that one was unable to see and the end result was that we could not get rid of the pollutants out of the various factories, out of the automobiles, out of the chimneys of homes, into the upper atmosphere, because it could not get through the fog layer. We are always going to get a fog layer but we can cut down on the pollution that is emitted from the chimneys and from the homes and from the automobiles. Thereby, we will be in a position, when a fog does lie over this area, where we are not going to trap all of the gasses and all of the killer smog below it and end up with something similar to what they had in London some years ago.

I asked, two or maybe three weeks ago, whether or not we were prepared to take steps in the field of banning the use of DDT. This is certainly one area where we could take steps to cut down on the amount of land pollution that is taking place. It has been proven, at least to my satisfaction, if not to the satisfaction of the Minister responsible, that DDT is most definitely affecting the lives of people. It is killing off the animal life, it is definitely affecting the soil, and the only way that we can stop this from happening is by banning its use, and it must be done now. We cannot sit back and wait and wait as we have been doing over the last years hoping for some miracle to occur, and knowing that nothing is likely to come.

In the Hamilton area, we are fortunate in having a research centre that is in the process of development, and I hope that some results will be forthcoming from it. A good proportion of it is federal, in fact it is almost entirely federal. I would hope that we would get some results from this, but we could now take steps to stop the pollution.

We could pass legislation that would bring about anti-pollution devices in automobiles. We could make assistance available, whether in the form of grant, or whether in the form of direct subsidy, to any industry that is prepared to undertake now to cut back and eventually stop the pollution of the lakes and

of the air. And we could also quite easily, as I said before, eliminate entirely the pollution in the soil from DDT and from the insecticides that are used.

There are so many areas in pollution that one could talk about. We are fortunate in our party of having people who have specialized in each of the areas, and they will deal in detail with their specialities as the debate progresses. Thank you.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition and the last speaker on this important subject of pollution control. The amendment reads:

> That this House regrets the inadequacy of government policy involving research, regulation, intergovernmental co-operation, and community planning to deal with the growing effects of pollution of the air, water and land of Ontario.

I welcome this opportunity to make some comments with regard to the tremendous strides that have been made in Ontario dealing with the effects of pollution of the air, water and land. My remarks will be confined, in the main, to water, with some reference to air and land.

I must say that I am surprised that the hon. leader of the Opposition would put this motion on the order paper, since year after year I have tried to enlighten him and members of this House regarding the programme that has been carried on by the water resources commission in co-operation with various forms of government and various departments of government. However, since the motion is here, this gives me the opportunity to bring to the attention of the many new members, in the short time that is allotted to me, some of the highlights of the Ontario water resources commission programme.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Lots of enlightenment but no action. All we get is enlightenment.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): The member had better be quiet, he might learn something.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, apparently the hon. member did not listen last year when I recorded where many of these treatment plants were situated. However, I will go on.

For the benefit of new members, let me remind this House that following a survey by a committee appointed by the government, The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act was passed in 1956. The commission was established and given very wide powers under the Act to deal with the problem of supplying adequate quantities of suitable water and to bring pollution under control where pollution might exist. Office space and staff were acquired following the passing of the Act, and policies were developed, and the programme was actually launched in 1957.

The commission was faced with a great challenge. We are all aware that during the war years certain priorities had to be established, and works that might have been built in that period were not built. We are also aware that through the 1930s, under a different government, perhaps there was not enough emphasis placed on pollution control and the provision of adequate supplies of water.

Under the sound policies that were introduced by the Progressive Conservative Party when it assumed office, Ontario developed and expanded at a rate that was not equalled by any province in Canada. Over half of the new Canadians coming to Canada since the end of World War II have established their homes here in Ontario. Half of the new industries coming to Canada have established in Ontario. Many people have flocked to Ontario from other provinces that were not providing the job opportunities that were being provided in Ontario. I am sure the hon. members from the NDP are quite aware that literally thousands of people left Saskatchewan to get out from under the dead hand of socialism and established their homes here in Ontario.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): How about that 23 per cent that earn less than $3,000 per year?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Nixon: This is a good pollution debate.

Mr. Root: Well I see it struck home. Hon. members are quite aware that the thousands of people who came to Ontario were not wrong, they were right.

Ontario population since the early 1940s has grown from around four million to nearly 7.25 million. This great influx of new people, along with new industries, consumed tremendous quantities of water and created a corresponding amount of wastes, and there is no more water available. This is the challenge

that was presented to the OWRC when it was established.

A number of distinguished members of this House have served on the commission, including the Prime Minister, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), and the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). They played a major part in developing the policies that we are following.

Mr. Speaker, it was forcast when the commission was established that it would require something like $2.4 billion over a 20-year period to pick up the backlog of needed works and keep pace with the vibrant economy of the province.

I could advise hon. members of the House that since the commission was established we have issued approval certificates for water and sewage works, having a total estimated value of $1,492,992,387. In addition to these municipal works, industries that do not treat their wastes through the municipal system have spent approximately $127 million. And I might remind the hon. member for the Wentworth area who spoke about Hamilton that Stelco have spent between $6 million and $8 million, and Dofasco has come into the programme with over $4 million for control of industrial waste. In other words, approximately $1,620 million worth of water and sewage works have been approved or built in the province in a little over ten years.

In addition to the works that have been completed, at the present time we have over 200 provincially owned and financed projects in various stages of development or construction, as well as some 53 projects where OWRC is building under agreement with the municipality. A number of area water projects have been developed, such as the Lake Huron water supply system and the Lake Erie water supply system. Another project under development is in the Haileybury-Cobalt area. Agreement has been reached for both water and sewage in the southern part of Peel county, and this project is presently before the OMB. In all, some 15 regional projects have been under discussion and development.

I am sure that hon. members will agree that Ontario can be justly proud of what has been achieved, and hon. members will understand why Ontario is recognized as a leader in the field of pollution control.

Mr. Speaker, I note the reference in the hon. leader of the Opposition's motion regarding research, regulation, intergovernmental co-operation, and community planning. Let me inform the House that on the water resources commission we have a research branch that is constantly making studies to assist us in our programme to develop efficient and economical ways of dealing with pollution. Let me mention a few of the projects that have been dealt with by our research branch:

The radioactive density meter for sewage sludge measurement and control, marine toilet facilities, sludge thickening and primary clarifiers, phosphorus reduction by algal cultures, effluent polishing process evaluation, the effect of algae on gravity fillers, aeration tank diffusion study, catch-basin efficiency evaluation, high rate combined tank activated sludge process, sludge treatment and disposal, control of cladophora, biological reactancerate studies, sub-surface aeration systems, the characteristics of water filtration media, pilot oxidation ditch, farm animal waste disposal, starch waste treatability studies, control of flowing wells, model sewage treatment plant, water treatment sludge disposal, ultraviolet sterilization of potable water supplies. These are some of the studies that are carried out by our research branch.

I might say that we co-operate with other branches of government and with different governments in the field of research, indeed in many areas. For example, we have a liaison committee that works with many of the departments of our own government, such as Education, Family and Social Services, Highways, Agriculture and Food, Trade and Development, Mines, Energy and Resources Management, conservation authorities, Health, Municipal Affairs, Lands and Forests, Public Works, Tourism and Information, the Hydro Electric Power Commission, Transport, and Ontario housing corporation. We are in constant touch with these departments so plans will be co-ordinated.

We are seeking to avoid such problems as having a sewer installed after highways have been built or just prior to highways building a road—in other words, breaking the street up twice. We carry on discussions with Agriculture and Food to develop a means of controlling farm wastes in co-operation with that department. We are working closely with The Department of Mines, and in order to avoid air pollution at times we agree to the deposit of tailings in certain waters, provided there is adequate control of the deposit. With the tailings deposited under water there is no air pollution from the fine dust blowing. We

have a committee that works with the mining people. They are looking at the possibility of vegetation on tailing disposal areas to prevent the fine tailings drying out and polluting the air, and possibly water.

We work with The Departments of Health, Education, and Public Works, to try to avoid finding large institutions being erected in areas where there is not sufficient water or facilities to treat wastes or dilute sewage effluent.

We have carried on discussions with many branches of the provincial government and the federal government. We have developed regulations to control pollution from boats. I might say in this area, the federal government is taking the responsibility for the large boats, and we are developing a programme to control pollution from the small pleasure craft that cruise our waters. I know The Department of Tourism and Information is greatly interested in this programme. The tourist industry can be greatly affected if the waters of our resort areas become polluted. The cottage owners are concerned. Many of them take their water directly from the lake, and they want to know that boats are not discharging raw sewage into their water intakes. At the same time, the boating public wants to be sure that there are adequate facilities to deal with the wastes that they will discharge from their boats. This is a co-operative programme and is moving forward, and will help to improve the condition of the waters in our resort areas.

With regard to intergovernmental co-operation, I might mention that there is a Deputy Ministers' committee on pollution. This committee is chaired by the Deputy Minister of Energy and Resources Management. The water resources commission is represented on this committee by our general manager. Other departments of the Deputy Ministers' committee are from Mines, Health, Lands and Forests, Agriculture and Food, Municipal Affairs, with a representative from the Prime Minister's office. This will indicate that there is complete co-ordination and co-operation in the government regarding the pollution of air, water and land in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I might also mention that we co-operate with the federal government. Hon. members will know that we are carrying out a survey of the five major river systems that are flowing into Hudson and James bays—namely the Severn, Winisk, Attawapiskat, Albany, and Moose. This survey is in co-operation with the federal government.

The Ontario water resources commission works very closely with the international joint commission. I might make some reference to Lake Erie, as to its condition. Contrary to what was read into the record this afternoon, I could tell you that two thirds of all the commercial fish that were taken in Ontario last year were taken from Lake Erie. It is far from a dead lake.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): There are five years left for Lake Erie.

Mr. Root: I would suggest to the member who interjected that he get facts rather than quote from newspaper articles that are reports of statements by ill-informed people.

Both the federal government and the Ontario water resources commission are carrying out surveys on the Great Lakes system. I might say we work in co-operation, through the international joint commission, with people on the other side. We are carrying out a co-operative survey of the Ottawa River with the province of Quebec.

We maintain liaison with the Great Lakes commission which represents the eight states that border on the Great Lakes. We are working together to get a uniform programme. I might say that we also have liaison with Manitoba and the Maritime provinces, and we have many foreign governments coming to the Ontario water resources commission for information and assistance. In other words, the Ontario water resources commission is recognized as a leader in the field of pollution control and the provision of adequate supplies of safe water, and this is recognized all over the world. I might add, we are actively participating in the international hydrologic decade, a world study of water resources.

Mr. Speaker, I note the suggestion in the proposed amendment that there is inadequacy of intergovernmental co-operation and community planning to deal with the effects of pollution of air, water and land of Ontario. Perhaps I should remind hon. members that there is the greatest co-operation between The Department of Municipal Affairs and the Ontario water resources commission with regard to community planning to control pollution of water. I might also add that, in the main, our municipalities are co-operating with the OWRC in its programme to provide adequate supplies of water and to bring pollution under control wherever pollution may exist.

One of the co-operative programmes that is carried out by the planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs is to inquire

of the OWRC whether there is sufficient water in the municipality, whether there is adequate pollution control in the municipality, before they will approve of subdivisions. We on the commission advise the planning branch when there is not sufficient water, when there is not sufficient capacity to treat wastes, or when there is not sufficient stream flow in streams to dilute the sewage effluent after it has been treated. The planning branch, working in co-operation with the commission, has from time to time restricted development when the development might not be related to the available water and facilities to treat sewage wastes and dilute the sewage effluent.

Mr. Speaker, I note the suggestion that there is not enough regulation. I think that I have already indicated that under our Act and under regulations, all municipalities and industries are now required to have their programmes for treating wastes and water approved by our divisions of sanitary engineering and industrial wastes, and in the main, we are having good co-operation from both municipalities and industry. There has been an odd occasion when we have had to issue a report or mandatory order to a municipality. There have been probably something like half a dozen orders in the history of the commission. This has not been necessary, to any degree, since we developed a policy of working in co-operation with the planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs.

With regard to industrial wastes, practically all of the industries are co-operating—many of the industries, as you know, treat through municipal systems—some on staged programmes, but we are getting a great measure of co-operation in bringing pollution under control. When an industry refuses to co-operate we have not hesitated to use the authority under the Act; in fact there were some 13 convictions in the courts for impairing the quality of watercourses in the past year.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The hon. member cannot depart from the prepared text.

Mr. Root: I would say to the hon. member that I am not in the habit, as are some members, of being repetitious. You asked the Minister for an answer, and the answer is in *Hansard*. I am not going to be repetitious.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. members would realize that the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition is really not related to fact. I am sure that the people of Ontario are proud of the fact that the Ontario water resources commission and various departments of government are leaders in the matters of water, air and soil pollution control.

Perhaps hon. members would like to have some idea of where the treatment works that I have mentioned are located. Members are no doubt aware from the comments I have already made that our programme extends from the shores of Hudson bay to the international boundary line of the Great Lakes, from the Manitoba border to the St. Lawrence and Ottawa River valleys. At the present time, we are constructing sewage and water works as far north as Red Lake on the western side of the province and Moosonee on the northwestern side of the province.

Hon members are no doubt aware that we hold public hearings when sewage works are being established to treat the wastes of one municipality in another municipality or where there appears to be opposition to the location of sewage treatment works in a municipality. In 1967, some 48 public hearings were held, and already in 1968 some 32 hearings have been held. The number of hearings that have been held are indicative of the way the programme is developing, and our desire to make people aware of the programme and give them an opportunity to express their views.

Mr. Speaker, in 1967 I asked our staff to prepare for me a summary of where treatment works were located to treat municipal water supplies, municipal waste water, and industrial waste treatment. I asked staff to break this down into the various watersheds.

For the information of members I could tell you that up to February 1967, in the province there was capacity to treat 9.3 million gallons of water a day in the area that drains into Manitoba; 68.7 million gallons of water in the Lake Superior drainage basin; 120 million gallons in the Lake Huron and Georgian Bay drainage basin; 34.5 million gallons in the area that drains into Lake St. Clair; 148.4 million gallons in the area that drains into Lake Erie; 652 million gallons in the area that drains into Lake Ontario; 28.7 million gallons in the area that drains into the St. Lawrence; 27.9 million gallons in the area that drains into Hudson and James Bays, and 118 million gallons in the area that drains into the Ottawa River basin. In other words there was a capacity in the province in February, 1967, to treat 1,208,000,000 gallons of water per day.

With regard to municipal waste treatment, there was capacity to treat 2.7 million gallons in the area draining into Manitoba; 11 million gallons in the area draining into Lake Superior; 48.4 million gallons draining into Lake Huron and Georgian bay; 47.9 million gallons in the area draining into Lake St. Clair; 65 million gallons draining into Lake Erie; 399 million gallons in the area draining into Lake Ontario; 15.6 million gallons draining into the St. Lawrence River basin; 4.1 million gallons into the area of Hudson and James bays; 54.8 million gallons into the Ottawa River, for a total capacity of 649 million gallons of municipal waste water treatment per day in the province.

Looking at industrial wastes, we find that there were industrial waste treatment facilities to treat 41 million gallons a day in the area draining into Manitoba; 141 million gallons in the area draining into Lake Superior; 164 million gallons in the area draining into Lake Huron and Georgian bay; 383 million gallons in the area draining into Lake St. Clair; 54.9 million gallons in the area draining into Lake Erie; 693 million gallons in the area draining into Lake Ontario; 14.4 million gallons in the area draining into the St. Lawrence River; 14.4 million gallons in the area draining into Hudson and James bays, and 21.2 million gallons in the area draining into the Ottawa River, for a total of 1,538,000,000 gallons of industrial waste treatment per day as total capacity.

Mr. Speaker, when you add these three figures together you will find that in the province of Ontario in February of 1967 we had a capacity to treat 3,395.7 million gallons of water, municipal wastes, and industrial wastes. When you add to this figure the many projects that I have already mentioned that are in the mill or that are being developed at the present time, I think you will agree with me that Ontario can be proud of the leadership that they are giving, and the tremendous strides that we have made in all the fields that are mentioned in the hon. leader of the Opposition's resolution.

I think you will agree with me that the leader of the Opposition is completely out of touch with the facts that the government has a sound policy involving research, regulation, intergovernmental co-operation, and community planning to deal with the growing effects of pollution of the air, water and land of Ontario. I am sure that hon. members, if they vote according to conscience, will want to vote unanimously against the proposal of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, in 1956, when I was a member of a municipal council north of this city, we were all delighted to know of the organization of the Ontario water resources commission. To us it sounded from the announcement that it was going to be another Ontario Hydro. It was going to supply an integrated system of water supply, and sewage treatment facilities in all areas of the province that needed them.

In some cases, these would be on package plant and municipal wells bases, but certainly an overall programme of laying out a system would be developed. Those of us in investment industry suggested—but understood that it was not the wish of the government—that the water resources commission be set up with the same type of financing base, an independent base, as Ontario Hydro. It could then go forward quickly to promote and construct a well integrated system to avoid pollution throughout this province and to provide its citizens with adequate supplies of water at all times of the year.

Eleven years later I am very disappointed with the results. Although there has been $1.4 billion spent directly or indirectly during this 11-year period, a great deal of it has not been spent in any different manner than it would have been had there been no Ontario water resources commission.

The only project that has been completed is the Lake Huron pipeline, which was completed last year with an initial capacity, a very substantial one, of around 15 million gallons per day. It can go up to a good deal more than that, once all pumps and other parts of the system are completed. But it still took 11 years to complete this project, and it was a very, very poor example of government getting a job done that is greatly needed, and it has only then been done to serve a very limited portion of the province.

We have had for many years discussions in the Brampton area regarding sewage facilities, but they still are not under way. It has been blocked by bickering between municipalities and the commission. It seems to me, that the commission has failed to act in a way that you would expect a provincial body would. Ontario Hydro did not wait until it had agreements with each municipality before it went ahead with the provincially integrated system of supplying hydro to this province.

For example, north of Toronto the piecemeal approach of the Ontario water resources

commission is shown by the type of project they have put in up there. They have helped us drill more wells in Richmond Hill—which are now going dry in the summer. In Markham township, we are not sure that our well supply will be adequate for this coming year. Thornhill, Kleinburg—all these areas are on wells, not pipelines. Our sewage treatment facilities are overloaded. Plants that were put in almost entirely after the inauguration of the Ontario water resources commission are not on an integrated basis according to the drainage basin, but are based upon municipal boundaries. Surely this commission should have been going forward and treating this matter of water supply and sewage treatment on a regional basis—water supply which would not cause a lowering of water tables and danger of increased pollution in our creeks, and sewage treatment which would mean that plants were not being overloaded and could adequately treat the sewage that was being put into them.

Surely, we could expect that from a commission which has been in operation during most of the period when the development in these areas has been going forward. But no, they have not. They have done nothing but stop residential development from proceeding because they say the municipalities have not yet agreed, among themselves, as to how they will deal with the problem. This is not a situation which should be left to the municipalities to work out among themselves. This is where the province should be stepping in and doing the job, knowing that they have the power to insist upon proper pollution control, and insist upon the proper availability of services in any development. And therefore, they could ensure that as the development proceeded, there would be adequate usage of these facilities.

As a result, they have also prevented further development on septic tanks, even in areas where the land is quite suitable for septic tanks. There are many parts of this province where even on one acre or two acre lots, septic tanks would not be advisable. But in other areas you could go forward on much smaller lots and have adequate pollution control. This scarcity of serviced lots has caused a tremendous shortage and permitted those owning these lots to ask prices far beyond the proper value, and helped drive up, very substantially, the cost of housing—an unnecessary, high cost to the people of this province and, at the same time, not contributing one extra dime to the solution of the problem. The only solution is that which can be provided through properly integrated and well developed plants on a regional basis.

Finally now, the Ontario water resources commission is going forward in proposing a plan for the whole region north of Toronto; a plan which will carry, through a very large trunk, untreated sewage, 30 to 35 miles, by which time it may not be possible to treat it adequately.

The very high cost. They fail to realize that sewage must be treated, according to elevation and the drainage basin—and it would be much cheaper to put the treated effluent of that sewage through high pressure lines into the lake rather than carry untreated sewage all across the north of this city. They could then take it down a valley, via high pressure steel pipelines, to the lake, and still treat the untreated sewage according to the natural drainage basins of the area where development would take place.

There is another great opportunity for the Ontario water resources commission in the areas beyond Toronto. The Premier spoke, last fall, of satellite cities within a fair distance, but not too great a distance, of Toronto. The development of these cities would certainly be very feasible, and could be developed well, if the water resources commission puts in its facilities without worrying about back to back contracts, as we call it in industry, to ensure every penny is received from the municipalities to cover the exact cost.

These latter are the agreements which take a long time to work out. It is because of these agreements that it has taken years for London to get its pipeline, and taken years for Brampton to hope to get its sewage treatment. Work out a proposal which will provide proper sewage treatment facilities for a good size area, a desirable city size, in these satellite areas and then, we can economically give other incentives, including transportation via GO transit and educational grant incentives to get these areas developed and take the stress away from the demand on lots around this city.

It is this tremendous demand—the excess of demand over supply of lots—that has driven our land prices, in Toronto, to the highest on the continent. It has not helped us one little bit toward being able to divert land speculation money into a much more useful economic end.

In the construction of the London pipeline, for example, the commission used the old, standard, pre-stressed concrete pipe, instead

of using modern high pressure inside treated steel pipe which can be much more quickly laid; a matter of several miles a day—instead of painstakingly going along with 16-foot sections of 48-inch concrete pipe; and would not only be cheaper and faster to build, but would be able to provide these pipeline facilities much more rapidly to the various parts of the province, where the water table is a problem.

In our own area, the water is still coming from water wells, and the water table is lower now than it was when the water resources commission started. Our stream flows are worse now than they were 12 years ago. We did have, I think, reasonable expectations that with this new provincial commission, we would see the end of the problem of lower water tables caused by wells and the increased pollution from these little package plants. But we still do not have them.

So, in conclusion, I would like to hope that this entire water resources commission would be revitalized; that it would go after its own basic financing plan and programme of an integrated supply of water and integrated sewage treatment plants throughout the province, the areas in which the province foresees development; that it will move ahead with modern-type facilities, including the use of new techniques of pipeline laying which can be done so quickly; that they do not take 11 years; that they would take less than 11 months. In some cases 11 weeks for a 30 mile line would be quite easy for them. Take a new approach to provincial planning so that we—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): I wonder what engineer has been preparing that stuff for him.

Mr. Deacon: So that we can greatly increase the availability of serviced lots in this province to reduce the cost of land. So we can cut out these overloaded sewage treatment plants which they have continued to encourage and build on a piecemeal municipal basis, instead of working on a regional basis with municipalities. Cut out the necessity for all these little hearings that upset people because of the very great increase in their costs of water under the programmes of the commission that would not be necessary if these were properly sized, and properly developed, on a provincial planning basis.

Let us put Ontario in a position to eliminate a lot of this pollution, Mr. Speaker. Give us a good supply of water in areas of the province that need it. We do not have to read about dry taps in summers. A properly integrated programme of development can then be carried out on a sensible basis.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this amendment, I would first like to express my disappointment that the government, in their defence through the member for Wellington-Dufferin, have listed the large gallonage of treated sewage that is dumped into our lakes, but, have completely ignored the billions of gallons of untreated sewage that is polluting our lakes and rivers. This is what they should be concerned with, not with the portion that has been treated for many years. I would have hoped for a more responsible approach.

However, the item which I wish to discuss today is one which I do not believe has been discussed at any time in this House in connection with air pollution, and this is a new form of air pollution which we have not, as yet, been affected with but which, beginning next year, we are going to suffer with. And this, is air pollution caused by the noise of the new supersonic jets and the sonic booms which they will produce.

An international congress was held in London, England, some two weeks ago, to consider this problem, which is just beginning to be felt in Europe and in the United States, and which is going to begin affecting us next year, and at that congress, on May 18, a resolution was passed urging government to prohibit supersonic flights over their territories. Now, this was the fifth international congress for noise abatement.

Speaking realistically, we realize that we cannot prohibit such flights because they must occur, and progress must go on. But something has to be done for the people who are going to be affected.

John Connell, the chairman and founder of Great Britain's society re noise abatement, urged this action because of the physical and mental disturbance such flights do cause. Now Dr. Charles Waxstein, of Dartmouth College, reporting on this problem at the congress, said that 150 million American urban dwellers are subjected to annoying noise levels in their homes on account of traffic, including air traffic. He warned that overland flights of the projected supersonic transports could expose 51 million people to an average of 15 sonic booms daily, and he estimates annual damage to homes of about $100 million, mostly to windows and plaster.

If we try to put this into the Canadian surroundings, it means that some 5 million

people in Canada are going to be subject to something like 1.5 sonic booms a day, with damage of some $10 million yearly.

Now, this is a problem that has not been considered by government, at any level, and I would strongly urge the government that the time to do something about that is now, before the problem is upon us.

Now, suggestions were made at this congress for improving the air noise problems, and for preventing the difficulties that are going to occur, and for compensation for those people living near international airports, such as Malton, who are going to be affected no matter what is done. They suggested creation of a subcommittee of international experts, to formulate a uniform code to curb commercial aircraft noise at major airports, and to propose acceptable noise levels. They deplored the increasing assault of noise pollution on the human ear. They pleaded for quieter aircraft, better insulation in the new buildings—and let me stress that—mufflers in construction equipment—and finally and most important, more governmental control action.

Now, in the United States there is a department of housing and urban development, headed by a Mr. Charles Harr who is the assistant secretary. He made a number of suggestions to control this situation, and he summed up the nature of the damages, and the inequities stemming directly from airport noise pollution, with five points:

1. Aircraft noise seriously affects property values and the health and well-being of those exposed to it—and I would like to add here particularly, hearing. The supersonic booms and aircraft noise in general are a definite hazard to the hearing of those living around the airports.

2. The noise damages are rarely recoverable in courts.

3. With rare exceptions the courts have left the burden of property damage where it falls, on the property owner.

4. Property owners have been compelled to pay for something they may never use, that is air travel.

5. The changing levels of noise volume and the number of flights make damages difficult to assess.

He suggested that we require laws in all the jurisdictions so affected—and may I say that Toronto is particularly affected—to protect the rights of property owners and to make the air transport industry fully aware of the cost of noise. The transient nature of airport noise level, he said, suggested a leasing system that would provide equitable means of recognizing accurately the extent of damage suffered for a given time, and instead of a permanent right to make noise at a level prevailing at the time of proceeding, the airport would lease the right to make noise for a stated period of time, perhaps two or three years. Then if new planes come in and there is more and more noise, they would have to pay at a higher rate. At the expiration of the lease period the property owner would be required to prove loss in value suffered due to noise, and by settling claims at the expiration of a period it would be easier to determine accurately the amount of damage, taking into account the change in noise level, up or down, that might have occurred.

They have done a study around one of the cities in the United States to show just how many people are affected. They used Los Angeles, and they found that around the Los Angeles international airport, which is very comparable to Malton international airport, the number of homes affected was 47,000—that is seriously affected by the noise level—33 public schools, a score or more of churches, three hospitals and a college.

A similar study around Kennedy airport showed comparable figures because of the slightly smaller volume this one was about two-thirds of the Los Angeles figures.

I would like to suggest to the government —and this is an area which has not been touched as yet in Ontario, has not been looked at—we are going to have this problem upon us with a bang, if I may use the term, beginning next year with the first flight of the supersonic aircraft. I would suggest very strongly that now, before the problem has already gone too far, as it has in other aspects of air pollution and water pollution, you assign someone in your department—in the department that controls air pollution—to look into this study, make suggestions, pass the necessary laws, so that once again we do not have a problem which has come upon us and we are not capable of handling it.

Mr. Speaker: Is the member for Muskoka going to engage in the debate? The member is next on my list.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, so far this afternoon there has been very little reference to one of the subjects mentioned in the leader of the Opposition's motion, and that is the matter of clean air, although there have been several references during

the session to this subject. When this matter is discussed, Metro Toronto in particular is referred to although the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) has also spoken of his city and referred to coal-burning electric generating stations. Some hon. members have been indicating that these stations are in some measure responsible for air pollution difficulties in the municipalities concerned.

On Friday afternoon we were debating here a matter having to do with air pollution, and one of the members of the Liberal Party who took part in that debate spoke about Metro Toronto—after all it was the area from which he came—and he mentioned that a study of Metro Toronto has shown that one third of air pollution in this city comes from combustion and fuel-burning equipment, one third from automobiles, buses and trucks, and one third from industrial plants.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Tell us how the Hydro pollutes.

Mr. Boyer: May I take the time to deal with that. It is in the last third that the Ontario Hydro contributes a portion of the pollutants to the air, and Mr. Speaker, it is my wish this afternoon, although no one else in the debate so far has mentioned this matter, to speak about Ontario Hydro's contributions to the clean air programme in this province.

I would like to make note of a speech earlier in this session by the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. MacKenzie) in which he made reference—although perhaps it was indirectly—to the contribution that electric heating of homes and buildings makes to the cause of pure air in this province. This is quite often a matter which is not mentioned and which deserves greater attention.

I want to assure this House that Ontario Hydro is by no means indifferent to the health of the people of the province and is ready to adopt every proven means which will ensure cleaner air.

I give as positive proof of Hydro' concern for clean air, around its thermal-electric plants in particular, the expenditure of $33 million arealy committed for air quality control at its coal-burning generating stations. Hydro does not deny that its coal-burning stations contribute to air pollution, nor has it ever attempted to do so. Long before air quality control regulations were anywhere near as stringent as they are today, the commission was striving for clean air around its thermal installations.

There is no known way in which the large quantities of coal these plants consume can be burned without discharging some impurities into the air. Hydro's efforts to control air pollution go back, however, more than 15 years, to the start of construction of its first large coal-burning station, and in that decade and a half its committed expenditure for air quality control has reached the $33 million figure which I have already mentioned.

As part of its air quality control programme, the commission has installed, or is installing, in its coal-burning stations, equipment desiged to remove up to 99.5 per cent of the fly ash before it reaches the chimneys —that is the solid matter which is one of the two main pollutants. The other — sulphur dioxide—is a different problem. To date, no satisfactory, practicable method of controlling emissions of this pollutant, which is a gas, has yet been developed, in spite of intensive research in Britain, the United States, Germany, Japan, and elsewhere. All concerned are most expectant that this continuing search for a solution will soon be successful.

The judgment of technical men in the utility industry the world over is, however, that the problem of sulphur dioxide emissions still is best handled by dispersal of the hot gases from tall chimneys high into the upper atmosphere. This is the principle followed by Hydro. And, as a further insurance against SO_2, Hydro uses the lowest sulphur-content coal available on a long-term contract basis. This has averaged slightly over 2 per cent during the past several years. During adverse weather conditions coal containing only around 1 per cent sulphur content is burned to further reduce SO_2 emissions.

Mr. Speaker, at this moment, may I refer to page 2370 of this year's *Hansard,* when the hon. member for Sarnia was speaking and he used these words—which I did not notice at the time, or I would have commented upon them:

> Here we are entering into contracts, as the hon. member for Muskoka says, to buy the lowest sulphur-content type of fuels at the highest economic feasibility. Right. Now those last words are scurrilous words, because it is like calling black white. We are saying in effect that we want to buy the lowest content fuel but the economic context of things must be overriding and this is the thing that has caused me some polarization of thought and respect to it.

Mr. Speaker, just for the record, I want to say that I never referred to "the highest economic feasibility" with respect to the purchases of low sulphur-content fuel. What I did say on that same occasion was that Hydro used the lowest sulphur-content coal available

on a long term contract basis. The sulphur content is as I have already described.

In addition to all other precautions Hydro is taking to safeguard the quality of air around its thermal plants, extensive air-quality surveys are conducted in co-operation with other organizations in the plant areas. A task force of experts on a technical pollution committee brings its collective skill and knowledge to bear on air pollution problems. In the light of such control measures, I assert that Ontario Hydro is endeavouring to lead the way in the battle against air pollution. Hydro shall continue in its efforts to be a good corporate citizen, and neighbour, and continue to improve upon the situation where its thermal stations are concerned.

In keeping with the province's desire to accelerate programmes to improve air quality, and as an important research project, earlier this year Stone and Webster, a firm of engineering consultants, was retained by Ontario Hydro to study the air quality control operation of the Richard L. Hearn plant on the Toronto waterfront. Among the many items being studied are: (1) the degree of pollution caused by the consumption of different types of fuels; (2) chimneys; (3) the installation of additional precipitating equipment; (4) the feasibility of adopting processes and devices for the removal of chemical pollutants, and other problems. It is expected the firm's report will be completed in the very near future.

When the Hearn plant was built 16 years ago, neither the effectiveness of control equipment nor the standards established for the operation of thermal stations were developed to the point that they are today, as I suggested earlier. Hydro is continually upgrading equipment at the Hearn plant, and to date has spent $10 million for air quality control at this station.

The advent of the giant thermal station is changing the pattern of power production in Ontario. By 1970, the commission's total thermal-electric capacity—both coal-burning and nuclear—will be greater than its water-power resources for the first time. And the emergence of thermal-electric generation creates yet another need for great quantities of water in the production of electric energy for the province's consumers. This need lies in the area of cooling water for condensing steam into water for reheat purposes.

Use of large quantities of water for cooling purposes has raised the question of possible pollution of lakes and rivers where the commission's thermal stations are, or will be located. In reply, let me first say that exhaustive studies are carried out in advance in the vicinity of all proposed sites, with the view to obtaining the coldest water possible and returning it to its source in such a manner that it mixes in quickly. These studies determine the relative locations of the plant's intake and discharge channels.

Water used for cooling purposes is screened as it passes through these stations, and if necessary, chlorinated to maintain cleanliness in the system. The result is that the water, although slightly warmer, is actually of higher quality when it is returned to the source than when it was extracted.

I might also point out that cooling water is exactly what the name implies. It is used for cooling purposes only and not for the production of steam. Steam cycle water is used over and over again, while cooling water is used only once—in a straight-through process. It simply does not qualify for the description given, I think three times in this House this session by the hon. member for High Park, of being "superheated and de-oxygenated." It is definitely not applicable!

Mr. Nixon: Is the member for High Park wrong when he states that it is polluting water?

Mr. Boyer: Oh, yes, he is quite wrong. I reject completely the statements that he has made.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment refers to inter-government, interdepartmental relationships, and I would like to speak for a few moments on this with respect to these matters. As in all matters of this nature, Ontario Hydro works closely with the government departments concerned. In co-operation with the fish and wildlife branch of The Department of Lands and Forests, and the biology and water quality surveys branches and the industrial wastes division of the Ontario water resources commission, Hydro is engaged in a comprehensive programme of study of the long-term effects which its thermal generating stations have on the biology and marine life of the surounding area. This programme is of great asistance in the design of various facets of water handling and condenser systems at Hydro's thermal plants—and in other research work.

In closing I can asure you that Hydro's engineers will take advantage of every modern technological advance to control air pollution. They will be supported by the commissioners and by the government, and I trust that all programmes now in hand or to

be undertaken in the interests of clear air will have the support of the electrical customers of the province.

Thank you very much.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to rise and support the motion of my hon. leader, and to add to what has already been stated by him. The hon. leader of the Opposition has spoken to this House about pollution in general and I shall be addressing myself to the problem of sound, or noise, pollution in particular.

Before doing so, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that pollution, especially water pollution, is not something that has just been sprung on this innocent government in the last few years, or indeed in the last quarter century. It is something that has been with us for at least 150 years. To stress this I would like to read hon. members a poem. About 150 years ago, the poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge wrote this poem as a special comment of the day:

In Köln, a town of monks and bones
And pavements fanged with murderous stones,
And rags and hags and hideous wenches,
I counted two and seventy stenches,
All well defined, and several stinks.

Ye nympths that reign o'er sewers and sinks,
The river Rhine it is well known
Doth wash your city of Cologne,
But tell me, nymphs, what power divine
Shall henceforth wash the river Rhine?

Today I wish to restrict my remarks to another form of pollution, not as deadly perhaps, but nevertheless extremely harmful. I refer to noise pollution. It has been estimated, Mr. Speaker, that between 2 and 20 per cent of the population are especially susceptible to hearing loss from noise, although there is no way to predict who falls into this susceptible group. Dr. Keith Neeley, the head of the sensory capability section of the defence research establishment at Downsview, said recently when speaking to a course in audiology at the Toronto General hospital, that one out of every ten Canadians has already acquired some kind of hearing damage.

Very few people realize that their hearing is being impaired or damaged by noise. Noise destroys, first, hearing in the high frequency range. Since this seldom affects the understanding of conversation, the loss is not noticed by the person. It is only when the continued exposure to noise begins to destroy hearing in the lower frequency ranges and the person has trouble understanding normal conversations that he realizes something is wrong.

Dr. Neeley points out that noise levels in major cities frequently rise above 85 decibels, which can damage hearing if you are exposed to it for more than four hours per day. In industrial plants, noise levels often exceed 100 decibels and exposure to noise levels from 100 to 130 decibels can permanently damage your hearing.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that a noise level of 130 decibels is about the intensity of sound if you happen to be standing beside an idling jet airliner.

How many thousands of workers in Ontario have been deafened or partially deafened through their employment. Without knowing that it was as a result of their employment? We can only guess at the number. It is almost certain, however, that they would be denied workmen's compensation if they applied.

All about us we have noise, and the strange thing is that few seem to notice and still fewer seem to care. There are recommendations which can be positively made to combat this menace. Some of them are as follows:

1. All factories should test the level of noise exposure for employees around machines.

2. Persons required to work more than four hours in a noise area of 85 to 100 decibels should be required to wear some form of ear plugs or ear muffs.

3. Persons required to work in noise areas of 100 to 130 decibels should wear plugs or muffs for any exposure.

4. From 130 to 150 decibels, we should have workers in some form of an isolation booth, which is soundproof.

5. Plants should be encouraged to promote sound conditioning to keep the decibel level below 85. Sound absorbers such as carpeting, drapes and acoustical tile will help, but more important, steps must be taken to regulate machinery manufacturing to that sound so that it is deadened at its source.

6. Measures must be taken to provide province-wide control of automobile and motorbike and truck noise in an effort to reduce this noise.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that public awareness to air and water pollution is increasing. We must also be aware of the pollution to land, and problems immediately arise concerning the present situation with respect to the "no-return" glass beverage

bottles. Roadsides and recreation areas are being littered with these items. Without the saving grace of a deposit, even the small children at public parks whose very feet will be cut by these broken bottles, have no incentive to collect and return them to stores and refreshment booths in order to obtain an ice cream bar or other treat from the proceeds.

Unsightly and dangerous conditions are being created. There are public values here which may well overcome the inexpensive use of these bottles. It may well be in the public interest to discuss this whole problem with manufacturers, distributors and merchants to find the best solution to it. I understand that the good roads association and various municipal councils including, I might add, that of the city of Kitchener, favour development of legislation to control these "no-return" disposable glass bottles.

Much has been said today to show the growth of polluted areas in Ontario. By air, by water, by noise and by land, we are all fouling our society. The growth of the city of Kitchener and of the whole of the area known as the golden triangle, has brought with it some serious problems of pollution. In years past, all of our citizens were happy to see factory smokestacks belching forth because this showed a busy and prosperous economy. Our points of view are now changing and we see that other balancing factors exist which must lead us to control pollution for the long-term benefit to our entire environment.

The city of Kitchener has been actively aware of the air pollution threat for some time. Since 1962 a pollution recording device has been operating to record the number of micrograms of pollution per cubic metre of air. Regrettably, it will not be until 1969 that we will receive a district air pollution station.

Mr. Speaker, there appear to be no generally recognized standards in Canada of what is an accepted pollution level. However, there are several Ontario cities, notably Windsor, Toronto and at times Oshawa and Hamilton, which exceed dustfall levels that are regarded as excessive by United States public health authorities. There is an uncomfortable feeling among our populace that the air and water are daily being polluted by potentially lethal chemical wastes.

Ever since the planet was formed, nature has polluted the atmosphere with dust and the rivers with pollen—the so-called natural pollutants. However, nature has also devised ways of cleansing these natural pollutants. When man began treading the earth, a different type of pollution developed. This similarly was easily managed because the population was small and there was no industrial pollution of any consequence until about 100 years ago.

Pollutants now have overcome nature's own ability to clean its own water, air and soil. It some areas of the world crisis proportions have already been reached. Air pollution represents monetary expense to every citizen. The annual cost in the United States alone is estimated to be $11 billion, three times the budget of this province for the current year.

Air pollutants tarnish paint, disintegrate nylon stockings, eat away historic buildings, abrade, corrode, crack and weaken materials of any description. Steel corrodes from two to four times as fast in urban and industrialized areas as in rural areas. Corrosion of stone buildings and statues is greatly speeded by the high concentration of sulphur fumes in the air resulting from the burning of coal and oil fuels.

We are gradually losing our fresh air, streams, rivers and soil. Although economic prosperity has importance in an industrialized nation, it should not have the premium position ahead of the citizens' health, the citizens' water and the citizens' air.

Besides research to prevent the problem, money is needed to aid in developing more effective anti-pollution techniques. Newer fuels can be used that produce far less pollutants than the present fossil-type fuels. Chimneys can be filtered so that particular smoke is reduced. Open burning of waste products should be eliminated. Automobile engines and anti-exhaust devices can be made much more effective.

In the United States this year, stringent regulations will apply to all automobile engines and their exhaust systems. The drafting of impartial rules and the establishment of sound standards by this government is long overlue and, Mr. Speaker, in this important area this government has failed.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, we witnessed over the past few years a growing concern over the pollution of our waters, land and air in this province, and this concern is certainly to be expected.

After all, these three natural resources are vital to our health and wellbeing. They are essential to life, whether it be animal, plant or human. It is a fact that pollution of even one of these three essential resources can be a threat to our very existence. That is why I am certain that the hon. members of this House agree with any measure possible that must be taken to safeguard these vital resources.

We are a prosperous province, a province that is experiencing tremendous growth and development in every respect. However, with this growth and with this development there is an ever increasing amount of waste; waste that must be disposed of, or it will destroy our waters, pollute our lands, and make the air unfit to breathe. This is no idle threat. We have seen with our own eyes what this waste can do to our water and air if it is permitted.

However, I am sure, as undoubtedly the hon. members of the Opposition are, that the intention and purpose of this government is to introduce legislation designed to keep pollution at not only a safe level, but a level that would be greatly reduced. There is every indication from what I have found in the very short time that I have had the honour of being a member of this Legislature that great measures have been taken, and new ones are being designed to bring this about.

The government of this province has always considered the matter of pollution to be a matter of the highest priority, Mr. Speaker.

Pollution has been continuously under the watchful eyes of our Department of Health. And within the last 11 years it has become a prime responsibility of the Ontario water resources commission.

These and other governmental departments work in close co-operation towards the prime objective of not only being able to control pollution, but to bring about a reduction, and these departments all work in close co-operation with the municipalities in the province towards this particular goal.

For example, Mr. Speaker, I was interested to find out that as long as 20 years ago, The Department of Municipal Affairs got together with The Department of Health to establish lot size standards for this province. These standards have been reviewed on a number of occasions, and revised when necessary, so that they would be in step with the times, so that they would help, among other things, to avoid the pollution of land and water where spetic tank systems are required.

There is a great deal of so-called inter-departmental co-operation between the departments on all general questions relating to water and land pollution. And there are numerous consultations to deal with soil qualities, capacities of lakes and rivers to absorb effluent control of lot sizes, new methods of disposing of domestic waste, and so on.

For example, when a municipality makes application for approval of a subdivision, or an official plan, The Department of Health, the Ontario water resources commission, and The Department of Municipal Affairs must carry on extensive and exhaustive investigations to conclude that among other things there will be no problems of pollution—no hazards to the health of the citizens of our province.

This particular area of control is important in the vacation lands of our province, as well as to the more highly developed urban areas of Ontario. Without stringent control on the use of land and lot sizes, or without zoning and subdivision control, many of our fine cottage areas could very easily become heavily polluted, and soon the fine crystal clear lakes and streams could become murky, with adverse effects on plant life and such recreational pursuits as swimming, boating and water skiing.

The Department of Municipal Affairs does not confine its responsibility to vacation areas alone. I have been interested to know that it provides advice to planning boards of municipal councils across our province on planning techniques and standards with consistent concern for prevention of pollution.

I am told, Mr. Speaker, that this department has exercised a great deal of firmness where it has found that municipal development, policies and regulations are inadequate or even non-existent, and where danger of pollution is evident. In some instances, it has even gone as far as to impose partial moratorium on development until policies and regulations of the municipality concerned are brought up to acceptable standards.

As I mentioned before, the burden of pollution control lies heavily on the shoulders of the municipalities as well. I, for example, come from one of the great industrial cities of North America where water and air pollution have always been of great concern. One point on this subject comes to mind. In a specific area near where I live, on Hamilton

mountain, we were faced with a serious pollution situation. We had the dumping of garbage in a large land-fill area which caused pollution of a creek that spread polluted waters across the east end of the mountain and the city below. Measures had been taken, and are being taken to remedy this situation by the municipality, the city of Hamilton.

The provincial government, through The Department of Municipal Affairs, puts great stress on the fact that municipalities within this province must provide sound regulations on zoning which, among other things, would help to control pollution, especially in areas where water and sewers are not available. To bolster the effect of its policy in this respect, the department has adopted a policy on urban development in rural areas which is specifically designed to discourage scattered haphazard urban development in rural parts of this province.

While I am still on the subject of pollution control, I think it is interesting to note that every effort is being made by people of this department to keep up with the new developments on pollution control. Its members take active part on committees dealing with pollution, and the Deputy Minister of the department is a member of the advisory committee on pollution control.

This war on pollution has become so important and so vital that every avenue is being investigated. Every step is being taken in an all out effort to overcome the threats and the problems caused by pollutants.

Sir, I think all the hon. members should be heartened by the negotiations that are, for example, underway at this very time with a university in this province of Ontario for the understanding of a study. This study is to deal with the capacity of lakes and other bodies of water to accommodate various uses such as summer cottages, urban development, boating, fishing and swimming without lowering acceptable levels of water quality. The study would also deal with wildlife protection, water safety and aesthetics.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that through the continued perseverance of this government, the pollution of our water, land and air will not only be controlled, but shall in actual fact be reduced. Our objective is to effect a reduction, and that is what we shall do. Therefore, I intend to vote against this proposed amendment.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I spoke at considerable length on March 12 on air pollution. This afternoon I shall try to be brief and avoid repetition.

After the ERCO affair broke last October, there was considerable public indignation in the Windsor area about the air pollution from Ecorse-Zug Island complex, on the Michigan side of the Detroit River. But all that happened from the direction of government was a newspaper picture in the Windsor *Star* of a representative of the international joint commission examining a possible site for one of five new sampling stations.

An accompanying article said:

> The 20 Windsor area sampling stations —there were already 15—will collect data on local air pollution conditions for a two year period, forming the basis for recommendations on what can be done to improve the situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if *Maclean's* magazine ever runs a contest for the most typically, bureaucratic governmental announcement, I intend to enter that one and win the first prize. Just imagine, there have been 15 stations there for many years. They add five more! Why? To spend two more years collecting data. Why? To form a basis, just a basis, mind you, for recommendations; not decisive action, but cautious, polite recommendations. And about what? About what can be done—not what must be done or should be done or shall be done, but just what can be done to improve this situation; not to eliminate it, just to improve it.

It leads one to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the international joint commission intends to perpetuate itself. A commission on a matter of this urgency should be set up for a limited time and paid well if it succeeds and paid poorly and dismissed if it does not. Just like many employees in the work-a-day world.

The international joint commission should produce results instead of reports. It should clear up the air or clear out and let someone else do the job.

What are these sampling stations sampling? It is my understanding that the number one pollutant, sulphur dioxide, is being measured. But are they measuring the fluorides which are rated by various experts as the second or third worst pollutants? As far as I can discover they are not. I should be glad to have the Minister correct me if they are measuring the fluoride emissions that are drifting over Windsor, LaSalle, River Canard and the rest of Essex county. There is absolutely no doubt that large amounts of fluoride, in both solid and gaseous form are being thrown into the

air by the open hearth furnaces and the steel mills of Zug Island. The question is how much, and how dangerous to our health?

A few years ago a mysterious pitting of car windshields occurred in Windsor, suggesting an unusually strong concentration of hydrogen fluoride in the air. When between nine and 17 persons were found to be suffering from fluorosis because of air pollution in the Port Maitland area it should have become a matter of great concern to the provincial government to measure fluoride emissions from Zug Island, to persuade our federal government to set national acceptable safe standards for emissions, and to pass the necessary reciprocal legislation with the United States that would enable, and in fact obligate, Washington to crack down on Zug Island for the benefit of the people of Essex county in particular and for the benefit of Canadians in general.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago my family and I saw a movie called "The Bible" in our local theatre. In Genesis, chapter 3, verse 6, it says:

> Where in the Garden of Eden when Eve and Adam had eaten the fruit from the tree of knowledge and of good and evil, the core was dropped to the ground, rolled into the river, so began the pollution of our waters.

The province of Ontario is surrounded by immense natural wealth—the largest supply of fresh water possessed by mankind. Almost 10 per cent of the population of the United States lives in counties bordering the Great Lakes. Almost 35 per cent of the total population of Canada lives in Ontario and its Great Lakes regions. Many of them take their drinking water from the lakes. Industries use enormous amounts of the water and others find their livelihood in recreation.

In Ontario, with all this glorious wealth, we live in a threatened society. The pollution of our water and air that we drink and breathe is, I believe more a threat to our health and welfare than the atomic bomb. Mr. Speaker, this problem was recognized some 59 years ago under The Boundary Water Treaty Act of 1909, which prohibits pollution in Canada or the United States to the injury of health or property.

The international joint commission completed its three-year study report on March 8, 1961, titled "the pollution of boundary waters." For the purpose of the report, it was deemed advisable and sufficient to confine these studies to the St. Clair, Detroit and Niagara Rivers and the Great Lakes. In certain portions of the Great Lakes and in all the connecting waterways serious pollution was shown to exist. The St. Clair River was included in the studies as a case of less serious pollution. Lake St. Clair was found to be moderately polluted by shipping.

The waters of Rainy Lake showed a minor but quite unexpected pollution. The river itself showed the effects of pollution from Fort Frances and International Falls. This pollution remains practically constant throughout the length of the river. Water of the Lake of the Woods and Lake Superior showed extensive pollution in Thunder Bay region especially in the areas of Port Arthur and Fort William.

The Detroit River was polluted with a coliform count ranging from 2,000 to 65,000. The western end of Lake Erie was found to be so noticeably affected by pollution entering by the Detroit River as to be unsafe for use on steamers. The waters of the Niagara River were studied extensively, with a mean seasonal average of coliform count of 4,250. The pollution of the Niagara River was found to extend into Lake Ontario ten to 16 miles from the river's mouth.

The lower end of Lake Ontario was found to be almost sterile before the season of navigation. The Kingston waterfront was found seriously polluted. Minor and intermittent pollution was observed about the Thousand Islands, rendering the waters unsafe for local domestic consumption at these points. Pollution by steamboats was shown to be a distinct source of pollution and they must be looked upon as moving sewer outlets travelling our waterways.

So much for the warnings of the past but what of today and of tomorrow? Today, our waterways are overcharged with offal, pesticides, acid mine drainage, wood fibres, detergent wastes and ravaging chemicals which are not only destructive in themselves but which, combined in water, form new chemicals whose effect on human beings is even unknown.

Lake Erie is already well on the way towards becoming a septic tank of soiled water, incapable of supporting any marine life. This is not too loathsome to life for those that are not too loathsome to live in sludge. Lake Erie is charged with untreated human and industrial wastes. Feeding an overgrowth of algae with added nutrients in the water, speeds aging. The United States federal water pollution experts

issued a report in 1965 describing Lake Erie as almost a dead body of water. In Lake Erie, sporting fish like blue pike, whitefish and sturgeon have disappeard, ruining the lake for commercial fish. Studies have shown that sludge worms are a sure indicator of pollution and have multiplied enormously.

In their latest report in 1968, Lake Michigan is now headed toward the same fate as Lake Erie. Pollution is aging it fast. Ontario spends thousands and thousands of dollars advertising our vacation land for tourists, and yet the pollution in Lake Erie and that of the many other lakes and rivers causes significant damage to recreation. Some 25 years ago, swimming in Lake Erie, there was no algae, but today it can be found almost any place covering some 100 feet of the water along the shore, four to 18 inches deep. Many beaches along the entire shoreline on the Canadian side and American side are being closed down by local health authorities —in particular, INCO Beach at Port Colborne.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to ignore the quality of water around us. Since 1945, there have been 30 epidemics affecting six to 20,000 persons attributed in different parts of the world to water-borne infectious hepatitis. Yes, in the province of Ontario in 1966 there were some 2,311 cases, more than the combined total of six other provinces in Canada. Ontario had 24 cases of typhoid fever. Dr. W. L. Mellmann at Michigan State University discovered heavy concentrations of streptococcus bacteria in chlorinated swimming pools. Bacteria remained alive in the water long enough to be picked up by humans.

A principal source of our life is water, yet it proves, in many cases, to be a source of disease. Is our water safe for persons who come in contact with it? What has this government in Ontario accomplished to combat pollution? The Ontario government has been allowed to open our Great Lakes to 90 per cent of the world's commercial vessels, with little control of their wastes being dumped into our waterways. There was the decision to postpone enforcement of sewage discharge controls on pleasure boat owners. We in Ontario were warned of increasing pollution from vessels and small craft in the report of the international joint commission in 1916.

For 25 years, the Tory government has shown no leadership. It has lobbied, and in fact endangered the health and welfare of the citizens. Any attempt to clean up the source of the outrageous water and air pollution is declared by some elected officials, businessmen, and even in cases that jeopardize the public health, to be an attempt to undercut the regions' prosperity. The offending industries might move away, and jobs would be lost. This is where the government action is needed. Federal and provincial governments are responsible for the control and uniformity of laws across Canada.

Mr. Speaker, another study of the sources of pollution along Ontario shorelines—in Lakes Erie and Ontario, in the St. Clair, Detroit and St. Mary's Rivers—was implemented in 1966 by the Ontario water resources commission dealing with the same problem that existed in 1960 study reports. It will this time state, as it has in the past, that our American neighbours are far more responsible than we for the problem of pollution in our Great Lakes waters. The study by the Ontario water resources commission of the Niagara River, the Niagara peninsula and the Welland River, in 1964 and 1965, from just above the city of Welland some two miles to Port Robinson downstream, found the water to be polluted to such a degree that it was rendered undesirable for industrial water supply purposes, and unfit for recreational use.

Excessive bacterial contamination of Lions' Creek in Welland county also, the Twelve Mile Creek in St. Catharines and Lincoln county showed a high coliform count.

Mr. Speaker, to delay sewage construction adds finally to its costs. It is time now in Ontario to recognize that pollution control is a necessary part of running the business of this government. Pollution is a drain on everyone's pocket book. There are three municipalities in Welland South that are going to join in the near future to spend large amounts of money to improve their quality of water. Ontario is the richest province but its municipalities are poverty ridden and hampered in their quest of clear, safe water, by the lack of money.

Many sewage treatment plants do not meet the minimum requirements set by the Ontario water resources commission for the removal of suspended solids and coliforms bacteria in their effluence. The Ontario government in four months has committed 40 per cent of the $10 million made available for interest free industrial development of slow growth areas of the province. If this government would apply this same scheme to every municipality in Ontario, there would be no slow-growth areas in this province. We in Ontario would establish guaranteed income

for thousands of people for the next ten or 15 years.

In a time of critical housing crisis in Ontario, with a programme for capital sewage systems and with further aid from the federal government, there would be little delay for approval of existing subdivisions in our municipalities. Instead, you would see many new cities and towns rise in Ontario with new industries following this trend. For they require the same services as housing. We then would have every drop of waste water returning to our lakes adequately treated.

The Tory government has failed miserably to abate water pollution, and it has failed to carry out its responsibilities. Caught in government bureaucracy, it goes on and on for years, with study after study. The government has led its people down the garden pathway to a false economy. I wholeheartedly concur and support the motion put forth by the leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Previous speakers have referred to specific details concerning the government's very considerable programme of pollution control measures and I do not intend to be repetitious. I would like, however, to take a moment to expand on the work and success of the advisory committee on pollution control. This committee, chaired by my Deputy Minister, and including the Deputy Ministers of the various departments involved in pollution abatement, was established in 1966, and has subsequently set up working subcommittees at the branch head level to deal with the technical aspects of the various phases of the overall problem. The Deputy Ministers' committee meets monthly and the subcommittees meet as technical progress warrants.

I would like to list the subcommittees and describe the relationship of the various departments represented on them, so that hon. members may have a better understanding of the dimensions of this complex, modern problem.

1. Air pollution subcommittee: Department of Health: The main effects of air pollution on the health of people and the administration of The Air Pollution Control Act.

Department of Agriculture and Food: The effect of air pollution on food production, both plant and animal.

Department of Lands and Forests: The effect of air pollution on tree growth.

Department of Transport: Vehicle exhaust emissions.

Department of Mines: Smelter and refinery emissions.

Department of Trade and Development: Regarding industrial plant location.

Department of Municipal Affairs: From the standpoint of community planning.

My own department: From the standpoint of the safe use of fuels and the approving of fuel burning equipment.

2. Industrial wastes subcommittee: OWRC: Industrial water pollution and the administration of The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act.

Department of Agriculture and Food: Needs of clean water for food production and problems of waste disposal from feed lots and poultry operations.

Department of Health: Regarding occupational health.

Department of Mines: Concerning disposal of mine wastes.

Department of Lands and Forests and my own department: Regarding biological problems of fish and game in the field of conservation.

3. Radioactivity subcommittee: Department of Health: Ensuring that radiation levels do not become a hazard to human health.

OWRC: Working closely with The Department of Health in a monitoring programme.

Department of Lands and Forests and my own department: Relating to radiation hazards to fish and wildlife from the point of view of conservation.

Department of Mines and my own department: Concerning the desirability of safely maintaining uranium production as a source of energy to supply an expanding world market.

4. Pesticides subcommittee: Department of Agriculture and Food: Relating to the continuing increases in food production made possible by the judicious use of pesticides and herbicides.

Department of Health and OWRC: From the effect on human health.

Department of Highways and Ontario Hydro: As two large users.

Department of Lands and Forests and my own department: As a large user and also resulting from fish and wildlife conservation problems.

5. Refuse disposal subcommittee: Department of Health: Primary administrative responsibility and human health aspects.

Department of Trade and Development: In relation to locating certain types of industries.

Department of Lands and Forests: Where no municipal organization exists.

Department of Municipal Affairs: In assisting organized municipalities.

OWRC and my own department: To protect river valleys and watercourses from refuse contamination.

6. Mine tailings disposal subcommittee: While similar in nature to the radioactivity problem, a separate subcommittee is examining some non-radioactive tailings problems in northern Ontario.

As you see, these six subcommittees encompass a range of technical knowledge which is beyond the ability of any one person to fully comprehend, but by establishing subcommittees which report to a main committee which, in turn, is able to advise the government, I think we have succeeded in providing the machinery to deal with this complex problem.

One of the difficulties, of course, in a task of this kind, is to make it possible for the average citizen of this province to keep abreast of developments and progress, when these tend to be of a highly technical nature. To try to bridge this gap, the government sponsored a conference last December in Toronto. This conference was not intended to glorify the government but to give a progress report on pollution control programmes. Our instructions to the advisory committee, which arranged the conference, were to admit freely any lack of progress in particular programmes where such had been the case, as well as describing progress made in other programmes.

I believe the news media recognized an honest attempt to be objective in reporting our progress and consequently reported the conference as a public service and helped interpret technical material for their readers and listeners.

In the light of the motion now under debate, it is interesting to recall that while members of this House representing the two other parties attended the conference, members representing the Liberal Party were conspicuous by their absence. It would seem that their motto is, "My mind is made up, do not confuse me with facts." I have a few spare copies of the conference proceedings which I would be glad to give to any member of this House in the hope that they will find them of interest.

Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the leader of the Opposition and the mover of this motion, I think that perhaps he is in agreement that we in the Ontario government, and especially Ontario water resources commission, are doing a fairly god job as far as water pollution is concerned. His great concern was the Great Lakes, and I think that is the government's great concern.

I might say that OWRC, the commission and the Ontario government have been working very closely with the international joint commission. We have been working very closely with the federal government when we can find the federal government, and that has been a little difficult of late. As you know, some time ago they called a national convention and it was very hard to find the responsible Ministers in Ottawa when that was going on. Immediately after that, they called an election and it is very difficult now to deal with them. But I would say this, that we are willing and we will be dealing with them on these problems shortly after June 25, when a new government is elected, because we have many problems that are of some concern to us and I am sure we want to discuss them further.

I think it is about time that all parties cease to deal with pollution as a political football, and this is what you are doing and this is what has been going on for some time. If you have a problem—and many of you have problems in your own ridings—I cannot see why you cannot deal with Ontario water resources commission, I am talking about water pollution. If you are dealing with some of the other pollutants, deal with the responsible people and deal with them immediately. Let us work together and try to clean up some of the things that are a problem not only to this government but to everyone in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Speaker, it has been said many times that we live in a very exciting period of human history. We will make more technological progress in the next 20 years than man has made since the beginning of history. This progress will be translated into a better standard of living and greater opportunities for human leisure, but as we gain extended periods of leisure, we turn mankind into a polluted wasteland. Is technology and man's abuse of our great natural resources going to destroy the kind of environment that is necessary for the creative mind of man? How long can we go on neglecting our environment, polluting our streams and lakes, polluting our atmosphere, with a general neglect of the great resources of this

country that have been placed at our disposal and in our custody?

There has been some enlightenment and a measure of awareness to the awesome problem of pollution, but there is still too much inertia and indifference, and the forces that continue to perpetuate the status quo are still at work in our provinces. We need a massive mobilization of the resources of this province in terms of its citizens and its finances to begin to clean up the water, the atmosphere, and the land, so that we create a living environment worthy of man. If the people of this great Canada of ours fail in this endeavour, then we will have destroyed our great natural heritage and the future generations will never have the opportunity to recapture the natural living environment that is ours today and theirs tomorrow.

We somehow become addicted to slick slogans as some people have become addicted to drugs, such as "the province of opportunity" and "the just society." Too often we accept pious platitudes as a substitute for dealing with basic problems. What we need to do is to find common answers to a common problem. Slogans can never be the answer. There is no lack of know-how for the capability to find solutions to the problem of pollution. What we lack is the will to commit ourselves and our resources to the total dimension of the problem that obviously confronts us. It is up to this government to generate the collective will of an aroused people as a motivating force to get on with the job.

I want to quote from a couple of paragraphs in a magazine, *The Canadian Businessman.* This magazine is not noted for being in the vanguard of the struggle to advance the new frontiers of social betterment, and it goes on to say:

> The Great Lakes are threatened by pollution. In places blue waters are becoming blackish. Water deterioration is taking place so rapidly in certain areas that some states in the United States face the prospect of paying $1 billion each to clean up the sludgy waters lapping at their shores. United States public health service officials have traced half of all Great Lakes' pollution to industry, with the other half to municipal waste.

I suspect the same thing is applicable in Canada. How did such a situation develop? Pollution of swimming beaches, loss of fish life, and general contamination of water, are basically a direct result of the growing concentration of people and industry. Many industries continue to channel waste into the lakes. People contribute debris, sediment, logs, lumber, automobile tires, and even automobiles.

We have assumed incorrectly that we could go on using the Great Lakes indefinitely as a means of disposing of waste, but now we have exceeded the capacity of some lakes and we are in trouble, warns a Great Lakes authority—and it was the leader of the Opposition who pointed this out—Mr. Langford, former director of the Toronto Great Lakes institute, said that. No matter how big, how deep and blue, lakes can be killed by pollution. In contrast to polluted rivers, which can be flushed clean, a lake damaged by pollution may never be reclaimed. Nature makes a gallant effort to absorb the filth, but natural processes cannot restore purity to the billions of gallons of sewage and chemicals surging from the expanding cities and booming industries.

The problem is at its worst in Lake Erie, the shallowest of the Great Lakes. The 2,600-square-mile area of its central basin is practically devoid of oxygen. All desirable fish and aquatic life have disappeared. The United States public health service survey conducted last summer showed an 800-mile algal bloom in the western basin and dense surface gum two feet thick. For years this lake has been a cesspool of Detroit, Windsor, Toledo, Cleveland and dozens of other cities on its banks, or along its tributaries. It can absorb no more and still remain what it was—a beautiful blue, fresh-water lake, a summer resort site, a source of millions of pounds of fish.

Lake Michigan is next. Because this lake has so very little outflow, experts fear pollution over a period of years may make this lake brackish. Today the southern tip of the lake is so badly polluted with sewage, oil, chemicals and iron slag that scientists doubt it can be reclaimed. Scientists flying over Lake Superior, the deepest and clearest of all Great Lakes have been surprised to find early but substantial signs of pollution.

As the water resource for the entire industrial, agricultural midwest, these lakes are of increasing value to the economy of both Canada and the United States. This region constitutes one of the fastest-growing industrial complexes on the continent due to its transportation, power and fresh water resources. But the point that I really want to

make, Mr. Speaker, is the last paragraph where it points out:

> If the tragedy of Lake Erie is repeated in the other Great Lakes, as it may well be, the great industrial cities of Canada and America would be the victims of the greatest natural resources disaster in modern times.

Mr. Speaker, we in the New Democratic Party have advocated that each child should have the kind of educational opportunity that would give the student adequate education to meet the complexities of today's society. We have called for greater security and dignity for the older citizens of this province when they are too old to work, yet too young to die. We have advanced the proposal for equal rights for every citizen, so that all may share in the abundance created by technological and scientific progress, and equal citizenship without discrimination of race, creed or colour. Our party has said many times every person who is able and willing to work must have access to a rewarding job.

When we gain all of these desirable objectives, it will have meant very little if we continue to put more filth, dirt and poisonous stench into the atmosphere. We in Ontario put thousands of tons of aerial garbage into the air each year, and in my own city of Oshawa we have a problem of industrial waste to which neither the municipality nor this province has found a solution. The citizens of Oshawa are consistently confronted with fall-out from coal and the burning of cheap oil by industry.

Mr. Speaker, we must create a wholesome environment, which means greater concentration on the conservation of resources, the cleaning up of the rivers and streams, and our lakes is not only a matter of highest priority but also one of great national urgency, because the day and the hour is much later than we realize. What is needed is strong legislation and stringent enforcement.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, that one of the fundamental problems, if not the fundamental problem, about pollution of all sorts—and perhaps I might restrict my remarks to air pollution only—is how much pollution would it pay society to eliminate. And to handle such a question—such a basic question in strict economic terms—and other questions that arise in connection with this type of social problem, economists have developed a technique of what might be called cost-benefit analysis.

This technique attempts to calculate the cost and benefits associated with different government decisions, in order to pick up the one which is the most desirable. Ideally, I suppose, we would like to know the cost and benefits associated with the elimination of each unit of pollution—if you could imagine a unit of pollution. In this context, I think it is important to note that there is a general failure to understand that it is not relevant, in a discussion of the economic cost and benefits of air pollution, to compare the damage from pollution to the amount spent on its cure. What is relevant, as one economist has stated, "are the additional benefits and the additional costs from reducing each unit of pollution." In the jargon of economics, the relevant analysis is what is called "marginal analysis". Just because the damage from pollution is, say, $5 million a year in a particular province of Canada, for example, and society is spending only $3 million on reducing pollution, this does not mean that more should, or should not, be spent. A government would be justified in spending more, for example, if another million dollars spent to combat air pollution, reduced the cost to our society of air pollution by $2 million; a rate of return of 100 per cent.

Well, it is fair to state then that we would be able to spend money on controlling pollution as long as the drop in pollution damages —which is the social benefit—exceeded the cost of obtaining the drop in pollution.

Now, the real problem, as many Ministers know, is that it is very difficult to obtain this type of precise information. Indeed, we may be able only to obtain data on one decision about air pollution. For example, our scarce information may limit us to the decision of whether nothing should be done about pollution or whether it should be eliminated entirely. Such a limited cost-benefit analysis might run along the following types of lines—and this is a standard technique, I believe, being used in the United States in this particular way, as explained in an article that appeared in *Life* magazine about nine months ago. It gives an idea of the type of approach that could be taken. For example, one must measure, or try to measure, however imprecisely, the yearly damage from pollutants—say air pollution. We might apply this to Ontario. We would cost this out—and economists can do this—by talking about the following types of pollutants or the damage a particular pollutant might have.

For example, there is the health damage such as cancer and respiratory diseases. There are the cleaning costs for laundry, rugs and drapes and facial cleaning of buildings. There is the increase in corrosion of metals, resulting from air pollution and, of course, anyone in Toronto who lives next to a factory and has a frame house will know their increased costs of painting their house. Well, suppose we try to estimate these yearly costs, these damages from air pollution in a particular area, and we cost it out, which can be done roughly. We might come to a figure of $150 million over a given period of time for a given geographical area. Then if we divide that by the number of people in the area, for example, two million people, we find that the total annual cost of air pollution in a particular area, in a particular province or even, indeed, in a particular country, might come to $75 per person.

Then we would examine the sources of pollutants. Where does this pollutant come from? And here again, the economist's technique, plus engineers and so forth, can arrive at estimates which give you some idea of the sources of the pollutant. For example, we might find that municipal incinerators account for 20 per cent of the $150 million worth of damage from pollutants. You might find another 40 per cent of the damage comes from pollution caused by automobiles and other types of vehicular traffic. We might find that 10 per cent comes from manufacturing plants, and another 10 per cent from hydro-electric plants and so forth. Well, this can be done roughly and then, once you get those two sets of figures, you can arrive at a yearly pollution damage by source. That is to say, you can say that municipal incinerators in the given locality, at a given time, over a given time period, account for, say, $30 million of the total damage of $150 million. Automobiles might account for $30 million, manufacturing another $15 million, hydro-electric plants $15 million and so forth. Break it down and you find out what the various sources are which contribute to the various types of pollution damage. Then you have to get into the area of how much it would cost to reduce the pollution from each of the sources and again, there are techniques. Indeed, there needs to be done more research in this area, but you might find, for example, that the cost of reducing pollution from municipal incinerators, automobiles, manufacturing plants, hydro-electric plants, apartment incinerators, and so on, would come to something less than $150 million. These would have to be costed, again, on an annual basis.

Well, to make a long story short, you find out what the benefits are of eliminating pollution; you find out how much it will cost to eliminate the pollution; then you ask, where do you stand after that? And in this particular example, you find the annual cost might be $150 million. You might find the cost of damage to society is $150 million in one year, and that the cost of eliminating it, entirely, might only be $86 million. That means that the net benefit is plus, that there is a net benefit.

Well, the point is very simple. Studies have been done and I know they are being done in this government. I think the real question is the urgency of these studies, the need to get as much precise data as possible to make a decision. I think that in Ontario there would be a net benefit by the elimination of pollution. I think we can probably convince the public that this will be a worthwhile investment because there would be a rate of return on this. But I think we can only go to the public, to the taxpayers of this province, if we do come up with this type of study, for we can then show them that they will not have to paint their houses as much if they get rid of air pollution. They will not have as high a laundry bill if we do away with air pollution. They will not have their car repainted quite as often if we do away with air pollution. If we sell anti-pollution costs, if we sell to the people of the province the fact that they will be benefiting, both in terms of their health and in terms of material goods in our acquisitive society, then I think we can get this support for tax dollars, in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to conclude my remarks and say that I hope the government studies in this area, particularly the health studies, will be done quickly, and enough resources will go into research so that we can get the facts and the statistics to convince the people of this province that it is less expensive to do away with air pollution and water pollution than it is to have air pollution and water pollution.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I represent a community where clean air and clean water is something which can be expected, but we do want to keep it that way. My concern was particularly aroused a week or so ago when I heard the chairman of the Otonabee River conservation authority discussing the prospects for the future of this area. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, we are moving towards a leisure society. Expectations are that there will be

seven to eight times as many people coming into this area within the next ten or 15 or 20 years.

In that sense the leisure society represents a very real threat to the people even of what could be termed "rural" or "tourist" Ontario. I want to deal with this problem, perhaps in a sense of what it tells—what is reveals to us about ourselves as a people—and also about the process in Canada.

There certainly has been no dearth of warning. Brock Chisholm put it this way: "If pollution is not checked, every lake and stream in Canada will be contaminated beyond hope." In a recent Royal Bank of Canada letter, it was stated, and I quote:

> After 5,000 years of solving mistakes by fleeing from them, that solution is no longer possible because there is no place to go. It seems evident that man is approaching a crisis which unless adequately prepared for, could bring disaster within the lifetimes of the people already born.

As the previous hon. member pointed out, there is a cost, a very real cost, and he tried to indicate how the economist would deal with this particular kind of a problem on a cost-benefit analysis. However, I would suggest that this analysis really does not go quite far enough, because we could reach the point where we would have to move entire cities, and certainly entire industries. The cost at this point in Canadian history would be minimal, and I suggest to you that if you regard the political process as one which is not simply ambulance service, then this is the time to act. I suggest to you that even if the cost analysis basis which has been described is not sufficient reason to act, the obvious demand of irrationality in our whole political process—that we must do certain things or we have catastrophe, and therefore we do them. Surely we can believe there is such a thing as foresight in politics, which leads us to do those things which must be done. The people of Canada are aroused; that is quite obvious. They recognize the priority of this matter.

The great problem, of course, that this government faces, and I think it is one which is quite obvious, is the problem of money. And here again is another problem where we must stand and wait until this government has somehow sorted their chaotic mess of taxation which we have in this province; until then it means that municipalities cannot move forward.

It means that the province itself must hold back on certain projects because the money simply is not available. So I would hope that once this taxation problem is at least revealed by the committee which is soon going to be at work, some of these things which are of first priority will be looked after, and I suggest this is of sufficient priority that this government and this Legislature will be willing to see a certain levelling out in terms of the rising living standards in this province in order to deal with something which is so important to ourselves and those who are coming after us. I think it is just that important. Of course, that cannot be done until there is a just taxation system, as well as an effective taxation system.

We have not given much emphasis to the whole problem of water and air pollution in the past; perhaps it is because we have had so much emphasis on Canada being a country in which there is no end to our natural resources. Perhaps it is also because we have tended to look at ourselves as a rural population in spite of the fact that we are now down to some 12 per cent of our population on the farm as compared to over 80 per cent of our population in the cities. And therefore this problem has not come before us in the same impact as it has in many parts of the United States.

I was rather interested to find that even young people are concerned about this. I had the opportunity of visiting Thomas A. Stewart secondary school in Peterborough last week, and a group of young people came up to me and brought a petition which was signed by all the 30-odd members of that class, asking that this government pass legislation to end the use of non-biodegradable detergents; that is, forcing detergents to be made out of processes which can be diluted into the water system which does not create all the kinds of foam and the problems which we had described to us on several occasions this afternoon.

That class knows as well as this Legislature knows that phosphorous salts that are being poured into our water system from this source is a small aspect. Raw sewage puts more into it, and certainly fertilizers probably put more into our water system than that small source, but this would be a beginning—at least these young people felt that this would be a beginning.

They as well as we have read what the conservation council of Ontario has said: There are few watercourses in the settled parts of Ontario that do not contain some

pollution. Many appear to be grossly and dangerously polluted.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we are going through what can only be called a dance of the mandarins. We are going through a meaningless process during which we will speak in favour and the government will defend its record, and make perhaps a few comments on the possibility of some improvement, at least in minor areas. I suggest to you that this is a dance of the mandarins because all of us know this is a serious problem, all of us are concerned about this as a serious problem. And perhaps some day, we will become sufficiently conscious of the realities of our political process.

I am not going to get into a discussion with the member for Sudbury on this matter, but the realities of the parliamentary approach are such that we have to recognize that there are some matters which should become before this House, and on which all of us can speak positively; in which there is absolutely no concern as to the survival of a government, and where we can at least pass a resolution unanimously in favour of something which is so obviously needed, so obviously important as what we are doing here today.

We in the New Democratic Party will vote for this amendment. We will vote for it on the 50th anniversary of a resolution passed by the international joint commission on a first report on a study of boundary waters pollution. In that report, sir, it was suggested that the international joint commission should itself be given the opportunity and the right to make rules and regulations, and the power to appoint the personnel to deal with the problem of pollution. Fifty years later, we are no closer to some particular source of authority to deal effectively with this kind of water pollution.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on one further note. I would like to say this. This is another of these problems which seems to be divided between international authorities, by means of the international joint commission, the federal, provincial and municipal. I think that I mentioned in the beginning, that I think that a matter such as this does tell us something about the political process in which we find ourselves, as well as about ourselves and our priorities. It is like housing and agricultural problems, and these seem to be the problems that we cannot solve effectively in this country. I would suggest to you, sir, that in the next decade, we had jolly well better find ways of solving these kinds of problems, and a good place to start would be on a problem such as water pollution. There is not much time left.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): We held a public meeting in Port Credit in January, with some 60 people present, to discuss this problem of pollution. This discussion centred around the Lakeview generating plant. This plant attracts attention because of the prominent smoke stack. There are emissions of smoke and steam which are subject to adverse comments which in a good many cases are uniformed and overly critical. Mr. D. P. Cliff, the vice chairman of Ontario Hydro said recently the following, and I will be brief in the interest of time, Mr. Speaker:

> We do not deny that our coal-burning plants contribute in some degree to air pollution. But if the degree is measured against the care and expense of which the commission goes to abate such pollution, then I suggest that Hydro is to be more applauded than reproached.

He goes on to speak of the capital contribution and so on. Well, I would like to again to refer to our county, Peel, where there has been a pollution control officer for some three or four years. It was one of four municipalities in Ontario which have had a control staff, and this now has been taken under provincial jurisdiction because of the new Pollution Control Act. Also this month there is going to be another office opened in Oakville, and they are going to work jointly.

The Ontario provincial Budget has increased about threefold in this fiscal year. I should say that industries in our area—four plants that I can think of, Texaco, British American Oil Company, St. Lawrence Cement, and Domtar have spent millions of dollars to successfully reduce the pollutants. We are not denying that there are some plants in violation; there are. But these, in accordance with the new Act, have been informed of their violation, and they must come within the regulation.

I wanted to touch for a moment on the role of the federal government, which has a responsibility, of course. In 1966, the government of Canada had no air pollution control legislation except for provisions in The Canada Shipping Act regulating marine traffic in marine waters within one mile of the shore, and orders by the board of transport commissioners controlling smoke from railways. This was in 1966. I could say to the House that the status today is no different, two years

later. A couple of members spoke of the contribution of aircraft toward this problem. This of course comes under the federal government, currently The Department of Transport. Here again, federal participation and leadership is essential, and I was pleased to hear the Minister of Energy and Resources Management indicate that more efforts are going to be made to get together with the federal government.

One other remark: There has been much discussion on the rivers and lakes pollution problem. The Credit River has been much improved in quality through a co-operative programme between the province and the Credit Valley authority. The latter was formed in 1954, and at that time we had "no swimming" signs in various places up and down the river. Now, the water quality data recently provided showed that the pollutant limits are well under the OWRC objective of four parts per million. The dissolved oxygen concentration is well above the minimum values required for the support of marine life, and we are very pleased with this. Today, we have the cleanest river in urban Ontario, according to the latest data provided by the OWRC sampling, and this is supported by the comments of the chairman.

The Air Pollution Control Act, Mr. Speaker, has been in force about six months. I would interpret this amendment as indicating something of a condemnation of the Act. There is absolutely no evidence that this Act will not work. It has not had time even for testing.

With these few remarks, I just say that it is not possible to support the amendment.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, rising to support this amendment this afternoon, and to wind up the debate for this group, I can only say that in listening to the members who have spoken for the government, I would never know that they had been in power on these benches for the last 25 years. The hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin mesmerized us with a great array of figures, and he told us exactly how many gallons had been treated or are treated at the present. But he did not tell us how much is untreated. He did not tell us the proportion, the percentage of the effluent that is now being treated in the province of Ontario.

It is all very well to give us figures, but we ought to have something with which we can compare these figures and then we will know whether he is talking sense, or not. My guess in this case is that he is not talking sense because of the slow progress that has been made in this whole field. He also told us other matters that are going on—the progress that this government is making, and fine, we agree that some progress is being made. I take off my hat to the OWRC and realize that they are making some progress since they were initiated some years ago, but that progress is far too slow because this government is not willing to put the resources into the programme which perhaps the OWRC might be willing and anxious to carry through.

Time after time this afternoon, we heard about this government's goings-on from its members. We had study after study undertaken. Fine. It is good to study. But as the hon. member for Peterborough showed, these studies started 50 years ago, and surely it does not take that long to get the information that we need from the studies?

So the studies continue, and the pollution continues to rise, and we set up committees, and they have acted, as the hon. Minister told us today, in various fields. Fine. But the old pollution continues to flow and rise in this province in spite of whatever activity there has been by this provincial government. The fact remains that the pollution of our air and streams is rising rather than decreasing, in total. I know that some streams are being cleaned up—I agree, some streams—but the total pollution is on the increase.

This government, says the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain, does not aim at cleaning up pollution. Well, I suppose that this is impossible in any case, but he says that "We aim at the reduction of pollution." He did not say how far we are going to reduce it. This is the problem. How far? He could not give us an answer because this government, and the federal government where this activity should originate, have not set standards. They have refused to set standards. Until standards are set, we just do not know how far down that reduction ought to go.

So the government is bewildered, because it has not been willing to set the standards above which pollution should not rise. We must realize in this kind of civilization that we cannot possibly get back completely 100 per cent clean air. Nor can we get 100 per cent clean water. We are not looking for that. But we have to determine in the light of our industrial development, and in the light of our population explosion, where that threshold is; where the clean water becomes untenable for human beings; where the clean air becoming

polluted becomes untenable, and set those standards and then start to reduce, with some meaning, toward those standards.

But again this government is the government you remember—25 years in office, knowing all that time of this problem and refusing to face up to it until forced. It was a government which, when the Spanish River became polluted by the Kalamazoo Vegetable Parchment Company and when the resort industry and the fishing industry was threatened, passed legislation to exempt that industry from the penalties. It is the government which allowed things to get out of hand in Elliot Lake and Bancroft with the uranium industry, until one of the employees spoke out of turn and the thing exploded and was brought to public attention. Then this government acted to do something about it.

It is the government which has seen our lakes become more and more polluted from waste and motor boats and all the rest of it. And then they began, under public questioning to take some action and then drew back because they said, "We have not the facilities to look after the waste from the boats." True, we had not those facilities, but again I say to you this government has been in power long enough so they should have seen this years ago, and they should have set up the facilities and seen to it that this pollution was prevented rather than us having to clean it up after the damage is done.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): How can they fight that, though?

Mr. Young: We come to the whole matter of how we are going to deal with pollution. We have today one of the great polluters, in the oil burners in our homes. For the last ten years there has been very very little research as to how to burn the oil in those burners more effectively. We have incinerators whose design goes back for decades, and there has been no great research in these fields.

In another field, motor car pollution, we have seen some progress being made, although again this government has refused to set standards. We are told that next year we are going to have anti-pollution devices, but we do not know whether those standards are going to be set at the United States level or not. But we did not get it until California and then the U.S. set the standards and said that all motor cars sold must have certain anti-pollution devices to bring the hydrocarbons down to 275 per million, and the CO down to 1.5 per cent. And California says by 1970 the hydrocarbons have got to be down 180 and the CO down to 1 per cent.

An hon. member: But that is a different climate.

Mr. Young: I thought we had sunny Ontario here, which has pretty good climate in the summer time at least—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Young: We will not talk about the political climate at the moment. But the fact remains that the motor car industry for years and years and years said, "We cannot do it," until the state of California said, "You have to." And then they went to work and they did do research and we got the results, and I hope that this government will start to cash in on the results of the United States areas.

Just as soon as governments begin to say to the oil industry, and to the designers and the sellers of the incinerators in our apartments and our domestic incinerators, "You must bring your effluent up to a certain standard by a certain year," then they will go to work on it. But why should they spend money if governments refuse to set standards?

It is the same way with plants like INCO in Sudbury, Stelco, Dofasco, KVP and the great paper companies—unless this government says, "By a certain time something must be done and you must bring those standards up," they are not going to do it.

Out in British Columbia, Cominco has cleaned up the kind of pollution that we see spewing from the stacks in Sudbury, and yet they say, "Well, we are doing research." Surely we know enough to go to the places where these problems have been solved and find out how they did it, and apply that knowledge here in the province of Ontario. Surely we have that much brainpower and have that much common sense.

We can reduce the sulphur content of fuel. I was very interested in seeing that in Kuwait of all places they are doing research, and they have set up a refinery in Japan, because Japan demands low-sulphur fuel. The equipment reduces Kuwait crude, which is 3.9 per cent sulphur, to less than 1 per cent. A second crude de-sulphurization unit is being built in Kuwait, for American Independent Oil Company. In other words we are learning the techniques and all we have to do is to enforce the standards for fuel and we will get those standards met eventually.

I was very interested in the poem which was read to us by the hon. member for

Kitchener about the River Rhine and the pollution there a century or so ago. But one thing that has happened in the River Rhine and the Ruhr basin—the cribbage area of the Rhine—in recent years is that the pollution has been cleaned up, until today, according to *Time* magazine, one can swim in the River Ruhr. It is not as good as it was originally, but it is improving!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No it is not.

Mr. Young: But what I am saying to the hon. Minister is that the techniques are there if this government has the willpower and the courage to go after them and to enforce those techniques.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! May I draw to the member's attention that he has overgone the time that has been agreed between the parties and is cutting off other speakers.

Mr. Young: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say that in winding up, we support the motion by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator: (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I have heard with interest this afternoon the comments of my hon. friend from Wellington-Dufferin and the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Try as I may to believe what has been said, I think this short account in the local paper on May 14 answers the question pretty well and outlines the problem:

> DEATH BY POLLUTION
>
> The dead smelts and American scoter ducks in this photograph taken at Port Dalhousie beach are indicative of what most of the Great Lakes shoreline looks like today. Deputy conservation officer says that fish and ducks are dying in increased numbers every year because of the rising level of pollution in our waters.

I would like to believe what has been told to us by the hon. gentleman, but how do you circumvent a thing like this? Pollution is with us, as a matter of fact greater than ever.

I have heard comments about the federal government. I heard about the 50th anniversary of the international joint commission. I have an advance copy here, a summary report on pollution of the Niagara River. You have all the pollution in Lake Erie and the lakes above, coming down into that narrow channel of water. You find a report made up by a group of people dated September 27, and they come up with a picture showing the city of Buffalo sewage treatment plant on the Niagara River, two discharges of the International Paper Company on Tonawanda island, discoloration at the shore from the Robert Gair Durez Plastics on Tonawanda creek.

International waters have been continuously polluted by large industries on both sides of the river, and I would like to show another illustration to you in connection with Bethlehem Steel. That is on the Smoke creek, the discharge at Smoke creek, I should have said. Note the change of colour from clear to dark under the bridge; stream flow at left; and at right, Smoke creek discharging industrial waste from Bethlehem Steel Company. It is one of the larger polluters in the international river.

I know I am getting involved in an international problem but I do believe that the water resources commission is in good stead with the people in Niagara Falls, N.Y., with the authorities there. I think they can work out the problem between them. The problem is not that great, in my opinion, but I think legal force has to be put on our American neighbours to clear up the situation.

I have before me another picture in the same report, a little closer to home at the Horseshoe Falls. It says:

> Surface foam on river below Niagara Falls. Note diversion sewer outlet on the right bank in the background.

And there is a large sewer just across from the Brock hotel, with which most of you people are acquainted and where you have been on occasion. You will find this discoloured water coming through this large outlet from industry and the city of Niagara Falls, N.Y., itself. A little farther down the river they have their sewage disposal plant and I would like to read the caption on a small illustration into the record here:

> Diversion sewer outfall to the Niagara River below falls and downstream from the Rainbow bridge at left. International Paper plant has ceased operating, reducing the degree of discoloration.

But there is still lots there because there are other plants flowing into this interceptory sewer and into the international river. Some of the authorities on the Ontario water resources commission, I know have looked at this particular scene.

Going down the river between the two bridges you will come to the city of Niagara

Falls, N.Y., sewage treatment plant. This plant only provides screening and disinfection and contains 75 per cent industrial waste. If this is cleaning up our international waters and if these industrial wastes come through these pipes, that is why you have this result down at Niagara-on-the-Lake and at Port Dalhousie.

They have a better financial process on the American side and I would like to draw it to your attention. This is a plus in their favour. If a municipality would like to build a sewage disposal plant, the federal government will give them a grant of 30 per cent. The state government will give them an additional 25 per cent and if they come to that agreement the federal government will give them another 30 per cent. In other words, 85 per cent will come from the federal and state governments. The city of Niagara Falls, N.Y., by agreement, can build disposal plants for as little as 15 per cent. I have talked tax incentive to this particular Legislature since I came here. I think industry needs some financial assistance. I think that a municipality needs this assistance and I think that New York state has found an answer to the problem.

I would like to get just a little bit more on the record because these are facts that cannot be disputed. They have 29 outlets that are polluting the international waters from above Buffalo on Lake Erie, to Lake Ontario. They have 14 outlets and it says "additional treatment required" and they are proceeding voluntarily. They have one "additional treatment required", no formal order issued. They have 12 "additional treatment required", completing without a formal order. In other words they are voluntarily doing this work.

But the pollution is there and they are doing not too much about it. They have two substantially completed but not complete. I think here again is an opportunity for this provincial government, with the government of New York state, to sit down and discuss their mutual problem, because the representative at a meeting that I attended in Niagara Falls, N.Y., made a statement to the gathering, and he was speaking on behalf of the city council. In summary, he said the city of Niagara Falls, aware of its obligations to do whatever is necessary and possible, technically and economically, is proceeding in a forthright and practical manner to eliminate sources of pollution quickly when the solution to the problem is obvious.

I know they want to work with us and I know it is a serious problem. I find it most interesting to hear the vice-chairman of Hydro, and the member for Peel South saying that there is not too much pollution. They realize there is a bit; something is being done. I realize the government commissions ought to set the pace. I think they ought to set the example, and I have, for the record, something that I would like to read to you:

> The adverse environmental effects of the conventional power stations, and perhaps, to a lesser extent, nuclear power stations, will become a growing concern.

It is significant that the smoke plumes from Lakeview power station are often the most distinct sign of air pollution over Lake Ontario. There is some evidence that anti-pollution measures taken since the inception of the Ontario Hydro thermal generating programme in the early '50's have not been fully adequate.

Power generation economics may be more and more influenced by the need to consider environmental factors in the future. Ontario Hydro is fortunate in being able to locate its major thermal generating plants on the large bodies of inland waters available in the province. The heat losses, which become very substantial in large power stations, are usually safely dissipated in large bodies of water. Occasionally situations do arise where cooling water discharge does upset the ecology and balance of lake areas with adverse effects on fish and plant life, thus contributing to pollution.

I am glad that we have the chairman of the Niagara parks commission with us because in a brief on pollution abatement measures in Ontario with respect to water quality in the Niagara River, to the international public meeting of the international joint commission on January 16, 1968, at Niagara Falls, N.Y., the representative of the international joint commission said this about the Niagara parks commission.

> Other pollution sources: For some time a number of Niagara parks commission properties have been responsible for the discharge of raw sewage to the river. As a result of a recent correspondence with the Ontario water resources commission, we have now been advised that the parks commission officials have completed plans for the conveyance of waste from Table Rock House and the surrounding area to the municipal sewer. This work should be carried out early this year.

In other words, hundreds of thousands of people are using the outlets of the Niagara

parks commission and raw sewage is going into the river. This is a government commission. Hydro and the parks commission, while they are not setting the example themselves, are not even doing a good job setting an example. I think they are finding themselves lacking and that is the reason for this resolution.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, we have heard some very interesting things about pollution this afternoon and there is one common thread running through the debates on all three sides of the House—if the House can be said to have three sides. It has at least three points of view, and they are all against pollution, naturally.

In listening to the hon. members of the official Opposition I have been trying to read between the lines. I believe they have a greater appreciation of some of the problems inherent in this tremendously great problem than our friends on the socialist side. Of course, they can, by a stroke of the pen, or a word of the mouth, wipe out all the ills of humanity just like that. Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, you and I know that this does not happen.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): It is a good way to start.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, but wind never blows away all the pollution. It will blow away some of the air pollution but it will not blow away the water pollution or the soil pollution.

Mr. Speaker, we are getting increasingly accustomed to the instant experts, and it is refreshing to hear, at least from the official Opposition benches, recognition of the fact that they do appreciate some of the difficulties that the government is facing. They are not as kindly in debate today as I have heard some of them in private but the fact does remain that they understand the problem.

The government of Ontario—indeed, sir, all governments of Ontario—almost throughout the life of this province have recognized the problem of pollution. Indeed, water pollution was one of the main reasons for bringing into being the original board of health, I think back in 1872, if I recall my dates correctly. Because of the spread of diseases such as typhoid and diphtheria, water-borne diseases, the government of that day brought into being programmes for the control of water pollution.

And even today, with the greater complexity of our living, government recognizes as never before the potential damage to man's environment from water, land and soil pollution. Today we have heard introduced not exactly a new source or type of pollution but one that is not talked about as much or has not yet been talked about as much as I predict it will be in the days that lie ahead —and that is sound or noise pollution. It is a very real problem and it is coming more and more to the fore in our modern society.

The government today has a well-defined policy, and I am quite surprised to hear one of the hon. members say that he cannot for the life of him, I think his words were, see what the government has done. May I quote to him a passage with which I am sure at least in former days he was familiar: "He that hath eyes to see, let him see." I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member open up his eyes and look about him and he will see the programmes that have been brought into being, the programmes that are being steadily expanded, the programmes that are producing productive and successful results.

These programmes are producing effective results in dealing with land, air and water pollution alike. Our expanding industrialization, our growing population, our increasingly higher standards of living, our tendency to urbanization, all of these contribute to the ever-growing volume of wastes that must be controlled if we are to avoid serious deterioration in our environment. But there is ample evidence of an accelerated response by this government to this challenge, and some of this evidence we have already heard and seen, even if there are those on the other side of the House who are not quite able to see it.

Mr. Speaker, when I presented the estimates of The Department of Health, I pointed out that none of us was satisfied with what has been accomplished. We are all constantly straining and striving towards even higher goals and higher achievements. We could spend a lot of time talking about what might have been done, and we heard what might have been done over the last hundred years and even more recently, but Mr. Speaker, if I may quote Churchill, "Nothing is gained by recrimination." The important factor remains that we are deeply involved in it now, and our job is to move forward with all possible vigour to the end which we have in view. We are in regular consultation with other authorities and the

federal government, and the federal authorities are a very important part, and have a very important role to play in this matter of pollution. Indeed, the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverdale spoke almost exclusively of matters that come within the purview of the federal government. The provincial government has no right or authority to involve itself in international matters. I think that should be very clearly in the minds of all of us, in view of happenings that are quite current, or have happened in very recent days. We have established environmental monitoring and regulatory programmes within the province. We do, and are actively fostering, research into environmental control programmes. There is continuing consultation with all of those who are involved and interested in the field, all those groups seeking to identify emergent problems and to work out the control measures. And we do support and encourage improved training programmes for training people in new skills, requisite for the control of environment and the menaces of health that come about.

The hon. member for Kitchener pointed out that water pollution was old. Of course, all pollution, Mr. Speaker, is old. As soon as man came on the face of this earth we started to pollute our environment, and the degree of pollution has grown with the growth of population. New methods and new ideas, the so-called progress of society has brought in its wake some things that are not quite so progressive as others.

As I pointed out, the programmes which helped to bring into being a department of health, arose because of the pollution of water. People thought that a clear running stream, so long as it was clear and running, was good water. Oftentimes, sir, it was the most lethal medicine that could be taken, as many, many thousands found to their dismay.

And the programmes introduced even then—nearly a hundred years ago in this province by the government of the day—have almost wiped out diseases such as diphtheria and typhoid. Of course, new problems have arisen. New dragons have arisen to plague us and some of these, such as infectious hepatitis re still carried by water, still causing us a great deal of concern, still more difficult to control than were the diseases of nearly a hundred years ago. Conditions that were once merely a nuisance have now achieved the status of being threats to our civilization.

But the whole record of government action throughout the province in this area—and I say all governments, Mr. Speaker, because we cannot exclude the efforts of other governments, they have been few in this century in this province but at least they did make some small contribution. Indeed, one of the outstanding contributions during the term of government held by our hon. friends, who are now the official Opposition, was one of the finest measures in the control of disease in this province, I am sure they know what it was, I will not go into it now.

We have heard today a good deal about the legislation that has come about, and I am not going to belabour it. I would point out, of course, though, that long before the OWRC was brought into being The Department of Health, through its environmental sanitation branch, was trying to control these matters.

Air pollution control is something that is more topical in these days; we hear a great deal about it. We hear a great deal about it that might better not be said because it is not borne out by factual information in many, many cases.

Soil pollution is something we have not heard much about this afternoon in all of the debates and yet it is a very real problem, and it is a problem that is typical of our modern society. The legislation for the control of pesticides brought into being by this government has kept pace with the increased use of these products. Through the major provisions of the new Act and regulations every possible safeguard has been established so that the benefits flowing from the use of these chemicals can be utilized without causing harm to man's environmental health.

In this field there is perhaps more change than in any other related field. Continued research and study are essential in order that we keep pace with developments and assess the effects of those new products upon the human health.

Recognizing the growing need for the regulation of refuse disposal, we introduced amendments to The Public Health Act during the last session of the Legislature. By this amendment the establishment, alteration or enlargement of waste disposal systems or sites are controlled by The Department of Health. And the depositing of waste is forbidden on any land or in any building which is not approved as a waste disposal system or site. Even a householder who until the present time has felt free to dispose of his own waste on his own property as, when and how he chose can no longer do this if it

is likely to create a nuisance or a hazard to health.

In regard to radiation protection, one of the signs of our modern times, the laboratory in this province of Ontario is the only one that has been established and is operated by a province in this whole Dominion, and it is only matched by that operated by the federal government itself.

The present government's concern is typified also by the organizational changes within our department. We have come to see that the branch of our department concerned with environmental health was one of the least important until a very short time ago. Now it is one of the more important, having a staff of 378, including four separate correlated services. These services as outlined during the estimates have to do with the air pollution control, the public health engineering service, the occupational health services and the environmental laboratory services.

Mr. Speaker, the member for High Park made mention of a new source of pollution, the pollution due to noise. In his opening remarks he mentioned particularly the noise from our modern airplanes. I think he is bound to recognize, as I am sure every other hon. member must, that this is not a matter that the province can control in any possible way. I am not pointing this out to emphasize that we want to get out of something. I am simply pointing this up, sir, to emphasize what we have held for a long time, that the federal government must be in co-operation with us in these matters, in the control of all sources of pollution.

Mr. Sopha: Trudeau will do all that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, if Trudeau's osculatory activities engage more of his time, he will not have time to do anything else. But there are areas where the government of Ontario is already involved. During the last year, sir, we were involved in more than 100 studies and surveys for management, for unions and for the workmen's compensation board.

A great deal is yet needed in the way of research and it was most refreshing to hear that the hon. leader of the Opposition emphasized this. He also noted and emphasized, as did the hon. member for Niagara Falls, that there needs to be incentive for industry, for municipalities, for all of those who are seeking to control these problems of pollution.

Unfortunately the time is pressing, but I have to emphasize that rash and irresponsible statements will not accomplish anything in this. The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside, if I heard him aright, spoke about nine cases of fluorosis. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, there was not one case of human fluorosis found in the Port Maitland area—not one. I think that the record should be put absolutely and definitely straight in this regard.

And then we had the hon. member for Yorkview, who is given to flamboyant statements. "My guess," he says, "is that thus is so." He is quite prepared to accept and have you, sir, accept his guess as gospel, but he refuses to believe the word of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, the vice-chairman of the Ontario water resources commission, people who are deeply involved.

We can afford to involve ourselves in guesses when we do not have to face up to the responsibility of establishing and putting into operation a programme. But the government must do this and the government is concerned only about putting into operation a programme that will work, a programme that can achieve the goals that we have for it. I suggest that every hon. member of this House should join forces on this important occasion and defeat this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister has moved that I do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of supply. An amendment has been moved by Mr. Nixon, seconded by Mr. Singer, that the motion that the Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of supply, be amended by adding thereto, the following words:

That this House regrets the inadequacy of government policy involving research, regulation, intergovernmental co-operation and community planning, to deal with the growing effects of the pollution of the air, water and land of Ontario.

The House divided on the amendment moved by Mr. Nixon, which was negatived on the following division:

AYES	NAYS
Ben	Allan
Braithwaite	Bales
Breithaupt	Bernier
Bukator	Boyer
Burr	Brunelle

AYES	NAYS
Davison	Carruthers
Deacon	Carton
Deans	Connell
De Monte	Davis
Edighoffer	Downer
Farquhar	Dunlop
Ferrier	Dymond
Gaunt	Gilbertson
Gisborn	Gomme
Good	Grossman
Haggerty	Guindon
Innes	Haskett
Jackson	Henderson
Knight	Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton)
Lawlor	Hodgson (York North)
Makarchuk	Jessiman
Martel	Johnston (Parry Sound)
Newman (Windsor-Walkerville)	Johnston (St. Catharines)
Nixon	Johnston (Carleton)
Paterson	Kennedy
Peacock	Kerr
Pilkey	Lawrence (Carleton East)
Pitman	Lawrence (St. George)
Reid (Scarborough East)	MacNaughton
Renwick (Riverdale)	Morningstar
Singer	Morrow
Smith (Nipissing)	Newman (Ontario South)
Sopha	Potter
Spence	Price
Trotter	Pritchard (Mrs.)
Worton	Randall
Young—37.	Reilly
	Reuter
	Robarts
	Rollins
	Root
	Rowe
	Rowntree
	Simonett
	Smith (Simcoe East)
	Smith (Hamilton Mountain)
	Snow
	Villeneuve
	Welch
	Wells
	White
	Winkler
	Wishart
	Yakabuski
	Yaremko—55.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 37, the "nays" 55.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. The vote is now on the main motion by the Prime Minister that I do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in committee of supply, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

It being 6 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 104



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, June 3, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 3, 1968

Estimates, Department of Transport, Mr. Haskett, continued 3805

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 3837

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT
(Continued)

On vote 2202:

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, on Friday I was going to ask the Minister about the matter of dual controls on driver training cars, and it just happens that over the weekend I got a great number of letters. I am sure that everyone did, so it fits in quite well with what I was going to say. I question the sensibility of the law that was passed that insisted on the disconnecting of the dual controls on automobiles to be used for driver training at the time they went to take their tests.

I really wonder at the wisdom of this move. Surely at the time when a driver is being examined, and we are not sure of his ability to handle the automobile—

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Why test him if you are not sure?

Mr. Deans: Why test him if you are sure?

Mr. Ben: Well, that is why you should.

Mr. Deans: When there is the possibility of error on the part of a student driver, surely this is the time when dual controls would be the most valuable.

Mr. Ben: If he cannot pass the test he should not take it, and if he can he does not need dual controls.

Mr. Deans: What I would like to ask is that I have been led to believe that all of the people who are in the business, or a great many of them, of instructing student drivers are of the opinion that these dual controls should be left in effect during the testing period, for safety's sake.

I would much rather that we did test them with the dual controls in effect, than we lost someone's life because they were not being used. I would like the Minister to tell me, if he can, how many accidents there have been since the disconnection of the dual controls; how this relates to the time during which they were in effect; and the reasoning behind disconnecting them.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Chairman, the member takes a very natural approach to this subject, and I think that I understand his feeling in the matter. His idea is that if a driver comes up for examination, and is not too sure of himself, it is rather reassuring to him, and perhaps to other users of the road, to feel that big brother beside him, his teacher in this case, or the examiner, is sitting there with a controlling set of brakes and steering that can supersede his control.

This is what has led to the public accepting the protest from the driver teachers against our regulation that students that come to their schools and come for their examination, must be tested in a standard equipped car, that is one which the driver controls, or in which the second set of controls have been disconnected.

Let me begin by saying that about three-quarters of all those coming forward for examination come forward with their own cars. About one-quarter, or between 25 and 35 per cent may use the driving school car. That would mean that the pupil of the driving school had that much advantage over the applicant who was taking his test who had not been trained in a driving school, and whose vehicle in which he was being tested was not provided with the second set of equipment. That being so, we think that it is only fair that they should all take their test on an equal basis. As soon as the test is over, every driver is going to be driving a normal car without the benefit of the super-control operated by the instructor or examiner. That is the only man who is going to be driving on his own.

That being the case, they have to be on equal standing. The next step is this, that if a driver comes for his test, so untrained and unsure of himself that he has to have big brother beside him at the second control, then he is not ready for the test, and he

should not be allowed to pass the test buoyed up by this extra support.

Immediately that afternoon, or the next day, he is put on his own as a fledgling to run his own machine without that protection. What we have found is this. I think the member wished to argue that there would be a reduction in accidents and a lessening in the danger to other users of the road if the second set of controls were there for the teacher or examiner. We have found differently.

We have found that since this new regulation went into effect at the first of the year, that there has not been but one accident by drivers for every 4,500 tested, compared to before when there was one accident for every 3,800 tested.

Let me give you one further significant view on this which will perhaps help members to understand why we are under pressure by the driving schools to amend our regulation, and why they have bolstered their case with as much argument as they have. When I tell you that driving schools have taken their pupils forward for tests, taken them there in the car in which they have learned, and equipped with these dual controls, and charged the pupil in the most cases for use of the car during the test, and I find that the schools make varying charges for the use of the automobile with the dual controls—and that is the driving school's car for the test—and these costs run from a low of $10 to a high of $22. I would think that the average would run about $15 for the use of the car during the test.

I think this will help us to understand some of the pressure, but my basis is this, that if three quarters of the drivers have to take their tests in standard cars, I think they should all take them in standard cars. If a driver has not acquired a sufficient degree of efficiency and sureness in himself to take it in a standard, he should not be taking the test. Thirdly, our records show that there has been an improvement in the safety to the public and other users of the road since we put this test into effect, and one thing further, I think there has perhaps been an improvement in the condition of the applicants coming forward for their tests, since this has been put into effect.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: I do not share the same feelings as the Minister. The Minister says that some of the reason for the driver instructors bringing this forward at this time is financial gain. They are doing it purely for personal reasons rather than for their concern for the general public. I do not share that with him at all.

I feel they are doing it because of their concern for the public. There is one other thing. If you feel that they do not require these dual controls, then why do you wait until the day of the examination? Why do you not say that they must take "X" number of lessons without them? Why should they not disconnect them and give them at the last three lessons without the dual controls? This, as opposed to taking the controls off on the day of the examination, with the student left sitting for the first time without assistance, or without a crutch if you like to call it that.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think that the driving instructor should decide when his pupil is ready to try his own wings, without the dual controls, and he should ascertain how many lessons the student should have with the teacher beside him and without dual controls. I do not think we have any control over the applicant until he comes forward.

I will support what I said about accidents though. Accidents over $50 reported during 1966 were 89 and during 1967 were 83 and for the first quarter of this year were 13. Thirteen, 26, 52—that is a pretty substantial drop.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, continuing on the same subject. What the Minister says may be quite true, but it is not so in the eyes of the people who are more knowledgeable on the subject, and that is those who are out teaching the student to drive the cars. In fact, other than Bill 66—that was the bill concerning dump truck operators—this piece of legislation produced more letters than any other. In fact I received 30 letters representing 105 different driver instructors.

Listen to this, Mr. Chairman. Burlington, Toronto, Stoney Creek, Belleville, Kitchener, Welland, London, Peterborough, Islington, Hamilton, Collingwood, Windsor, Brampton, Brantford, Ottawa. Driver trainers from the length and breadth of the province of Ontario are extremely concerned with the fact that you are requiring the disconnection of the brake at the time the individual is taking the driver's test—showing the extreme importance of having the brake connected, thus allowing the examiner the opportunity to prevent a serious injury. I have two exams or two tests

that were taken, one on May 17, here in the city of Toronto, at the Metro test centre in Downsview. The comment, the reason for the failure is "applicant fails to obey stop sign in off-street test area, depressed accelerator instead of brake to stop, lost control of vehicle. Examiner stopped vehicle by applying brake. Mr. Chairman, what would have happened if that brake had not been there? The brake was connected, and this was taken care of in your own test centre. Another was on March 6 of this year, and the vehicle was stopped again by the examiner. Apparently there must have been dual controls on these vehicles, Mr. Chairman. Then again you mention the fact, this was March 6 at Cooksville.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This year?

Mr. B. Newman: This year. March 6, 1968, right. Both of these are 1968. The first one was May 17, 1968; the other one was March 6, 1968.

Now, Mr. Minister, or Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister. Maryland at one time required the disconnection of the dual brake, as did Ohio, and both rescinded that, because they saw the element of danger involved. Colorado has no controls. South Dakota never considered requiring them to disconnect the dual brake. Alaska never considered this. Even the Yukon Territories, which happens to have one car with dual control in the secondary school—

Mr. Ben: All, except the Yukon, foreign jurisdiction.

Mr. B. Newman: He insists on having that dual control in the car. Now, as a safety measure, Mr. Chairman, the national professional driver educational association would not be so insistent that you keep the dual brakes connected if they did not see the merit of it. In fact, the letter that they did send around, that was mailed by the various driver training schools, has in a middle paragraph:

> The student, the examiner, and the bystanders are primarily and most severely endangered by this Department of Transport ruling. It is they who risk injury or loss of life in potential accidents, not the instructor or the driving school owner who are not present in the car at the time of the testing. Therefore this issue is essentially a public issue.

Mr. Chairman, I would sincerely hope that you would reconsider your decision on this. When you have 129 driving schools—private driving school owners representing 430 driving instructors—requesting that you reconsider your decision, I think that they have presented their case very, very forcefully and I think you should reconsider.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): What happens when he wants his own car?

Mr. B. Newman: Well, if the man wants to have his exam in his own car that is his responsibility.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. B. Newman: Here is a telegram sent, Mr. Chairman, to show concern. This is not from one who operates a driving school, but just an interested citizen. This was delivered to me this afternoon at 12:01 p.m., "As a public spirited citizen and a taxpayer, I oppose the ruling of The Department of Transport concerning dual brakes in the interest of public safety." And this was sent by Gordon R. Lawrie from Markham, Ontario. Mr. Chairman, I think that you should reconsider the position that you have taken and once again re-institute the use of dual controls, the dual brakes, during the testing programme.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I regret—

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, how many times do I pop up?

Mr. Chairman: I assure the member that I will recognize him, but the member for High Park was first.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): May I suggest that we might avoid this difficulty if you went back to your list system, which would solve this problem of everybody popping up all the time. It seemed to work very well.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to say to the members and to the committee that we did try the list system and we did experience difficulty with it, and I will try to be fair and recognize the members back and forth.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to pursue this particular matter, Mr. Chairman, by asking the hon. Minister if there is any area, if there is any jurisdiction, which has put a regulation such as he has now made here in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I understand that there is something like 10 or 12 jurisdictions of this

regulation in effect. I do not have the names of them.

Mr. Shulman: I wonder if the Minister would go to the trouble of checking those jurisdictions because when his department was previously queried, the gentleman in his department gave the names of six jurisdictions. Now all six have been written to and, of the names that were given, all six deny having such regulations. Some of them did have it, but rescinded it because of the fact they were running into so many accidents. May I suggest to the Minister that perhaps his department has made this change under the erroneous impression that other jurisdictions had also made this change, but since having received this information, they have rescinded the regulations.

I would also like, on this particular point, to draw the Minister's attention to a model Act to increase the safety of people taking tests and taking courses in the United States so as to cut down the number of traffic accidents by adequately regulating and upgrading drivers' training schools. I understand it has been introduced into some two dozen states in the United States. It was originally drawn up by the national professional driver education association in Dallas, Texas, and I would like to draw the Minister's attention to rule 6 (c), which reads as follows:

> That the motor vehicle is equipped with dual control brakes.

Now this is a model Act—I will not trouble him with the other portions of the Act at the present time—and I would like to join my voice to that of the other members who have already spoken on this matter to suggest that the Minister has made a serious error in this particular change and that he will be extremely wise to give it reconsideration.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I know that a number of people in the Liberal caucus are going to be exercised by the fact that I rise to speak on this particular thing. The fact that we are talking about a very delicate subject and a very dangerous subject. More lives are lost to the automobile in this country and in the United States than in all the wars that these countries have participated in. We have a slaughter of over 5,000 people a year in this country and the majority of them in this province—and what are we discussing here today?

We are not discussing whether we are going to produce safer drivers or less safe drivers, or get the dangerous drivers off the road; what we are discussing here today is: Are we going to genuflect to the drivers' training schools?

Mr. Chairman, we have had these drivers' training schools for some time and what has been the result? Have the accidents decreased any? Not a tittle, and I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion these driving schools, which do not teach people how to drive an automobile properly, are probably more responsible for the high rate of deaths we have on the highways than any other media that is going on at the present time.

When I was on city council, I took the trouble for three days to follow driving instructors from four different schools in Toronto. They did not even teach the driver how to back into a parking spot and that is why, when you go down to the city hall underground parking lot, everybody drives in. You go to a Loblaw's parking lot, everybody drives in. How many times do you see drivers circling the block looking for a parking spot and passing half a dozen of them because they do not even know how to back up a car and this is what driving schools are producing today.

Now we come to a situation—shall we have dual brakes or shall we not have dual brakes? Mr. Chairman, I tell you this. These driving school instructors are exorcized because they do not want to get their cars battered up and because they charge for the use of them. The simple solution for the Minister is to compromise. Leave the dual controls in the car but have your examiner sit in the back seat. He will be safer there.

There is an echo here from the hon. member for Wentworth. He says it is a clever statement. The Minister has pointed out that 75 per cent of the people who take a test do so in their own cars where there are no dual controls. And until the time that dual controls are made compulsory in driver trainaing automobiles, they did not have dual controls and everybody took an examination without dual controls. All of a sudden this House must exercise and exasperate itself discussing dual controls.

Let is get to something more serious like reducing the number of accidents on the road, not on a Department of Highways driver training ground up at Downsview.

One of the things I want to discuss is getting people under 18 off the roads. I have taken this up in this House on two previous occasions suggesting that there is no reason

why youngsters under the age of 18 need a driver's licence.

And yet we continue to licence those under 18 when statistics, year after year, point out to you—the insurance companies point out to you—that accidents are caused by those under 18 completely out of proportion to their number for their age. But still you continue to licence them. Why? They do not need a car to drive to school because they have either streetcars or the subway.

If they did not have to drive a car to school you would not have to spend so much money in The Department of Education to build parking lots for students. Statistics show that the marks children get in high school vary inversely to the amount of driving they do. The more driving they do, the worse marks they get in school. All those things point out why they should not be driving automobiles. Our insurance rates are high because our chances of having an accident with youngsters on the road are greater, so our insurance is high even though we do not have anybody under the age of 25 driving an automobile in our household, but that still goes on.

I pointed out—and I was told I should bring it up under this item—that at the present time, police officers must apprehend a a driver of an automobile before they can summons him, and I suggest to you that we ought to go back to the previous system where you could just get the licence number and did not have to identify the driver of the automobile. You could charge an owner for an infraction of The Highway Traffic Act. And I suggest that that would help to reduce the high death rate and high accident rate that we have on our highways. All we get is an echo from over there, "aw."

What are we interested in? Are we interested in saving lives, or are we just interested in giving everybody the right to go in there and put a loaded gun in his hand, because, an automobile is more dangerous than giving a loaded gun to a five-year-old. But they want just everybody to commit mass murder. They figure that way they are going to get rid of all the rich. They forget it is the poor who mostly drive on the roads now. The rich get rich by taking the subway.

I have already mentioned, Mr. Chairman, when the estimates were up on Friday or Thursday, that I believe a jail sentence ought to be mandatory for persons who drive while their licence is under suspension. And there should be a limit to the number of suspensions a person can get.

I think it was on February 29 this year, there was an article in the Toronto *Telegram* about one individual who had had his licence suspended six times, and who has been found guilty twice of motor manslaughter. That is killing people in automobile accidents, and he is still driving—well, not at the present time, because I understand he is in jail. Is he still in jail or is he out?

The driver was Jacob Klassen; he came here from another province. Nobody knows how many other accidents he has been involved in but they say since 1954 he has had 12 accidents, two of them fatal, and still he is licensed to drive. Now surely there must be some limit to the number of people that you can kill on the highway, or that you can maim on a highway before your have your licence suspended permanently. But to continually drive and kill or injure people is sheer nonsense. A licence is not a matter of right, it is a matter of privilege.

I discussed also, under the previous estimates, that I think doctors ought to report not only heart conditions and epilepsy to the department, but I think they also ought to report to the department when they think a person is not mentally stable enough to drive an automobile. There should be something to protect them from so doing.

I suggest also that licences which, incidentally, are used more frequently for purposes of identification when it comes to cashing a cheque or any other purpose such as that than any other document, should have a photograph of the bearer affixed thereto.

If the Minister is not going to acquiesce and increase the minimum driving age to 18, then I suggest the next tack he should follow is to make driving instruction compulsory in high schools so that everyone who finishes high school is what they call a "pro" driver.

I do not think they should learn by the hit-and-miss method as is presently employed. I would think, Mr. Chairman, that after a person has been involved in three serious accidents or has had his licence suspended twice, that he should be given a mental test before his licence is reinstated. After all, our job is to protect the innocent, and not the bad man behind the wheel. Mr. Chairman, my tranquilizer has taken effect, so I will sit down.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): That my friend has exorcised the Minister, that is to say he has driven out the evil spirits by invocation,

I should like to ask the Minister whether the press recorded him correctly over the weekend in attributing to him the statement that the matter of imposing a compulsory jail sentence on drivers previously convicted for driving while under suspension was a matter of federal jurisdiction only?

Mr. Ben: You made the statement in the House, Mr. Minister. You suggested—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think my approach was that the matter of driving while under suspension was the kind of offence that should be one that should be considered as meritorious of a jail sentence, and I had spoken to my colleague the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), with that in mind. Did I say that it was a federal offence only?

Mr. Sopha: You said that the imposition of the punishment of that nature was a matter for the federal government. Or so the press reported you as saying. I wanted to ask you if that is actually what you said.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not think that it would necessarily, but I would agree that a suspension is the kind of offence that, when it is breached, merits a jail sentence. I would agree with that, but I do not think that I would say that I did not; I would not intend to say that.

Mr. Sopha: My friend from Humber now tells me that you were even more specific, that the imposition of such a penalty would require an amendment to the criminal code. No lawyer in The Department of Transport, nor the Attorney General nor any law officer of the Crown would agree with that as you said it.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, I would agree.

Mr. Sopha: All right, now we are on good common ground. For at least five or six years, and perhaps longer, I have advocated that those convicted of a second offence for driving while under suspension have a mandatory sentence imposed upon them. I think that this is a reasonable and defensible position to put, and I do not have to speak in terms of driving being a right or a privilege. Driving a motor vehicle is a fact of life. It is part of the environment in which we live, and one does not have to get distracted with the semantics of whether it is a right or a privilege.

I would think that once an individual has demonstrated flagrant contempt for the law, and it is nothing less than that—the individual has stood in a court, well most of them have stood in a court and had their licences suspended in the most serious surroundings. Frequently, I suspect, the magistrate at the time of imposing the sentence says something to the convicted person of the seriousness of the offence upon which he has been convicted.

There are a number, of course, who have their licences suspended by the Minister himself, within the confines of his office, and who never see a court before the time that their right to drive is terminated. I put it forward as a reasonable proposition that the individual should have brought home to him nothing less than that he has flagrantly violated the laws, the customs, and the mores of the society in which he lives. I would think that a period of seven or 14 days in the local lock-up would have a very prophylactic effect on his driving habits in the future.

As I say, I advocated that five or six years ago in this House, and I have made very little progress in contrast to the other reforms that I modestly say were rather grudgingly accepted on a later day. But I leave this one open for borrowing by the Minister of Transport. One observes that I have entirely lost his attention for the last ten minutes. He is engrossed in some research project that he is boning up on.

In a parallel way, one observes that the department does not hesitate to use the penalties imposed by the criminal code of Canada in relation to certain offences. The Minister is familiar with them. The penalty which is added to the conviction, the penalty under the criminal code, is itself suspension of licence. That is to say, in a conviction of impaired driving, as we all know if there is property damage and the court suspends the licence for three months, the Minister thereupon suspends it for six.

Mutatis, mutandis for a conviction for leaving the scene of an accident, drunken driving, are treated in similar fashion. The department in adding to those penalties seems to say that suspension of licence is a very effective punishment. That is what it appears to be saying. And if the deprivation of a licence for an extended period of time is viewed by the Minister of Transport as being consistent with the gravity of the offence under the criminal code, then I ask the Minister to go one step further. When the individual violates the law and shows flagrant contempt by continuing to drive as if he had the privilege,

then I think that individual is worthy of severe punishment.

In addition, I would like to see many more road checks on this basis by the Ontario Provincial Police. I have advocated that also. When they have nothing to do, and that seems to be most of the time, I do not see why, on a nice summer afternoon, they do not stop the cars on chance and say, "Let me see your driver's licence."

The public would soon become knowledgeable of the risk of driving the car without having the proper documentation to do so. And then, by having such an attentiveness to the law and its enforcement by The Department of Transport, I believe and predict that right down the line you would see greater care in the operation of a motor vehicle. More and more of our citizens are becoming aware of the dependence economically that they have on that right to drive.

Let us make it meaningful. We have the right to drive because we abide by the laws and we operate a motor vehicle with purpose. And once we depart from accepted standards, which are not very high, then we forfeit the right and we face a state with its particular law enforcement characteristics that is going to impose severe penalties on us for the violation and contempt that has been demonstrated. There need only be added to that the additional thought that this business of the point system and all those other devices that are used just have varying degrees of efficacy. Some drivers do not apparently care a hoot. The higher the economic dependency on the operation or the right to use the automobile, the greater awareness and anxiety there is about the point system.

I have seen far too much of the futility of the person, as my friend from Humber says, coming into court on the third or fourth conviction of driving without a licence, and the magistrate fining him once again. And you know, they are not all Draconian like Tupper Bigelow. We have some real humanists on the bench, men of very great human understanding and they could send the man to jail. But they just impose another fine on him, and in the greatest exercise of futility they suspend his licence again. The one that he has not got, and has not had for four squared times.

They add another index to it, and he is not going to get it until long periods of time have elapsed. He will not get it back. My friend from Humber says that there is a great deal of futility about it, and I would like to see the department put some teeth in that statute and impose a penalty such as I have advocated for a half dozen years.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the member for Humber brought up a number of points that perhaps I should speak to, and the member for Sudbury now has supplemented what the member for Humber was saying with regard to a mandatory jail sentence for driving while under suspension. He has added the further thought that perhaps it should be mandatory jail on conviction of a second charge of driving while under suspension. There is in the criminal code, if I recall rightly, a provision for a discretionary jail sentence for driving while under suspension.

Mr. Sopha: Section 225-4 of the criminal code, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It is 225 something—it is in that section, and I would like to consider that, but at the same time I agree with both the members for Humber and Sudbury. There is very good ground for a jail sentence and I think that most of our magistrates in our area have been using that in convictions for driving under suspension, usually on second or third offence. It is a very difficult kind of person to deal with. I do not know how else you would deal with them. I come back to the question raised by the member for Humber, with regard to 16-18 year olds, where he said they should not be licenced to drive, and then later he said that no one should be allowed to graduate from high school without having taken a driver training course.

Mr. Ben: As an alternative. One or the other.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is where they do tie in. I was going to point that out to the hon. member that a great many of the students taking the high school driver instruction course now are in that 16-18 year old group. I presented certificates to more than 150 at a celebration at Ottawa, a couple of weeks ago. They graduated some 500 who had taken the course, and passed it. If we were to deny driving licences between 16 and 18 or under 18, we would interfere with that programme on the one hand; we would also cause considerable consternation in the rural areas where boys of 16, 17 and 18 need to operate vehicles. They have a very real dependency on them.

I tell the member for Humber that we are giving consideration to a probationary licence for the younger drivers.

Mr. Ben: May I ask a question of the Minister? Is the Minister aware, or am I mistaken, that in the state of New York although you can drive at the age of 16 in the rural areas, you have to be 18 in order to qualify for the city of New York?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There may be in the state of New York what we call restricted licences, for daytime or for those under 18. Most people are warned not to go into the state of New York with a 16- or 17-year-old driver because it is against the law.

Mr. Ben: Would the Minister consider permitting them to drive at 16 in rural areas, and restricting it to 18 in built up residential areas or urban areas?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, as a result of the recommendations of the committee on youth, we are looking at the licensing of 16- and 17-year olds primarily with the thought of providing them with a probationary licence. We will consider the further thought.

Mr. Ben: Would you cover the rest of the points that I mentioned, please, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, the member dealt with two other matters. One was the Klassen instance. I do not have the record here but I recall that driver as having a very, very bad driving record. I am just trying to check out and if I can get the record from my friend tonight, I will; if not I will follow it through to find out.

Mr. Ben: I will help you. It says 54, 12 accidents, two of them fatal, has his licence suspended six times, has been convicted 15 times for driving offences ranging from bylaw infractions to dangerous driving. In February, he was serving a six months term for dangerous driving, resulting from an accident that killed a man.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Just to say, Mr. Chairman, that we will be checking out to see if that man's licence is not under what we call indefinite suspension, which can be for life.

The other matter the member raised had to do with doctor's reporting.

Mr. Ben: Also summoning the owner of a motor vehicle.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There has been a lot of thought given to the matter of summoning the owner of a vehicle. We got away from this because of our demerit point system and the fact that they did not harmonize. If we charged the owner of the vehicle instead of the driver, our demerit point system that has so much merit—and is working, we think, very well—is badly interefered with. We have sought, as an alternative, some device whereby it might require the owner to identify the driver, and we have been trying different approaches to that.

There is a law in England, and I checked out with the department of the Minister of Transport in England as to the number of convicitions they had brought about through that device. It seems to be working there, but I do not know whether we can use it here or not. That is another approach to it, because I would like to find some way of facilitating the work of the police officers without encroaching on the rights of individuals.

I see the area that is left unoccupied once we get into the position of requiring that only the driver be charged, and not the owner of the vehicle. There has to be a harmonizing somewhere here, and I am going to find an appropriate way of reaching the owner of the vehicle and if not charging him, at least requiring him to identify.

Mr. Ben: May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman? Do you necessarily have to give demerit points where you are charging the owner as distinct from the operator? Could you not just have a stiff fine, based on the degree of culpability? I am more concerned with getting dangerous drivers off the road. Evidently the Minister is more concerned about the demerit system working. I think perhaps we are *ad idem*, but we are just going about it in a different way.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I have to agree with the hon. member. It is just that we are trying to find a way so that we get at the driver by requiring the owner to identify, without interfering with our demerit point system. I would like to be able to cover both situations.

I have just had the report in that Klassen case, he is under three-year suspension from February 13 and before reinstatement he will be considered for an indefinite suspension. I can assure the member of this.

Mr. Ben: Good grief, Mr. Minister, if the Chairman will forgive me! It has already been pointed out that this man has had 12 accidents; he has been convicted 15 times, has had his licence already suspended six times,

and now you inform this House that he has only had his licence suspended for three years. Why not permanently?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: If I might point out to the member, Mr. Chairman, that before his three years is up and before that licence is restored to him, consideration will be given to giving him an indefinite suspension, which could be for life. This is our device for doing what the member suggests.

His other point was with regard to doctor's reporting and I will direct him to the appropriate section. I think it is 145a—yes, here is the new section—

> Every legally qualified medical practitioner shall report to the registrar the name, address and clinical condition of every person 16 years of age or over and attending upon the medical practitioner for medical services who, in the opinion of such medical practitioner, is suffering from a condition that makes it dangerous for such person to operate a motor vehicle.

I think that is what the member had in mind.

Mr. Ben: I prefer it to be set out, but I had in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the previous operators' permits asked the question: "Have you ever suffered from epilepsy?" I ask why could not these applications for renewal ask: "Have you ever suffered from epilepsy, heart disease, coronary diseases, or mental diseases?" Why can they not ask those applying for renewals?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the reason we moved from using the renewal application into requiring the doctor's report was because of the lapse of time that can occur now between renewals which are three years apart. We think that this is a much more solid approach to the subject, that we should get reports on all of those who should not be driving.

Mr. Ben: Except some people never go to a doctor.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It could be.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): I would like to come back for a moment or two to a point that has already been discussed; that is driver training in the high schools, a subject in which I have been very interested, and on which I have often spoken in this House.

I think the hon. member for Humber, wanting to get the youngsters off the roads from 16 to 18, is perhaps a little overzealous. I think that the crux of the problem is to get that training efficiently done for the youngsters so that when they leave high school, perhaps even before they get to graduation, they are ready to drive.

I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, through you, about the timetable for achieving the purpose which he has intimated he has. That is, of graduating safe drivers from our school system.

I know the Minister has been interested in this. He has started the process and each year we are told more driver instructors are graduated, more of them are working at the high school level. I wonder if the Minister would indicate to us how far this has now progressed—whether he has a timetable saying five, ten years from now we are going to have every high school graduate a driver. Or has he tried to draw up such a timetable for the future?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I cannot give the member the kind of answer I think he wants. I can tell him this, that when we started, I think it was five or six years ago, with the first driving instruction course in the high schools, we had 36 schools enrolled to give a course that year. Last year there were 200 and some.

This year the course is available in more than 303 schools. By fall, we have indication that there will be in excess of 350 of the high schools in the province—and they will be the larger ones in the main—making the course available to students in the schools. That will be well over half of all the high schools, and I say we will include those in the main cities now—Toronto, Ottawa, and so on. But I would point out to the House that this does not mean that every child graduating from the high school will have passed the course. Because the course is still on a voluntary basis, and it is still an extra-mural and extra-curricular course and it costs money.

The course is endorsed by The Department of Education. It is put on under the authority of the local school board, and they have the authority, they have the determination, whether the course will be given yet or not. I do not have the determination of what course will be given in a school. Our department provides the aides and the teachers' courses, and the text books and the controls for the cars, and so on. So it is a joint venture, and we will be happy to see it extended as far and as rapidly as possible.

I do not know that I would agree at this point that it would be desirable to make it compulsory, and I say that for the reason that there is a certain value in having students reaching for and wanting it, rather than being compelled to take it. We may change this thinking in the days ahead, but we have not achieved a place yet for every school is provided, and that is our present goal.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister then, through you, what proportion of the children in high school are actually graduating from this course. I suppose we have some figures on that. I would disagree with the Minister. I think that in an age such as ours—when every person sooner or later becomes a driver of an automobile, unless he has some physical or other handicap—the compulsory angle becomes pretty pertinent. But I wonder if the Minister could tell us about what proportion of the graduates are drivers.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I have the proportions; perhaps I have it coming up here. I know that last year there was something in excess of 15,000. But coming down to percentages, that is about 15 per cent of the high school graduates.

Mr. Young: Fifteen per cent?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Fifteen per cent; so you see that we are getting into more than half the schools, but we are not taking all the pupils or all the graduates.

Mr. Young: Well now, would that be 15 per cent, Mr. Chairman, of all the graduates in Ontario? Not 15 per cent of—I was thinking—the schools themselves. Is the percentage in the schools where the courses were offered very high? I presume that it is very high.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it would be consistent. I think that some schools have pushed it and have advanced the course greatly, and others have not done as well. So that the percentage would vary in schools as indeed the cost of the course does to our concern. The cost of the course still is about $35 on the average, but it runs from about $15 to $65, and that is a problem.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): I would agree with the Minister that many, if not most young people in the country need to drive at 16 and 17.

It is rather obvious that many of those young people at age 16 are not ready to assume the onerous and heavy responsibility of driving a car. Some of them are, of course, and they do so in a very capable and responsibile manner.

I was wondering if the Minister had even given consideration to instituting a reduced point system. Something to the effect of three points at 16, six points at 17 and then perhaps at 18—provided there were no convictions or loss of points during that two-year period—the young person would then be in receipt of the total 15 points. I wonder, first of all, if the Minister has given consideration to that matter. I pose that question.

Then the other matter I want to deal with is in relation to a letter which I received from a high school teacher in connection with the application for renewal of a driver's licence. The letter is a rather technical one and perhaps the simplest and easiest way would be for me to read it into the record.

This letter was addressed to the Deputy Minister, and a copy was sent to me. It says

> Dear sir,
>
> With the application form mentioned above, you enclose a card entitled "points to remember".

If I may interject at this point, the letter is rather critical of this application, this renewal application form, and in the letter he suggests various things which could be done to improve the clarity of the form.

Item 1 on this card says, "Have you answered the five questions on the back of the application?" If you check the back of this application you will notice that there are questions 1a, b, c, 2, 4 and 5. And the question is asked, where is question 3? The writer goes on to say:

> I have had a bit of experience with the design and wording of this type of form and I think this is one of the most ill-conceived that I have ever seen. I offer the following suggestions:
>
> 1. If the space for restriction on the face of the card is to be filled in, you should clearly state this fact.
>
> 2. The list of questions on the back is a badly muddled set. Part of the questions are answered on lines, part in little boxes, and number 3 is missing entirely.
>
> Such a list of questions should be a neat, consistent progression.

3. On the back of the form under "restriction code" the item marked "9 see box below" is unclear. Is there any reason why the numbering of these items is x 1 2 3 4 9, instead of a more orderly sequence of numbers. The box marked "code 9" carries with it absolutely no instruction about whether to fill in something or other or leave it blank.

4. The last line of the address on the front of my card reads "Wingham, Bx 465".

And the writer again asks the question, when did Bx become an abbreviation for box. "If you were going to use this abbreviation on my address, why do you not use the same on the address of your return envelope"?

Then he goes on to say, "Many people will wonder whether or not to include exchange with their checks if it is so; if it is to be included, the form should clearly state so".

And then the last suggestion the writer makes is to proofread the form. I would be interested in hearing the Minister's comments in that connection.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I take the member's criticism and I shall make a real point of going over the format of the application form and the nature of the letter going out. I think that we used a filler that had not been corrected as it should have been. The problem that we run into really on the renewal application is trying to get a lot of information into a very small space. And we deal with all kinds of people. We have avoided getting into anything like the income tax forms that are driving people up the wall; we do not want to do that with this.

I can see by trying to keep it compact to work through our machines, our data processing, that it does pose problems. I will go carefully into the format of the renewal application and the letter or the stuff that goes out with it. The member makes a good point; you cannot be too careful when you are dealing with the public en masse, like we do with three million drivers. We try to make it as simple and as understandable as we can.

With regard to the points, a varied points or a modified system of points for young drivers—16-year-olds—that is inherent in what I said to the member for Humber. It is under consideration to have a probationary licence for 16, 17-year-old drivers. It is, you might say, a modified Yazer plan, which is really our demerit system turned inside out; but it may allow varying the number of points available to a young driver until he proves himself.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us a little more about his present attitude about breathalyzer tests so far as controlling drivers?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the matter of the use of breathalyzers, blood tests and urine tests to determine the amount of alcohol in the system is one that has been receiving a great deal of attention and has been used to increasing advantage in many jurisdictions. I think we are all aware of what benefit has flowed from the new law in England. I have said in this House before that I think the proper place for the breathalyzer test, and especially the improvement in the law regarding impaired and drunken driving belongs in the criminal code and like most people concerned with safe driving I was delighted with the amendments being made in the criminal code when the House at Ottawa suddenly dissolved.

We are hoping it will go back onto the order paper in the House of Commons—whatever the government—and be processed. I have said that I preferred dealing with it in that way—in the establishment of an offence for being in possession, or in control of a motor vehicle with an alcohol condition above a certain measurable limit. I prefer that approach to it rather than the implied consent law whereby the provinces can make the acceptance of a driver's licence conditional upon undertaking to undergo a test when required to do so or to surrender his licence. I think that is what we understand generally is the implied consent law.

I have had the opinion given me by those in jurisdictions where they have the implied consent law that they do not get much more evidence adduced, and they do not get a much better record of convictions with that amount of evidence available to them through the implied consent law than we do. That may be.

My chief resistance to adopting the implied consent law here was that—and I have said it publicly—I think it helps get the federal government off the hook, as it were, in the need to amend the criminal code. I certainly approve of the action they were taking in that direction and I am sorry it did not proceed through the several stages until it became legislation.

Mr. Singer: You still can bring in your own legislation.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: A good suggestion. I understand what the member means.

Mr. Sopha: By voting the right way, you could facilitate its passage.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The one point that I was somewhat concerned about was that they seemed to water down in the bill the recommendations that had gone forward from so many sources, including the standing committee on justice and legal bills in the Commons. I think generally speaking a level of .08 was approved by most authorities, including the bar association, the medical association, the British white paper, and the committee, as I say, on justice and legal bills in the Commons. I was rather hoping that when the bill came before the Commons that they might amend the .1 rating to .08. Is that what the member was asking?

Mr. Singer: Well, I wanted to get the Minister's view and now I think I have it. Let me tell the Minister, Mr. Chairman, what I think of his view. A few words, not very much at all; I am disappointed, but I learned over the years that insofar as we look for action or advanced steps from this department we are bound to be disappointed. I am very sorry, Mr. Chairman, that over the years we have not been able to take advantage of the wonderful research work done by the late Dr. Ward Smith, who was the head of the Attorney General's crime laboratory.

He was the man who pioneered in this field in Canada and I would have thought there could have been no greater testament to the great service that he did for this province than that the Minister of Transport would have risen in his place one day and said, "We are not going to pass the buck any longer, we are going to take some action."

Yet what do we get tonight, Mr. Chairman? We get the Minister saying hopefully those fellows up in Ottawa, whichever party might get returned, will maybe do something and maybe they will have a law that is a little better than the one they were talking about.

The Minister has heard what Dr. Smith has had to say over many, many years. He has heard the speeches that have been made in the House, not only by me but by the hon. member for Yorkview since he has been here —he has been saying exactly the same thing. He has heard the recommendations of this outstanding research man, Dr. Smith, who was a leading government employee. The Minister has shilly-shallied backwards and forwards.

At one stage, I remember him telling us that he did not think there was legal authority within the province to do it. By now he has backed away from that because we read in chapter and verse of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, which said that the province of Saskatchewan had this power. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have the most concrete example of all, it has been in effect in England. The outstanding result in England of enacting this kind of a law, is the dramatic reduction in death toll.

What more can the Minister ask? How much longer is he going to say it is someone else's responsibility and not his? The Minister is aware of the figures, he says it is interesting to note. Is it any comfort to those who continue to be killed on our roads by people who are under the influence of alcohol, that the Minister finds it interesting that something has been done in England? And in England the law was subject to great criticism, but the law was enacted. What happened? As my colleague, the member for Windsor, pointed out deaths were down 579 or 23 per cent for the first three months after the new law came into effect in October of 1967.

Is that not a startling figure? I am sorry, the member for Yorkview corrects me—33 per cent. Would the Minister not like to have been able to stand in his place and said, "We have taken a step which resulted in a saving of lives of 33 per cent of those people who were killed on the roads last year." Would that have been a feather in the Minister's hat? But what do we get from him tonight? "I wish those fellows up in Ottawa—whoever they might be after June 25—will do something, not quite what they are proposing but something maybe a little stiffer."

Where is the courage that once resided in the front benches of that government, Mr. Chairman? Where is all the brave and new initiative that they tell us they are prepared to exercise? Where are they? Why do they not do something to prevent the horrible death and acccident toll on our roads?

Mr. Chairman, over the Christmas period in England, in the five festive days of 1967 compared to the same period in 1966, 60 fewer people died on the roads; 497 fewer were seriously injured; and 1,367 fewer were slightly injured, for a total of 1,921 fewer total accidents. Mr. Chairman, those figures speak for themselves. There were lots of complaints.

My friend, the member for Sudbury, and I have talked this over frequently. We do not believe that anybody has done any less drinking in England; they are just drinking in different places; they are walking to where they drink or taking taxis to where they drink. They are drinking closer to home but they are not drinking and then driving. We are not asking the Minister to reform the morals of Ontario, we are asking him to enact laws that will protect the lives of the people of Ontario.

That is what we are asking you to do and it lies very badly in the mouth of any member of that government, any Cabinet Minister, to say, "I am waiting on some other jurisdiction and maybe, hopefully, some day they are going to do something." This Minister, Mr. Chairman, has the power, he and his colleagues can do it. They could bring in an Act tomorrow morning; they do not even have to exercise any initiative as to how to write the statute. The province of Saskatchewan did it for them.

They do not even have to have any doubt in their mind as to its *vires*. It is *intra vires* the powers of any province, as the Supreme Court of Canada decided. The judgments are there; they have been read into this record and I am not going to labour that any more. With the record of England still fresh in our minds, I am shocked and disappointed that a Minister of the Crown, in this province today, can stand up and say in reply to the question I posed to him what this Minister has just said.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, just to add to what the member for Downsview has already said, I have a quote here from the Ontario safety league of November 20, 1967. We have heard of the British experience:

> The Ontario safety league says that two years ago Czechoslovakia reported a 25 per cent drop in accidents after blood or breath tests were made compulsory in the case of suspected impairment.

These figures are similar to the ones in the British experience, and I would like to bring to the Minister the report of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme), and he might perhaps listen to the experience of the Minister of Highways in this regard, on page 214 of this report.

Mr. Singer: That was where?

Mr. Young: In Ontario. The gentleman who is sitting across from us—his advice to the Minister of Transport perhaps might be pertinent at this point.

> The King's highway system, exclusive of secondary highways, reported 766 deaths as a result of 604 fatal accidents. There was evidence of drinking in 36.3 per cent of these accidents. Single vehicle type fatal accidents accounted for 30.6 per cent of the highways total. Drinking drivers were involved in 46.5 per cent of 189 fatal accidents which resulted when the vehicle went off the roadway and struck a fixed object on the King's highway.
>
> Pedestrian accidents resulted in 113 deaths or 14.8 per cent of the total of 766 persons killed on highways. In 32.7 per cent of these accidents the pedestrian had been drinking.
>
> The 700 miles of controlled-access highways had a 2.6 per cent fatal accident rate. There was evidence of drinking in 41.5 per cent of the accidents resulting in deaths; 41.3 per cent of the fatal accidents involving one vehicle only, while pedestrian deaths accounted for 21.8 per cent of the total reported for access highways.

In other words, what the Minister of Highways is saying to us is that a very high proportion of the fatal acidents on this system involved the drinking driver.

There is also a report here from CTV which has a well-known outlet in this city. March 24, 1968, not very long ago, in the programme W5 it reported on one of its surveys, "78 per cent of the people interviewed were in favour of the breathalyzer test." Their survey showed also that six out of 10 accidents involved alcohol and five out of 10 deaths on the highway involved alcohol as well.

Mr. Chairman, this matter has been debated in this House every year at great length and I do not know that we need to debate it tonight to similar length as we have in the past. Again I urge upon this Minister, as the hon. member for Downsview has urged, that the breathalyzer test—backed up, if you will, by a blood or urine test, voluntary on the part of the driver concerned—should become mandatory in the province of Ontario. I am not a lawyer; I do not know the legal aspects of this. I am assured by my hon. friend that the power is here, and I accept that. I believe that with the breathalyzer brought into our legal system, we will see the same dramatic drop in the death rate on our highways as we have seen in the case of Britain and of Czechoslovakia and other jurisdictions. Again

I urge upon this Minister to take another long look at this situation and to bring the required legislation to make our roads safer because the breathalyzer is mandatory.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, it becomes quite obvious from the remarks that have been made on this side of the House that the Minister will certainly not find opposition to the introduction of stricter regulations, both with regard to the breathalyzer test and abuse of the ordinary public by drinking drivers; the dangers that go with it, and the dangers that we face from people who are not in a condition, medically or mentally, to drive.

But, with regard to the original question which was presented to him a while ago about the drivers' training school regulation and the disconnection of the dual-safety brake, I would like to find out from the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if the prime reason for this disconnection was to ensure that the drivers that were applying for tests and applying for approval would be better trained and better prepared for the test than they might otherwise be.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the member for York Centre puts the question in a very easy way to answer. My officials report that a noticeable improvement in the calibre of applicants presenting themselves for driver tests during the last few months indicates that novice drivers are taking greater care and more time in preparing themselves for their driver tests. Furthermore the results are reflected in a higher passing rate at their first attempt.

There are fewer failures and fewer retests. There has been a sharp reduction in the number of persons waiting for tests because people have understood they have got to come forward better prepared than they were; and the driving schools know they have to bring their pupils forward in a better trained condition.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman: I would appreciate the Minister advising me whether or not there is a difference in the performance of drivers who are taking their tests in their own cars. That is, of those 75 per cent of applicants coming forward for tests that before did not have any dual safety system and now do not have any dual safety system, are they also improving in their performance?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, formerly they could take the test in either the driving school car with the dual controls, or in their own cars without them. I think I can get some statistics on the failure rate, if we may just hold up. May I deal with the other matter, though, finally, since we have had further comment on the breathalyzer test?

I think we all want the same results—a reduction in road collisions and fatalities and injuries resulting from drinking drivers. I have to repeat, though, that breathalyzer tests alone would not get us all the desired results; that more benefits can be expected from the approach of the federal government in amending its criminal code that will establish the impaired level and make it an offence to be in control of a car while with a level of alcohol content above a specified level, along with the means for collecting the evidence. I think we have to be very careful that we understand the difference.

I may say that the matter was discussed by all our provincial Ministers responsible for motor vehicle administration and the consensus was there, as I have just said, that the breathalyzer test alone has only limited value in gathering evidence. Better results are to be obtained if we can have the federal government amend the criminal code in the way that it was proposing to do.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, what the Minister is obviously trying to say is that he thinks there is a better way of doing it; and unless the federal government moves, he will not move. He is saying that a better way of doing it, in his opinion, is to take action under the criminal power that the federal government has. Mr. Chairman, the point that I was making was very simple. It may be a year or ten years before the federal government ever moves in regard to that. In the meantime, this government, which calls itself responsible, has the power to do it. It has the constitutional power to do it and there can be no doubt about it.

Surely every day that the law is delayed you are allowing that many more accidents and deaths on the roads in Ontario. We, here, cannot control anything that is done up there in Ottawa. How much longer do we have to wait to see this government move? This is the responsible Minister and government that gets up and pats itself on the back saying what great fellows they are and what great advances that they make. This Minister has moved a bit; I will give him credit for the fact that when I first argued this with him several years ago he thought it a terrible

thing. Leslie Frost used to get up and say, 'What an infringement of people's rights', and shock swept the front benches over there. This was a terrible thing. They have moved a little in their thinking in all aspects, except passing laws.

I say that this government must stand condemned by reason of its lack of courage and by reason of its continued desire to pass the buck.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, there is one other point associated with this matter that the Minister referred to a few moments ago, and that is the feeling that has been expressed in many quarters that the proposed amendment to the criminal code does not go far enough in that it recognizes only 0.1 per cent as the level at which a charge may be laid. The Minister correctly pointed out that .08 would be more appropriate. From the reading that I have been able to do, it appears that if the level is 0.1 per cent, the person would be very obviously intoxicated and he would not need a breathalyzer test other than to substantiate the charge that would be laid. The person would hardly be capable of operating a motor vehicle at all.

I think that the Minister has a good point when he says that that level is too high. If he believes this himself, then it appears that even if the enactment does take place at the federal level, in the Minister's judgment—and I think that he is right in this—it is not stringent enough for matters as we find them in the crowded highways of Ontario. He may very well have to request this House to give him parallel legislation which will make the enactment more stringent here. He himself has said he feels that the 0.1 per cent level would be inadequate for the enforcement that we feel is needed in Ontario. I would ask him even if federal legislation is forthcoming, if he would not then feel—having said that it is inadequate himself—if he would not have parallel legislation on that approach?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would not like to comment on that until we see the nature of the federal enactment.

Mr. Nixon: It has disappeared?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, it has disappeared, and wait until you see what reappears. It may go back to .08. That is what I hope. But I would just like to repeat what I was saying. The member for Downsview is one skilled in the law. He knows very well, that merely to bring in an implied consent law, utilizing the breathalyzer for evidence, will not be the equal of the amendment that can be made to the criminal code to establish the offence. Sir, the member for York Centre asked me specifically with regard to the percentages of failures of those coming forward with their own cars, as opposed to those with dual controls. My officials say that in 1967 a survey showed that about 28 per cent of persons in privately owned vehicles failed. 49 per cent of those in dual control vehicles failed.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister says I know full well that the kind of law that has been enacted in Saskatchewan would not be nearly as effective as what Ottawa is proposing, assuming that they reduced or increased the severity of the percentage of the test—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Established the offence.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I disagree with the hon. Minister just as violently and vehemently as I possibly can. I think that it would be most effective, and I would think that the only way that we are going to test that difference of opinion is to pass the legislation here in the province of Ontario. The English law is much more closely aligned with the type of thing that has been done in Saskatchewan than that which is now proposed in Ottawa, and the Minister knows that. His advisers must have told him that. The dramatic proof is there. There is no point in quibbling about 0.8 or 1.0. Dr. Smith made a very substantial argument—Dr. Ward Smith made the very substantial argument—that it should be point five.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Point zero five.

Mr. Singer: Well, all right, it depends where you put the zero. We are talking about 0.8, 0.5, and 1.0. Or, if you take 0.1, then you are talking about .08 and .05. We are talking about the same criteria. Dr. Smith was much more violent in his recommendations. We put them that way, he wanted them to be three-fifths of one hundredth of 1 per cent more stringent. Now, I am asking Mr. Chairman, and all I think that this government should do is to move. The Minister has no basis whatsoever to suggest that what has been done successfully in Saskatchewan, and what has been done successfully in England, cannot be done successfully in Ontario by this government here and now.

It is a blatant avoidance of responsibility, supreme negligence on the part of this government that they will not and cannot summon the intestinal fortitude to move in this important field.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, two things. First in the matter of school bus drivers. Has there been any consideration given to having their licences reviewed or retested yearly, in keeping with the practises in Ohio and Pennsylvania? Second, in the matter of the school bus stopping law. Taking this under driver control, although it may not be there, I would like to know what the accident rate has been, and what has happened since this law has been passed. I would gather from those that I have spoken to that there have been more accidents since the passing of the school bus stopping law than there were prior to its passing. I am not against the law, but I wonder if the drivers of the buses have been properly informed in the use of it? Have they been giving adequate warning to the drivers coming behind them and from the opposite direction when they are going to stop, putting on those flashing lights?

I know of one case in which there was a serious accident, not six weeks ago, because the bus driver stopped over the crest of a hill, and two cars, as they came over the hill, came upon this bus with its lights flashing, not aware of its presence. Both applied brakes and the one behind was about to pass the leading car, but smacked into the back of it. Now I would like to know something about the statistics since this law has been put into effect, and I would also like to know with regard to retraining or rechecking the licences of school buses yearly.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I will deal under this section with the examination of school bus drivers. That is a routine matter. Those over 65 are tested annually now, and those under, every two or three years. But when we called in all the drivers for preliminary tests, we picked up the licences of a very substantial number of school bus drivers, especially in the over-65 age bracket. I find here that of the 408 drivers over 65, 208, when they were tested voluntarily or were called in voluntarily, decided to discontinue driving school buses. It just shows how necessary this test on school bus drivers was.

We have more stringent requirements for school bus drivers than ordinary drivers.

Mr. Deans: That is very good. I wonder if I could ask then if the other matter will not be dealt with at this time? The matter of instructing the drivers in the manner in which they should use the warning lights in the buses to warn the people travelling with or toward them?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think that the matter of the safe operation of the school bus stopping law comes under vote 2205, and I have here for that purpose an outline of what we have done by way of instructing the school bus operators, the school bus owners, the school boards, the teachers, the police officers, and all of the related organizations or bodies of people involved, in how to effectively use the school bus stopping regulations.

I think we have done—we thought—a blanket job on this, and yet we still find that for all that we amended the law two years ago in a very, very simple way, simply requiring approaching traffic as well as overtaking traffic to stop—and that was the only change we made—that there seems to have been a tremendous rhubarb made over that single change.

Mr. Deans: Since you have decided to answer. Has the accident rate gone up since the law was brought into being?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think, Mr. Chairman, I could summarize or condense it by saying that the accident rate over all has increased slightly. The accident rate with regard to accidents from approaching vehicles being required to stop, has not. The number of people involved in accidents has increased. The number of fatalities has reduced. So how do you relate all those figures and come to any consensus?

I think our operation has been eminently successful and I think our performance is good.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, coming back to the matter of driver training and testing. I note that the Minister has shown there to be a great discrepancy. The much higher failure rate on the part of those taking their tests in driver school vehicles would indicate possibly that these applicants were not properly trained at the time they came up for tests.

I understand from the national professional driver education association that their

main concern now is to have regulations introduced by the province to ensure that a much higher standard of school is operated.

They have introduced in various states, legislation which would ensure this, rather than putting in a law to disconnect the dual system which is already in the car and is quite inconvenient and is not a mechanically sound regulation to make as far as the car is concerned. Would it not be better for us to introduce legislation which would eliminate many of these schools which are not operating on a sound basis. They are charging rates that are far below what could possibly be charged for a well operated regulated driver training programme.

We know that good training, such as the pro driver programme and these high school programmes, does result in a much better record of accident-free driving after the test. Surely what we are seeking is a lowering of killing on the highways as the result of the test that we bring into effect. I cannot see that it is a sound move for us to go about this matter by enforcing installation of mechanically inadvisable changes in the mechanism of these dual safety or dual braking systems, when we could be covering the matter by instituting and bringing in legislation covering driving school regulations.

I have noticed in business in which I have been associated that another factor that definitely comes into driver control of cars is the matter of insurance. If you have full collision coverage and no deductible, or even $25 or $50 deductible, accident rates are higher than when you have no collision insurance at all, and the branch which the driver is working out of have to pay the full collision cost out of their own operating results of any accidents they have. If we do not have the financial responsibility or have a lessening of financial responsibility, we do not take the same care. And this applies, I think, perhaps in the testing of drivers.

When you are using your own vehicle, and a vehicle that you have probably been in much more frequently than you have in a driver school vehicle where you have to pay so much an hour, you are going to be much more careful, and you are probably going to be better trained, than if you do not have a vehicle of your own and you have to rent one or use the driver training vehicle. There are other factors in here that I am sure are resulting in a much better record of passing of tests by those taking it in owner operated vehicles than in the driving school vehicles.

I, therefore, submit Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, that he introduce legislation regarding driver training schools at an early date and consider changing and relinquishing this other regulation which I do not think is the right approach for us in reducing the killing on our highways.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: If I may, just for a moment, follow up on what I was talking about, on the school bus safety; just two little points.

Would you consider making it mandatory for the driver to come out of the bus and escort the children who must cross the highway?

Second, would you make it mandatory for a driver to pull the bus off the road?

I think this would assist immeasurably in avoiding some of the problems that we have been having together, of course, with no stopping on hills, curves and the likes with those two things.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, earlier in the evening there was quite some discussion concerning the raising of the driving age from 16 to 18 and the Minister mentioned the report of the select committee that studied youth and youth problems.

I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister, a conference of all-Canada young drivers. I will not bother reading the recommendations that they have made. The Minister can have someone from his department look them up. But, the recommendations issued as a result of this conference, Mr. Chairman, are worthy of serious consideration by your department and I would only hope that as a result of this conference of the youngsters that you do come up with some type of legislation that will enact some of their suggestions.

To show you how seriously interested we are in our own community concerning driver education, the present chief of police in the community made the following statement, just on March 16 of this year, Mr. Chairman, and I am quoting his statement:

> Soon Ontario will have to pass legislation to require teenagers under 18 to take driver education courses before they are allowed to drive.

Now I think he is a forward-looking individual when he makes a comment like that. I would say that you will follow the example that the state of Michigan has laid down and you will insist on exactly the same thing. I only hope

that you will do it sooner than we would normally anticipate you doing it.

Mr. Ben: What is his name?

Mr. B. Newman: Chief Gordon Preston.

Mr. Chairman, in my introductory comments, when we originally started the discussion of this department, I made mention of the use of certain tags on licence plates and I specifically mentioned a learner plate or tag. In other words, an individual driving the car not having a permanent driver's licence—or simply having a learner licence or even if an individual with a driver's licence accompany him—must have, on that vehicle, a big "L" fastened to the licence plate both front and back. I notice in a magazine sent to us from northern Ireland—I assume every member of the House received that magazine—that they are using both an "L" or "R" attached to licence plates. The "L" being a learner and the "R" restricted, meaning that vehicle is not to travel faster than 45 miles an hour.

Mr. Chairman, I would like your comments concerning the use of identifying tags on cars for individuals who are learners—individuals who may have lost a certain number of points as a result of convictions. We have tried to convince them of safety behind the wheel. They apparently do not pay attention to our pleadings and so we have to identify them by putting some type of tag on their vehicle. I would also like your comments concerning the use of tags on the licence or somewhere on the vehicle. The tag can be removed when an individual is no longer driving the car, and someone else takes over.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I earlier mentioned that we were considering a probationary licence for young drivers. The special learner tag would be a part of that study, and if we decide to go ahead we might provide the licence attachment. Before the member for Wentworth goes, I would say to him that the two suggestions he made with regard to school bus stopping, I think it would more properly come under vote 2203, but I will answer him now.

The requirement for the operator to leave the vehicle and escort the children across the road has problems leaving the vehicle unattended while still loaded with children; and the consideration of requiring the vehicle to pull off the road to flash its lights has been considered, but there are disadvantages in that traffic might feel more inclined to travel by it. We think that the requirement to stop for overtaking traffic is better enforced by having the vehicle stay on the road and flash its lights. These things are being considered. They did not just come off the top of the member's head, I am sure, and I want him to know that we are giving them serious thought too.

I come to the member for Windsor-Walkerville again with regard to the young Canada conference that was held in Ottawa, at Carleton University, last summer. We had members of our department assisting with panels. I understand they are sending forward a brief to me, but we do not have it yet. When we have it, it will be very carefully considered.

Mr. B. Newman. The conference was held August 7 to 10, so surely you have—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I say we have not received a copy of a brief from them that they intimated was coming forward to us.

Mr. B. Newman: Surely you would not be waiting for a brief. Surely you could take the recommendations on the back of this and have your department study them, and if they have merit then implement them. Why wait for that, why delay safety another six months.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2202 carried?

Mr. B. Newman: No, there is another question.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There is some misunderstanding that there is some second thinking on some of these points, and that is the reason I was waiting for a formal brief from them, The member for York Centre also asked me respecting the licencing of driving schools. We licence driver instructors, and we have that control on them. At the moment we are under pressure, I think, from a group that is trying to organize the schools and force them into membership. They would perhaps have their programme of bringing all the driver schools into the membership of their organization, if we co-operated in this way. We take a second look at this.

At the present there is less than one-quarter of the driving instructors, as we understand it, that are interested in this. I do not think that we would want to run too quickly into requiring the schools to organize and probably take out membership in the association until we are satisfied that it is moving in the right direction. One of the organizers, I understand, has come over from

the American association and is trying to set up an association here. We look at it very carefully.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister earlier for his comments concerning a special tag on a licence plate, or a special licence plate to an individual who has lost, say, nine or 12 points. After a person has lost a given number of points, he receives a letter from your department. Why not at that time require him to turn in his licence plate and issue him a special licence plate identifying him as being a driver who is not too safe on the road.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Under driver control, and our demerit point system, drivers are notified in a warning letter that they have reached the six-point level. At the nine-point level they are called in for interview, and retesting. There might be a problem. We have not given any serious thought to putting a special plate on his car, as a six-point or a nine-point demerit point driver, because the cars are driven by all the members of the family, but I will look at that.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I do not mean that the plate will be permanent. That individual who has lost nine points will be required to fasten a tag on the vehicle only when he is driving the car. When he finishes and another member of the family who has not lost his points drives the car, he would take the tag off exactly the same way that he would with an "L" or an "R" on the licence plate.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the Minister's comment about the association trying to coerce others into it. This is not what I was suggesting, and I would concur fully with the Minister's thought that we would not want to be doing something to help build up an association necessarily. That is their responsibility, not ours.

My understanding is that a group of driver training instructors are very anxious that the province bring in very much stricter legislation concerning the requirements not only for the driver training and passing training, but also for the vehicles they use in training drivers. They feel that the regulations as we now have them in the province are not nearly strict enough, and there is a great deal of abuse in this field. It is an easy field to get into, without any proper precautionary measures with regard to vehicles, and the instructors and the sort of performance that they must live up to. There are many states that have this legislation.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2202; the member for Windsor West.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): I would just like to take the Minister for a few moments from concentration on the problems of younger drivers into the age group that he belongs to.

I note in his statistics for 1966-1967 and from what he said earlier in tonight's debate, that 208 of the 408 school bus drivers over 65 years of age voluntarily surrendered their licences to drive those buses. And that further, the tests and requirements for their capabilities were much more stringent than those applied, I assume, to drivers of automobiles in the same age group and up. It is this group driving private automobiles, Mr. Chairman, that I think requires to be subject to the same kind of stringent test, stringent eligibility, the Minister has applied to the school bus drivers in that 65 years and above age bracket.

Recently, there was an instance to support this proposition in a community north of Toronto, in which a small child was sitting on the curb of the street, when five car lengths away a driver, 69 years of age, started up his automobile to drive it on to the roadway. Instead of pulling away from the curb, into the normal lane of traffic on the right hand side of the road, he continued along with his wheels very close to the curb to the point where he ran over both legs of the child, breaking them.

To this point, although that accident occurred, I believe, at least over a month ago, no charges have been laid by the police in that community and the driver of that automobile is not therefore subject to any review of his capabilities to drive. I suggest that there is a serious gap in the Minister's programme of driver control and driver re-examination when such an accident can occur, when charges are not laid by the police, and therefore no investigation is held of such a driver's capacity to continue to drive.

I note in the statistics in the Minister's report for 1966-1967 on page 37, that he sets out the reasons for the first-attempt failures on driver examinations for the calendar year 1966. Among five categories of drivers for which reasons for the failure are given, the first two (a) and (b) are drivers 70 years of

age and over, and drivers 80 years and over, the first group having been involved in accidents.

It appears that it is not at all mandatory, except for the driver's physician's report to the Minister, for such a driver to have his licence and his capacity to drive re-examined. I would like to ask the Minister: of the 5,000 drivers who failed on re-examination, how many of these fell within those first two categories, (a) and (b) drivers 70 or 80 years of age and over?

I want also to ask the Minister will he not apply to the drivers in these age groups the same kind of stringent tests that he says would have been applied to those school bus drivers 65 years of age and over, but who, rather than subject themselves to the tests and face the risk of suspension of their licence, voluntarily gave them up?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I do not know the case to which the hon. member has referred, where a driver ran over the legs of a child sitting on the curb. I would think that there would have been a charge laid if the driver had been felt to be at fault.

With regard to the drivers over 70 and 80 and their passing percentages, I will try to get the figure. But I point out to the House, sir, that all drivers over 80 are required to provide a certificate or have an examination every year. All those over 70 who have been involved in any kind of accident are required to have a test. I will try to get the figures. I do not know if I can pull them out as to the failure rate of drivers over 70 or 80 trying their initial test. That was what the member asked.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, the reason I drew these statistics to the Minister's attention is that I find it hard to credit that of the 5,000, only 810 were failed because of lack of adequate vision, the balance being failed on account of their lack of knowledge, or inability to deal with, the signs and rules of the road. It would appear to me, Mr. Chairman, as appears to be the case in the accident I raised with the Minister, that vision had a good part to do with the cause of the accident. I think the Minister ought to take a very good look at imposing at least that test of vision on all drivers over the age of 65, regardless of whether they have been involved in an accident after they have reached that age, or not.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Every driver over 80 has to have an annual test on those grounds. The member suggests that we should drop it to 65. With regard to vision, we are much concerned with the vision tests we are making and this last year we have added a new instrument to measuring tests. We have even tightened the vision requirements to bring us into conformity with all other provinces. We have established a Canada-wide standard, and that was a prerequisite to a reciprocating arrangement that we have made between provinces on licensing drivers coming into one province from residence in another province where you present a driving licence.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I think that is a pretty poor reason for setting the minimum age at which drivers are subject to a vision test or other tests, simply because other provinces in this country may have accepted 80 and that, therefore, we want a uniform standard and 80 happens to be the age which the provinces recognize.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The hon. member misunderstands me. The age of 80 was not set in the Canada-wide standard. The vision standards were set to agree across the country. I would not say that the other provinces all had an annual test beginning only at 80. Maybe they have, I do not know, but we have a test for every driver of 80, and if a driver has reported that he requires glasses or he is troubled with his driving sight, he can be called in as often as his licence pops up.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, this again is subject to the voluntary disclosure by the driver of his failing eyesight.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: And his doctor's report.

Mr. Peacock: It is not at all a mandatory obligation on him to report to the department or to come in for an examination once he reaches a certain birth date and I suggest to the Minister that the age of 80 for compulsory vision examination is much too high and that he should reduce it substantially to the age that I have suggested.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: I would like to talk on driver control in relation to truck drivers and bring to the Minister's attention the brief that had been presented by Dave Elliott of local 880 of the teamsters' union, in which he has taken on, as a personal campaign, an effort to set up more stringent safety stand-

ards in relation to the drivers of heavy equipment.

Now he makes two comments that would have direct bearing on this vote and several other comments on following votes. I am quoting from his brief:

> Another important factor that is being constantly overlooked in the trucking industry is the standard of health. There are drivers who have been on the road for years who may never have had a medical check up. Most companies ignore this completely, while others keep a close check at least once a year.

And he recommends that all truck drivers should be compelled to take a regular health and vision check up at specific intervals. I will ask the Minister to comment later on that.

He makes mention that every driver should be permitted a proper rest period after a decided and controlled number of driving miles, and the third suggestion made by him is that log books be kept, as the United States law requires all United States drivers to keep a log book which records the length of time the driver has spent at the wheel. If a similar procedure were followed in Ontario, he contends that the accident ratio would fall substantially and likewise there would be a method of checking up as to maybe one of the reasons for the accident not being the fact that the driver may have been a little too tired. Would the Minister comment on these please?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, just this: The federal labour enactments are tightening down on the number of hours a truck driver is allowed to operate. It has not been in force—I think that is section 3 of The Transport Act—and the labour requirements on hours with respect to drivers has been postponed too, but that is where the control on hours of driving, I think, would rest. I do not think that there is anything in our regulations that would limit the number of hours, or give us the opportunity to check on driving hours unless there was an institution of something comparable to the log book. I see the point the member is making—the desirability of having the complete record on the driver as well as the vehicle.

Mr. B. Newman: Is the Minister considering the application of the log book principle in his department?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would have to say, Mr. Chairman, I have not at this point.

Mr. B. Newman: May I suggest to the Minister then that he have his officials look into its value and if it has merit then implement it.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I have noted the point.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman: I am surprised at the Minister's answer because this same topic was brought up last year and the year before to the Minister when it was pointed out that Britain, Germany, South Africa and many other countries have compulsory log books with each automobile. Now how can a Minister get up here today and, in answer to the hon. member's question, say he has not given consideration to it as yet but that he "might." I think it is a disgrace.

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: First of all I would like to say how pleased I am to hear the Minister is considering bringing in probationary licences, because I have a letter here from him dated two years back in which he said that this particular matter had been considered and rejected as he felt it was discriminatory against some of the drivers. However, as we get older we get wiser.

The matter I would like to discuss is driver examination and I have some personal interest in this particular matter because of a sad personal experience I had. About a year and a half ago, I made a speech one night saying that anyone who drove without a licence should be locked up and the next day I was picked up by the police for driving without a licence.

What had occurred was that my licence had expired some two and a half years earlier and somehow I had not learned of this little matter and when I protested that the IBM machine must have broken down, the Minister —and he may have been perfectly right—said I had not probably opened all my mail.

In any case, for one reason or another, I did not realize my licence had expired and I had been driving for two and a half years without a licence. Well, the police pointed out that it was—

Mr. Sopha: He was liable to six months imprisonment—is not the Minister of Reform Institutions sorry?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Not until they give him to me.

Mr. Shulman: The point which I am coming to, Mr. Chairman, is that I found that I could not drive my car at this point, not having a licence; I could not have my licence renewed because I was told that because it had expired more than a year before, I had to take a new examination. I could not take a new examination because the places where an examination could be taken were all jammed up for a period of some ten days to two weeks ahead.

I have two complaints here. The first is that I think everyone should be treated alike. It so happens that, by chance, at the same time as I had this misadventure, the police reporter at the Toronto *Star* made the same sad discovery and while I had to go through the routine and taxi for the two weeks until I took my examination, this particular gentleman, although his licence had also expired for a period of two years, had a new licence delivered to him that day by taxi. And, as he pointed out, it appears in this province there is one law for the rich and another for the press.

The point which bothers me mostly here though, is that in my case I did not need to drive to earn a living, I was able to manage, but this could have happened and certainly must happen from time to time—

Mr. Ben: The member does not take house calls?

Mr. Shulman: My wife drove me to the house calls. But it must happen to people who have to have their licence in order to earn their living and I would like to suggest to the Minister through you, sir, that undoubtedly this will occur. Whether it be error of the individual involved or by error of the department is really immaterial; it will occur, and I would like to suggest that when such an incident does occur, the persons finding themselves in this position should be taken, so to speak, to the head of the line, particularly if their work depends upon their having a driving licence.

I can well understand people applying for a new licence and people coming up for re-examination where there is no great rush, a day or so here or there is not going to matter, but to someone, for example, driving a taxi, it can be terribly important. I would like to suggest to the Minister that there cannot be too many of these cases and when they do occur, that they be given the first cancellation that comes in so they have an early opportunity to get their licence back.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would like to check out the story about someone getting preferred treatment so far as getting a licence like that. I would like to know of any happening like that. We try to treat people fairly.

But with regard to the member's story that he was required to wait some two weeks or so, I can assure him that the appointment can be made now within the current week. I think in his case there was a chance that there was a cancellation and he was given the courtesy of being advised of it and filling in. We try to treat all people fairly. I would be very surprised; I will make a point of finding out how anyone got by, because in my operation there are not two laws.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister is quite right. I did have to wait only a week; there was a cancellation and I got in. If I could have a page boy I will send the name of the person who did not have to write the exam across to the Minister if he wishes to look into it.

Vote 2202 agreed to.

On vote 2203:

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, the matter which I wish to bring up is the matter of compulsory car inspection. I have recommendations here from the Ontario chamber of commerce, from *Canadian Motorist,* from the highway safety agency in the United States, from the Toronto automobile dealers association, the transportation committee of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto; and among others I have a recommendation from the House leader, present here tonight I believe, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree). I will quote him:

> Here I wonder if we could not to a reasonable degree follow the example of British Columbia in requiring vehicle inspection every six months at the hands of a qualified mechanic. This, it seems to me, would go a long way toward eliminating certain chronic causes of accidents, defective brakes, defective steering, worn-out tires, horn and windshield wiper not working, cracked windshields; all are factors which contribute to accidents.

I would like to commend to the Minister the recommendations of these various bodies and individuals.

This particular recommendation was made by the hon. Minister on January 31, 1957, in his maiden speech. I hope the Minister of

Transport has had an opportunity to read that speech and considered the suggestion. There is also one other group that has made the suggestion we have compulsory car inspection.

Let me stress, Mr. Chairman, the importance of compulsory car inspection. It has been proven, in the various jurisdictions in which it has been brought into effect, that this will reduce the number of accidents. There was a recommendation made on page 22 of the *Guide to Traffic Safety* by the Canadian government specifications board; it is very brief on this subject and I would like to read it to the Minister through you, sir. I quote from page 22:

> Since the average owner is not competent or equipped to do more than limited inspections as outlined above, and in any case probably will not make them, there should be compulsory inspection by a competent professional or enforcement agency at regular intervals. It is suggested that the current issue of Standard D71 of the United States of America standards institute be the basis for such inspection.

In case, Mr. Chairman, you are not familiar with this *Guide to Traffic Safety*, which is issued by the Canadian government specifications board, let me say that this is the ultimate word in traffic safety, it was produced by experts—

Mr. Ben: The ultimate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: It is 100 per cent Canadian content, for the benefit of the member on the Conservative back benches. This was set up by the Canadian Department of Defence Production, Ottawa, Canada, and they invited leading experts on automobile safety from all over Canada to come and sit—

Mr. Chairman: Could I ask the member if he is speaking about highway safety, because vote 2205 deals specifically with highway safety co-ordination and promotion.

Mr. Shulman: Vehicle safety inspection—under vote 2203.

Mr. Nixon: Anyone we know among those experts?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I think there are two people whose names you might have heard among those experts. Actually, there are two people represented here tonight who were among those experts and one of them was Mr. A. T. McNab, the Deputy Minister of Highways. Modesty forbids me to mention the other.

In any case, the recommendations in this particular report were unanimously voted. This particular recommendation was unanimously voted; there was not a single person on that committee who spoke up against this recommendation because it is plain, ordinary common sense. I would like to suggest to the Minister that with all of these bodies, with members of his own Cabinet making the suggestion, with the government specifications board making this suggestion, that it is a shame—I can use a stronger word but it is a shame—that we in Ontario have not followed the suggestion.

The vehicle inspection, the compulsory inspection that we have in Ontario at the present time, is a pale imitation of what has already been put into force, as suggested here, in at least 17 states of the United States and the District of Columbia, certain areas of Canada, British Columbia. I understand now two of the other provinces have it.

It was suggested years ago in the action programme, the master plan to prevent traffic accidents, which I have here, which was brought out by the President's committee for traffic safety. This has been available to traffic departments for some ten years now and I point to page 18 of the section under motor vehicle administration. They point out here—I will not read it, it is fairly lengthy—how essential it is to have compulsory vehicle safety inspections annually or semi-annually and that the system which we have here in Ontario, which was specifically discussed at the conference that brought out this action programme, is not sufficient. The system we have here picks up a tiny proportion of the cars in the province and examines them.

This is an inadequate system and yet even with this inadequate system—I have a clipping here from the Toronto *Star* of November 4 last year, which has just been passed to me by the member for Yorkview. It points out that even here, with our system, that a Queen's Park safety lane check of 844 motor vehicles over the past eight days revealed that 632 had mechanical defects; a total of 27 were found completely unsafe and ordered off the road.

This is what you are finding by pulling cars off the road and inspecting them. If you had a proper system, where every car had to be inspected, all of these unsafe cars would be pushed off the road; changes would be made in the cars that could be improved, so undoubtedly there would be a reduction in the

number of accidents. More important, and I think this would follow, in addition to there being a reduction in the number of accidents you would have a reduction in the number of injuries. The present system has, in addition to being inadequate and inefficient, a rather sad and yet humorous side effect.

The police are doing their best with this law, they are pulling off as many cars as they can, directing them to have safety inspections. Unfortunately, in some cases it is not being done too intelligently and I would like to tell you the story of Lemuel Brent of 48 Meighan Avenue, in Toronto this past month. On May 6 at six o'clock—it was on a Sunday night—he was stopped in Ajax by an Ajax police officer. It was a spot check. I believe they were stopping every 10th or 20th car.

He was not stopped for committing any infraction of the driving rules but just because this was a routine they were carrying out. He was told to report to the safety lane at the rear of Steadman's to have his vehicle checked. He was quite willing to do this. So he said, "I will go there now"; but they said, "No, you cannot go there now, it is closed. You can go there any time on or before May 7."

This man lived and worked in Toronto. He just happened to be passing through Ajax and he said this would be inconvenient for him to come all the way back to Ajax. "I will have to miss a day's work," and they said, "Well, you have to." So when he got to Toronto, he got in touch with the Downsview station and he said, "I do not mind having this check, may I come up to Downsview and have my car checked there and get it over with." They said, "Well, you are very welcome to come up and have the check but if you do not go to Ajax you will be summoned and you will have to appear in court in Ajax to answer why you did not appear in Ajax. Undoubtedly the case would be thrown out of court if you say you came to Downsview but this is not going to save a trip to Ajax."

This is not an earth-shaking matter but let me suggest to the Minister that this is one of the rather foolish side effects of the present inadequate system. If you are going to continue to use this system, for goodness sake at least allow people, if they are going to have a check, to go to the area closest to their home.

But the whole system is bad and I would very strongly suggest to the Minister that the time has come in this province to have an annual, or preferably a semi-annual, compulsory, governmental check of every car that is used on this road and let me suggest to the Minister that there should be two modes of doing this.

In a city like Toronto, which has a very large number of cars on the road, the best system is that which is used in Vancouver, where there is one large government-run garage where cars can be run through at a very rapid rate. The fee I believe is $1.50 or $2 per examination. Because of the high volume it can be done very reasonably. Obviously this type of garage is not practical for smaller areas in the province and in these areas it is necessary to licence the private garages to do these inspections.

I am well aware of the objection that has been taken by the Minister, and of the problems that have been found in other jurisdictions with small private garages, but these problems can be overcome by a system of inspectors. Certainly, it is far better to have the minor problems that do come with using private garage in those areas rather than the system we have now where the cars are not inspected at all.

So may I say to the Minister, this is a reform that is long overdue. Are you prepared to bring it in? If so, what system will be used?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I spoke on the same topic last year—about compulsory checking of automobiles—although to tell the truth I did not visualize it being done every six months because I thought that would be both physically and financially impossible.

In the city of Metro Toronto alone we have, I think, some ¾ million private automobiles. There being 250 working days in the year, we would have to inspect cars at the rate of some 3,000 a day if we were to inspect them all in a year.

As a matter of fact, when I discussed this topic in the first instance, I discussed it in connection with a log book, stating that every time an automobile was taken in for repairs a mechanic would have to certify that the automobile was in a safe condition to be driven on the road. Through this compulsory log book, it would mean that an automobile was being inspected—and thoroughly inspected—every time there was an oil change, which would be anywhere from 2,000 to 3,000 miles. If there were some major repairs in between, again there would be a major check of that automobile so that, with the log book, an automobile would continuously be receiving a check.

Every automobile has its oil changed between 2,000 and 3,000 miles. This way the responsibility would be on the mechanic who is servicing the car. He would have to sign the log book as does the person working on an aircraft, who has to indicate what repairs or alterations he made and sign his name to it to assume responsibility for it.

Mr. Chairman, I rose on another matter, and that has to do with noise.

In 1957, then Alderman Don Sommerville, who subsequently became the mayor of the city of Toronto, moved that the city of Toronto, or Metro council rather, ought to pass a bylaw controlling noise emisison from automobiles. In order to prepare themselves for this bylaw, they engaged the services of one W. E. Hodges, a professional engineer, as the electro-accoustical consultant and he prepared a very comprehensive report and suggested how this bylaw should be phrased.

Because of objections made by the automobile industry and, specifically, the transport people, the automotive transport association of Ontario and the Canadian automobile chamber of commerce incorporated, it was not until 1958 that this bylaw was passed.

But dealing with motor transport it had to receive the approval of The Department of Transport and at that time, the hon. Mr. John Yaremko was the Minister of Transport. It was not until 1962, under a third Minister of Transport, following the hon. Mr. Yaremko, the hon. Mr. Rowntree became the Minister of Transport, that I believe it was he who ordered a report, I believe a report was prepared by the motor vehicle noise research committee. It was set up by the then Minister of Transport.

This committee finally reported in the year 1961, and in the interval, the bylaw which had been passed by Metro council did not receive approval of the Minister of Transport.

To make a long story short the report of the committee was absolutely assinine. They stated that it was not automobiles that created a problem but the presence of people; that it did not matter how much noise an automobile out in the desert made, it would not be disturbing anybody and the only reason that the noise out of automobiles was a nuisance was because people were around. The answer being, get rid of all the people and you will not have any trouble with automobiles.

At any rate, when this answer was passed down by a third Minister of Transport, the hon. Mr. Auld, to Metro council, they were so incensed that they got Mr. Hodges to prepare a rebuttal to the recommendations made by the motor vehicle noise research committee under Professor Henderson with the result that in 1963, if my memory serves me correctly, a bylaw was finally passed in a slightly amended form.

They just changed a few words and the method of metering. But the reason I raise the topic, Mr. Chairman, was that one of the reasons given for turning down the approval of the original bylaw was that there should be a uniform bylaw across the whole province.

Well, five years have gone by and aside from that section in The Highway Traffic Act pertaining to mufflers, there is still not a uniform anti-noise bylaw pertaining to automobiles for this province. As a matter of fact, the old bylaw that was passed by Metro dealt with decibels whereas it was suggested by the motor industry that they should deal in sones, this is what they suggested should be the unit of measurement. Please do not ask me what a sone is because I doubt very much whether even the hon. Minister knows.

At any rate there are two suggested methods of measurement. A metropolitan bylaw provided that a motor vehicle could not emit more than 94 decibels of sound. It was pointed out at that time in 1957, that there were only 10 per cent of the motor vehicles in Ontario which would have exceeded that particular measurement and that since the bylaw had been in abeyance to 1963, during the interval even those motor vehicles have gone into the graveyard where motor vehicles of that age go.

It would make more sense to reduce the maximum noise emitted by motor vehicles to say 74 decibels, because it has been pointed out that if you subject yourself to 85 decibels of noise for a period of four hours, you can impair your hearing. You can permanently lose part of your hearing in the higher frequency ranges. I think you should be wearing ear plugs at that rate, but the only bylaw that they could pass dealt with 94 decibels. Now I ask the hon. Minister:

When is he going to introduce a uniform anti-noise bylaw governing motor vehicles for this province; and if he ever does in the fullness of time, how many decibels are going to be permitted by that bylaw, or is he going to go into sones?

Mr. Sopha: And if he cannot answer, resign.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Unfair, we dealt with this, I think it was Thursday night, when the question of noise was raised. I would refresh the hon. members' memory in this. I gave tentative approval to the Toronto bylaw that it could be tested. They laid charges and they were dismissed, and they have not come back with anything that they think will make sense.

Some municipalities seem to have an enforcement locally, I think with the help of their magistrates that it seems successful, but I do not know how to do it. I give you this frank answer. The research council in Ottawa has had the problem on its hands for about two years, and if they can come up with anything satisfactory, I would be happy to consider bringing in the law that would make it uniform across the province.

Is there anyone else who wants to speak on vehicle inspection, because I would like to answer?

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in the—

Mr. Ben: May I just rebut with the hon. member what the Minister has said. I want to point out to him why it is so difficult to get a proper bylaw for the city of Toronto, and it is a pity that the Attorney General is not here, because this is what has to happen.

First of all, with reference to location of the metering device, for example—the section of street in which the noise is to be measured must have negligible grade. The surface must be smooth, unbroken and free from street car tracks, or railway tracks, and permissible speed limits must be 30 miles per and there must be no building or structure within a radius of 100 feet from the microphone. In addition—at the time the measurements are made—surrounding noises must be at a minimum; the temperature of the air must be above 60 degrees fahrenheit; and there must be no rainfall—in fact, the sky must be clear, or slightly overcast, and the wind velocity must be less than 10 miles per hour. Now in those circumstances, how in heaven's name do you expect them to get anybody for making too much noise out of an automobile?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Ben: You are not going to answer that one?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, I am not going to try.

Mr. B. Newman: Earlier in the debate I made a recommendation to the Minister as to how he could effectively institute a compulsory automobile inspection, and I would ask that he give his comments on this. Before I do sit down, may I mention that we had a safety lane inspection in my own community. To show you just the type of vehicle that is sometimes found on the road, there was a 15-year-old sedan which had its left front tie rod lashed to the wheel with a rubber band. This is the type of vehicle that you sometimes get on a road. So the type of inspection that you do have is not good enough, because the individual who has an automobile that might have some type of even minor defect, does not take it out during that period of time in which you have a safety inspection, a vehicle inspection in a community.

You have to institute a compulsory type of vehicle inspection. I did not make mention of one annually, because I thought it would be made physically impossible to start at an annual auto inspection, but I did programme it over a series of five years. I suggested that you take all vehicles older than the year 1960, or all vehicles that had over 75,000 miles; inspect them; and have owners present to the department a certificate of mechanical fitness when they apply for their 1969 plates. In the following year it would be the vehicles '63 and older, plus all vehicles with 75,000 miles on the odometers. The year following 1970—'66 and older; 1971—'69 and older; and by 1972 you would be right up to date, so that within a five-year period you could have all vehicles on the road inspected, and then later an annual type of inspection. I would like the Minister's comments on this.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, this is just a section of the vote we are talking about at the present time.

Mr. Chairman: I have taken the vote in total.

Mr. Young: Well, it may be the Minister wants to comment just on this matter on the techniques of inspection, I do not know, but I think before we have the inspection, of course, we have to have some standards as regards the motor vehicle, and I am not sure that the Minister is ready to set the standards, safety standards, and the kind of items that should enter into an inspection.

The matter I wanted to deal with particularly was in connection with the transfer of

the registrations. Perhaps you want to leave that for another moment, or shall I deal with it now.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Now is all right.

Mr. Young: All right. I have a letter before me, and I will quote a paragraph from it; I think, Mr. Chairman, it puts the matter very clearly.

> Recently I had to help cope with the problem encountered by someone who last winter got a new car. Several months later he began to get summonses in respect of his former automobile. Complicated investigation revealed that the new owner had not sent in the prescribed form—the car permit. The old car was not insured and still registered in the former owner's name and my father, when consulted, said that the former owner had no civil liability; but a fine combing of the Act convinced us that the only way he could safely conform with it is by going hand in hand to the postbox with the purchaser when you divest yourself of your old car. How silly!

Now, this was a matter which was subject to some correspondence between the person writing this letter and the department, and between me and the department, and finally some resolution was arrived at. But I wonder if there is not some better way that could be developed to transfer the motor vehicle. It may well be that both somehow have to act in this field, so that responsibility can be divested from the former, and the new owner accept that responsibility. It may be that the Minister has some ideas as to a better method than this one which evidently has been in effect up until the present time. I wonder if the Minister will want to comment.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have required that the transfer be reported, and as you say it was a joint responsibility of the vendor and the purchaser. This may be solved in part by the new regulations with regard to transfers that will require the coming forward of the certificate of mechanical fitness, and perhaps impress upon the purchaser the need to get the papers completed and get the certificate of mechanical fitness, and see that the transfer is recorded. I think that there has been a tendency in the past for each to suppose it was the responsibility of the other. Is that the point you are making?

Mr. Young: The point is, Mr. Chairman, that it is very difficult if I am selling a car to another person. It is very difficult for me to force him to register that car in his name. I might chase him a long time and still he might fail to do the job. I have another note here from another person in the same way when canvassing in Parkdale. A note here:

> I met Mr. Anthony Mastrolas, 116 Glendale Avenue, who complained that he notified the licence bureau of a change of address for his driver's licence, and assumed that the same notification would cover his owner's permit. He found to his chagrin that it did not, and when he got stopped on a police spot check, he ended up by paying a $12 fine for failing to change the owner's permit.

This is the problem. I sell the car to someone else, and that someone just does not bother to register, and how am I as the vendor going to force him to do it. I can telephone: "Have you done it?" He says no, I am going to do it tomorow. Tomorrow I telephone him, and he says: "Yes I have done it." But he has not. This I think is the fundamental problem that must be overcome in some way.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Well with our new requirement for a certificate of mechanical fitness we will have dual papers for both to sign, and if one completes it and sends it in, I think that will be satisfactory.

Now I come to the member for Wentworth to speak on motor vehicle inspection.

Mr. Deans: I did want to speak about tires, that is all.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes.

Mr. Deans: Let me ask the Minister if he would consider tire safety as part of the motor vehicle inspection? Every day I see on television, and I watch in the newspapers, advertisements that tell me about the wonderful treads on tires and how they have redesigned them and how they have changed them so they are getting a better grip on the road and everything is getting wonderful. Now, at the transportation workshop at the Inn-on-the-Park I raised the question of these bald tires that were regrooved and at that time I questioned whether they could possibly be safe.

I question it yet, I doubt very much the answer I received. I have looked at them; I have looked at buses that use them; I have looked at the transports that use them, and I question very seriously the safety factor. In Hamilton, for example, the HSR gets 60,000 miles from an original tire and they are regrooved twice to get up to 50,000 additional miles. A great many of those additional

miles and even a great many of the original 60,000 are on tires that, if not completely bald, are at least almost bald. It does not make sense to me that I should read so much about the value of the tread on a tire if it is possible to come along and just score it and make them safe.

I would ask the Minister, has this been very seriously tested? Has he seen it personally? Is it safe? If it is, I do not see how it could be.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, let me deal first of all with the business of vehicle inspection. I think we all agree that vehicle inspection is a good thing. We all agree it is going to come and the question is how is it going to come and how fast is it going to come? The term "vehicle inspection", I think the member for Yorkview makes his point, depends on what your standards are. And this is what we see when we look at the overall problem of vehicle inspection.

I have talked to some of the ablest vehicle safety people on the continent and I gain the impression from them that there is a lot goes on under the blessed name of vehicle inspection that is not worth the sticker that is given. There is as much difference in vehicle inspections at one place or another as there is between day and night. And there is a great confusion about the stories we get on vehicle inspection.

The kind of spot-check that we have been doing with our 38-point safety check-lane, which was a unit that was originated here in Ontario, is good up to a point, and I think it is a very good standard. It will compare very well with the standards any place on the continent. And yet I can pick out a few instances where they have done certain vehicle checks that I think were better in some measure than we were doing. But I am not sure they are consistent.

The hon. member mentioned inspections being done in the city of Washington, the District of Columbia. It has about as long a record of periodic compulsory vehicle inspections as I can think of; it has been going on there for about 20 years. I rode around the stations with the administrator of motor vehicles for the District of Columbia. I asked him how long he figures they spend on a car. He said, "On the average, about three minutes."

I think we spend about ten on our vehicle check-lanes. I am not satisfied with that, not even with the cars we do, about 125,000 to 150,000 a year, because we are using them now through the winter months. As we had it out here in the Highways' garage, we had it operating for some time in Ottawa. In the late winter we took off the road over 400 cars as being unsafe, in that piece of winter inspection. We took the plates off more than 5,000 cars with that compulsory inspection lane operation last summer. It was our second full year of compulsory use of those lanes. And the fleet of lanes keeps increasing.

In British Columbia they have had a good operation. It is under the auspices of the municipality. And where you have a compact population like that, with all the cars close in, an operation by the municipality has certain things to commend it. British Columbia does not have compulsory inspection in the way the members advocate and think it is now operating in certain places. They have taken our kind of equipment and they have really just started using it. I do not think they could give you any convincing results over any period of time or over any area yet. I think we want to be honest about these things.

The province of Nova Scotia has recently adopted a province-wide compulsory vehicle inspection programme drafted, I would say, after the fashion of the state of New York, utilizing licenced garages.

These are the different kinds of things. What are your standards going to be? Well, one of the standards that concerns me is steering, tie-rods and ball joints, and we have just now got in the new equipment for calibrating tie-rod play. We can check any kind of set-up now with the front end to determine how much tie-rod play there is, and we will use the manufacturers' specifications as to what is allowable safety and what is not. This is the kind of thing we have to get into.

We do not pull wheels and check the brake linings, and I do not think we can do that in our mobile lanes. You pull a wheel and what happens? Supposing a spring falls off or breaks, supposing one of the cylinders becomes injured, supposing you put the wheel back on again and you do not have all the torsion types of wrenches you need to meet the manufacturers' specification for replacing the wheel. It puts our operators in the mobiles in the difficult position of possibly doing some damage to the car and not being able to replace that damaged part then and there with the required piece of equipment. These, I confess to you, are problems we run into in our mobile operations.

Our mobile operations are doing a first-class job since we got them on to the compulsory operation. I think that it was the

operation of one of those in Windsor, I say to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, that moved me to say, "Why do we bother with using these on a voluntary basis, let's get into using them compulsorily," and we have been doing that since. But we are not covering, as I say, more than 150,000 a year. And that is only a spot-check or an audit check; good so far, but just so far.

I have discussed this matter with the people in the Ontario garage operators association. I have talked with them on the problems of staff and their ability to handle that much more work, thinking it would be a bonanza for them. They shrug their shoulders and just wonder how far they can go before they got bogged down. We are making a survey of all the registered motor vehicle mechanics there are in this province, all the certified mechanics. We are wondering how much more work they can do that we are going to impose on them this year.

This year every used car sold by a used car dealer or in a private sale has to go through a new type of vehicle safety inspection; not the kind of thing we have been doing, a much more in-depth inspection. It will take much longer. It will be done in one of the licenced garages by a licenced mechanic; 600,000 used cars being transferred in title will go through that kind of in-depth or sophisticated examination this year. I say that is a very, very substantial step into something in the nature of motor vehicle inspection that will be worthwhile. Now, add that to what we are doing.

Then we have about 300,000 new cars sold annually in this province. As you know, the system now followed by the motor vehicle manufacturers is they require their franchise dealer to make certain service inspections and adjustment before that car is delivered. There are gaps in it. There have been cars go through that should not have been passed. That will happen wherever you have the human element interjected.

About 300,000 more vehicles will be subject to that kind of inspection and I have been discussing this with the leading motor car manufacturers. The service chief of one of them is coming in to see me this week with a report I asked him to give me on just how they are doing these things, how their recalls are operated and some of these other pertinent questions on which we have been pressing for answers.

So with the 300,000 new cars, with the 600,000 used cars being sold going through the new in-depth vehicle safety examination, with the more than 125,000 or 150,000 going through our check lanes, we are checking this year more than a million of the cars on the highways of Ontario. And I say that is a very, very substantial increase in highway safety so far as the vehicles are concerned.

We have looked at the different ways of doing it. Are we going to do like Vancouver does, or might we copy from a single city like Washington in the District of Columbia? Can we do that in Ontario with its great distances, with its sparse population, with the long areas people would have to drive? I do not think so. Can we use garages? We are not sure we have enough mechanics. When they get the meal digested that we are giving them this year, I think they will have all they can handle for now.

But we are checking, as I say, the total number of certified mechanics across Ontario to do the job. If we were to hand it over to the garages, we could come to a combination of these—of government-operated stations for check-lanes and certified garages doing the job. This we are looking at, but I say that it is premature to decide if the garages can do any more than we are going to be looking for them to do right now. There is no use getting a whole backlog of cars to be inspected because they cannot handle them, because you know the kind of work that will likely go on in some garages; it would be quite superficial. This we do not want.

So I say to the hon. member, insofar as vehicle inspection is concerned I am not standing in the way of it. I want vehicle inspection, I want to know the standards, and these we are checking out—a very long and detailed list of all the critical parts in a car that should be inspected. This we are checking over with the manufacturers. All their key personnel and engineers are coming in to discuss with us the feasibility of the various points we want done, the reasonableness of doing it, and the requirement for specialized machines for testing. This thing is advancing as rapidly as I think it is reasonable to push it.

I come finally to the point on tires raised by my friend from Wentworth. I intimated to the House in measure about a year ago, and I cannot recall my exact words, that we were expecting further regulations on used tires, on retreads and regrooves. That was to have come up following V1 and it was to be grouped as V2 standards for used tires. That programme has gone by the boards at the present because we have moved into our Canadian standard tires. Instead of the V1 now we are applying the CSA standards, the

full equivalent of V1 and CSA, and the tire manufacturers are working out with us new standards that will be used for retreads, re-grooved tires and such.

Every tire that has been manufactured for sale in Ontario today has telltale tread level marks in it. We will be able to specify tread level depths from here on, as soon as we get these new standards. I have said to this House that we are progressing with new standards for tires and we have done it. We expect these new tire standards to come out as soon as we can have them ready and they will establish tread depths. When we get tread depths we will be able to specify what tires can be regrooved safely and we will have to take cognizance of the telltale colour lines in the remaining tread depth. This is what we are looking for.

I know that there was this case in Kingston of which the hon. member spoke. It was not as final as we might have hoped because the case was simply decided that there was no liability on the part of the driver or the company, but despite that, our new regulations will deal with the new tires that will have to have a determined level of rubber left in tread depth before they can be touched. The retreading will not be able to go below it.

Mr. Deans: Just one question on that. Will these standards also designate what kind of tread—I mean will it be sufficient to have this sort of V-type grooving, this criss-cross groove across the tire? Will this be suitable and adequate under the new standards or will you have to have a certain number of treads on the face of the tire?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would not like to answer the member, Mr. Chairman, I do not know. This is the kind of thing that will be worked out, I think, as we get into the re-tread programme of regulations for used tires. I will take the suggestion thoughtfully and see that it is discusesd.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister regarding the licenced car wreckers throughout the province. I understand that when they buy a car for wrecking from a dealer that they have to submit the licence and the registration card. Of course, as licenced auto wreckers they pay a sales tax on all the parts they sell. But what I am concerned about is the hundreds of people who are not licenced and who do not submit the plates or the registration cards to the department. In some cases, I understand they just burn them and that you have no record of any of the private people who buy from dealers.

I was thinking that if the dealer was to turn in the registration cards and the licences of cars that are to be wrecked previous to selling them either to a licenced dealer or to a private person, that it would be more in order to keep records.

For example, I understand that some of the private people who do buy a car for wrecking, transfer the plates to another car, drive it until the end of the year and are getting away with it. I have had some complaints by licenced auto wreckers who claim this is happening. They feel it is not fair that they are paying licence fees and paying sales tax on all parts, and other people are not. Has the Minister comments on that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the reason we licence not only used car dealers but car wreckers is that we may have inspection of their premises. Now this is an enforcement problem and it may be that there are cars escaping the law. I think the used car dealers who are selling cars for wrecking would have to send us the licence plates and the certificate. If they are not safe cars to be sold—deals between car dealers, used car dealers as such—and they are registered with my colleague, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, transactions between registered used car dealers do not have to go through the inspection before they are sold, the sale from one of them to another person has to be to a user or to a wrecker.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, the discussion we have had on the inspection of motor vehicles is a very interesting one. I think we all understand something of the difficulties the Minister faces here and something of the progress that has been made. We promise him that we will keep the pressure up until we see the fulfillment of the dream that he has outlined here tonight.

But there are a couple of other approaches to this whole field which, I think, would assist in ensuring safety on the highway. One is the insisting on standards of the brand new vehicles that we have discussed across the floor here from time to time. The other one is standards for certain parts of the vehicle.

I am not sure in the province of Ontario how much supervision is being given to things like brake linings, for example. Brake linings are pretty essential in motor cars and while I think, by and large, the brake linings in the new cars coming out are pretty satisfactory

and pretty good, what assurance have we that the brake linings going in to replace the original ones are all superior quality? Have we any standards at all in the province of Ontario in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would have to say to the member for Yorkview that we do not have, as far as I know, standards on replacement of brake linings. I think he is quite right.

Mr. Young: Yes. I think here is something perhaps the Minister ought to examine very carefully because we have a lot of small plants making brake linings in the province. I came across a survey which was made a year or so ago, and this is reported in *Mechanics Illustrated*, November, 1966. It is rather an illuminating article. I am not going to read the article into the record but there are two or three things that should be pointed out.

The question is asked how good are replacement linings? "Our investigation of only a small segment of the market, using the latest and most scientific testing method yet devised, indicates that some linings are surprisingly good and some equally poor."

Then they ask the question, do the linings increase in quality as they increase in price? "Our research revealed that there is no discernible price-quality relationship. Prices seemingly depend primarily on how much profit the manufacturer or retailer permits himself." I understand there are only a few regular standards—New York has them, Pennsylvania has them, and I am not sure if Massachusetts also has a standard. But the survey which is given here points out certain things, and I want to give an illustration. The number one, top-rated, top-quality brake lining costs $6.60 in this particular location to install. The second best costs $9. The third best costs $9.50, the fourth best costs $4.25, a price drop. The fifth went up to $14.88; that was the fifth quality down the line, and you have the price up to $14.88. The sixth $7.50, the seventh $13, and the eighth and the poorest, $15.80.

In other words, the best as far as the testing equipment showed is $6.60, and the poorest costs $15.80. This was a test which was run and the accuracy is claimed here and the proof is given; the names are given of all the various brands. This is an American test, of course, but I have no reason to think that similar tests run in Canada, in Ontario, might not result in the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, last week we had an authority to specify brake linings but with the amendment that went through The Highway Traffic Act last week, we now have authority to mandate by adoption of standards by records.

Mr. Young: But will the Minister mandate? I do not know whether the Canadian standards association has set any standards, or is working on standards of this kind, but surely brake linings are important enough for the Minister to give immediate attention to it so that we have some real standards in this field?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will certainly look at the standards on brake linings.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): I just have a short question for the Minister. Certain dual-purpose vehicles that are being manufactured by General Motors, Ford and Chrysler and some of the imported vehicles, are classed as commercial vehicles; a person who licences them has to put a commercial licence on them. However, in most cases they are just used as station wagons. Is there no way that they can be changed to use the dual-purpose licence which is a cheaper licence, and still operate on the highway?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The dual-purpose is really not a commercial licence, it is dual purpose.

Mr. Jackson: That is what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that certain of these vehicles that are being manufactured and come out of the plant are originally licenced as commercial vehicles, and yet when the person buys them they are used as a station wagon, or dual-purpose vehicle. I know of several cases where the owner has tried to change them over to a dual-purpose licence, and has been refused, and has had to licence them as a commercial vehicle. This has had several other problems other than just the licence—insurance regulations and the fact that the licence is more expensive are the main objections to it.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I can see a problem in moving a vehicle that has been licenced as a commercial vehicle into a dual-purpose one. I will just try to find out what the requirement is; I think that we can find out. I will look at it and consider what the problem is.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, we spoke of Millbrook reformatory and the making of registration plates, and I cannot in my own mind help but wonder a little bit why we spend the money, $1,040,000 every year,

making new plates, when a windshield tag or a small licence plate tag would serve the purpose.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is likely to happen in about two years time, as we get our system mechanized.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): I should like to ask the Minister whether he has replied to the brief that was sent to him by the teamsters' local 880, a request for highway safety measures, particularly safety equipment and rescue on the highway. Have you replied to them?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I do not identify the group that the hon. member refers to, by the teamsters' union?

Mr. Burr: Yes, local 880. Apparently they sent this brief in during the winter, I believe, with a large number of suggestions.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: They did not make an appointment to see me. I do not think that I have any brief before me where I do not have representation and we usually have invited the people to come and support their brief of that nature. I will look it up if we have it, but I doubt it.

Vote 2203 agreed to.

On vote 2204:

Mr. Young: On vote 2204 I would like to ask the Minister if the recent changes in legislation or proposed changes will make a difference in the rental situation in the province where, up to the present time, rental carriers were riding roughshod over The PCV Act. The small cartage firms are limited by territory and they have certain regulations to abide by, and yet, up to this point, one could hire a rental truck and goods could be transported anywhere without the restrictions that applied to the smaller common carriers, and I wonder if the new changes will solve the problem.

For example: the PCV carrier with a licence is perhaps licenced to take goods from here to Cooksville, he cannot take them on to Hamilton. But that same carrier might rent a rental truck and carry the load through. This has been the cause of a great deal of concern among the smaller carriers in particular in the province who have been brought under the PCV licences. They have been much disturbed by the growth of the whole rental field. It may well be that the recent changes in the legislation will meet this problem, and I wonder if the Minister would comment on this.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the member suggests that a common carrier can extend his franchise beyond his licence limit by renting another vehicle and using it to transport his goods beyond the licenced area?

Mr. Young: I understand that he can get one of the rental companies to carry the load for him?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: He is breaking the law someplace, I will look into the situation and see where the breach has occurred. We tried with our amendments to The PCV Act to plug both pseudo-leasing and that angle of it.

Mr. Young: So, the Minister feels that this problem is pretty well solved once the legislation—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, Mr. Chairman, I would like the member to give me a further story on the problem so that I can satisfy myself that what I am saying to the member is the fact. I do not understand what he says is occurring.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, perhaps this can be done. The Minister feels that the problem is solved in this legislation and I do not know that we need take too much time here tonight. But what was conveyed to me was that giant rental companies, often controlled outside the country, set up shop in local service stations and thus escape most property and business taxes, and they buy provincial licence plates for their trucks and they are in business.

They have no territory limitations, and they can go where they wish and work seven days a week, and do business anywhere. The rental trucks are generally supplied by dealers at a much lower price than the licenced carriers. This is the information the licenced carriers give me.

Because in the dealer link their used transports have a higher resale potential, and the licenced carriers are limited to territory while the rental firms are free as the birds. The licenced companies do business within a specified area, and they are subject to penalties if they pick up or deliver cargo outside these boundaries.

If they wish an extension of these limits, they must apply, accompanied by a fee, and the hearing involves legal and other expenses. The rentals are not bound in this way. They

can go where they wish and do business where they can find it. It is an ironical fact that a licenced company—this I understand—operating in Metro, cannot use one of its own trucks to take a cargo to Hamilton, for example. But that same company can hire a rental firm, and make the delivery without violating the regulations of the province. Now this may be a misunderstanding, I do not know. What the Minister says is that this is not the case, and I would like his comment on it.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the renting or leasing of a vehicle does not give a person the right of for-hire carrying the goods of others. If he rents a vehicle for his own use and moves his own goods, that is one thing, but he has no privilege to go into the for-hire trucking business in competition with licenced operators because he has leased a vehicle. He can move his own goods in a leased vehicle.

Mr. Young: If he takes contracts and moves goods from here to Hamilton? And then he cannot get the rental truck to do the job?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is an enforcement problem. He can extend his own fleet by the renting of other trucks from other people so long as he is operating within his territory.

Mr. Young: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will deal with the estimates of this department, followed by those of The Department of Education and University Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 105



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Lakehead milk marketing and grants to northern Ontario, statement by Mr. Stewart 3841

Printing errors in physicians' applications for involuntary admissions under The Mental Health Act, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Nixon 3844

Dr. Rygeil's home for children in Hamilton, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Nixon 3844

Employment for former Blind River police force, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. MacDonald 3845

Altering conditions at an accident site prior to an investigation, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Martel 3845

Westmorland hotel, question to Mr. Welch, Mr. Singer 3845

Loans to relieve housing shortage in Toronto, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. Sargent 3845

Income tax deduction for living costs of university students, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Sargent 3846

Regulating use of antibiotics in food producing animals, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Sargent 3847

Summer student employment programme, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Sargent 3847

Tourists bringing live bait into Ontario, question to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Stokes 3848

Extending deadline of crop insurance purchase for corn, soya beans and white beans, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Spence 3848

Altering scene of fatality at Copper Cliff, prior to investigation, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Martel 3849

Stacknic inquest, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Martel 3849

Independent police investigation of mine fatalities, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Martel 3850

Release of sworn testimony of Mr. Murray Mehlman, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Shulman 3850

Ord Wallington and Company Limited, questions to Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Shulman 3851

Estimates, Department of Transport, Mr. Haskett, concluded 3851

Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis 3880

Recess, 6 o'clock 3885

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 1968

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon we have visiting us, in the east gallery, students from Christ the King school in New Toronto; and in the west gallery, from the Richard W. Scott public school in Toronto.

Later this afternoon we will be most pleased to be joined by two ladies' groups. In the east gallery will be the North Derby women's auxiliary from Jackson and, in the west gallery, the Madoc women's institute in Madoc. We welcome these visitors.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

The Minister of Agriculture and Food has a statement.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I noticed a newspaper article which appeared in the Port Arthur *News Chronicle* recently as a report submitted by the hon. member for Port Arthur. The article appears under the dateline of May 10:

> Ron Knight, Port Arthur MPP, suggested in the Legislature Thursday, during a debate on estimates of The Department of Agriculture, that the department had obviously written northern Ontario off as far as farming is concerned and it was now in the process of gradually withdrawing aid. Mr. Knight said today in a telephone call from Toronto, the Minister Hon. William A. Stewart had not denied it. He did not even reply to the statement. The Port Arthur member said he had several reasons for his statement. He asked the Minister why do farmers in northwest Ontario have to dump milk at times when in the city you have to pay 34 cents or 35 cents a quart for it. The Minister said because the Lakehead is not drinking milk. The only solution is to get more people to drink it. The hon. member is a professional in promotion and perhaps he should go back to the Lakehead and start a milk campaign to get more people to drink it.

Now I thought that was a very good suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

> Twenty two items were discussed and voted on including the allotment for agriculture in northern Ontario which amounted to $250,000. Mr. Knight said millions were spent in other parts of the province on agriculture and he felt that $250,000 was a piddly amount for all of northern Ontario. He also objected to the fact this major item was included with the debate on general awards and farm safety programmes. He felt that the debate was not concentrated on northern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I did not reply to the hon. member's statement during my estimates was because it was such a ridiculous statement that I did not really think the hon. member was serious and so I made no reply to this charge of withdrawing aid.

Concerning excess milk production to—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, on a point or order please.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I suggest for your consideration that it is one thing for a Minister to get up and make a statement *ex cathedra* on a topic that has not been before the House, but for a Minister to get up and acknowledge that he has changed his mind—that something said some weeks ago in the House is now deserving of reply—is an abuse of the privileges of this House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): In speaking to the point of order. I was under the impression that the Minister was getting up on a point of personal privilege as would be his right, if in fact something had been reported that he believes is in error; but as we follow his comments he simply makes a speech in reply to the comments made by the hon. member some weeks ago.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I take it this is a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nixon: "The Minister of Agriculture and Food has a statement", the Speaker said. That would be a Ministerial statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The Minister is making a statement and insofar as Mr. Speaker is concerned he will continue. He is in order.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, do you consider this a point of personal privilege? Otherwise, I do not see that it is in order.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Make a fair ruling.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise again on this point of order. In fact, I have been sitting rather quietly for some days and—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: —I have been sitting rather quietly, Mr. Speaker, for some days with reference to the greater restrictions being placed on questions from this side of the House. Now this is your duty—to see that the rules of the House are enforced with regards to questions from this side.

I suggest that abusive Ministerial statements are equally important in terms of seeing that the rules of the House should be enforced. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, we have reached the stage where the only way we can protect the House from abuse from this side is that you get the questions and vet them in advance. Conceivably, the only answer to the problem facing us is that you should get the replies and the Ministerial statements in advance and vet them. Then, maybe, we will have an even balance in applying rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Well, after listening to debate in this House on all sides during the present session, I must say that the matters concerning which the Opposition are now questioning my ruling and feeling are equally evident at various times on all sides of the House. And as far as I am concerned, I would be very pleased to take under advisement the suggestion by the member for York South and discuss the matter of Ministerial statements.

I must say this though, as far as I am concerned, the Ministry has a right to make a statement as to policy or as to any matter of importance so far as the department—

Mr. Sargent: —policy! He is defending himself.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member please extend to me the courtesy which I usually try to have extended to him?

As far as the Ministry statements are concerned I have a strong feeling that they must be proper, but that they must be less hampered than Opposition parties, of course, would wish them to be.

Mr. MacDonald: Why?

Mr. Speaker: Just as the Opposition questions have been allowed and are still being allowed to be quite unhampered.

Mr. Sargent: And unchanged?

Mr. Speaker: The questions, if they are changed, are changed by the member concerned now in accordance with the rules.

Mr. Sargent: On the government side.

Mr. Speaker: The member has never learned that courtesy pays and, in this House, when he continually interrupts the Speaker he is interrupting the work of this House and not myself personally. And since the question and problem of statements by the Minister before the orders of the day has been a custom of this House for a long time, as long as I have been here, I think it is one that should continue. But as I mentioned, I will be glad to take under advisement the suggestion of the member for York South. Then I would say to the Minister of Agriculture and Food that on occasion he has let in this House his feelings—partisan feelings—persuade him into longer and greater statements than perhaps he originally intended to make. I would ask that he now deal with his statement before the orders of the day in the manner which is understood in this House.

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, I hate to prolong this, but on the same point of order —since you are asking for advice or you are taking it under advisement—I do not believe it is your responsibility to vet Ministerial statements but only to rule in a reasonable way when a Minister appears to be out of order; as this Minister is on this occasion. If he were to rise on a point of personal privilege there would be no question. But to cloak this in all the majesty of the Ministerial statement is, in my view, out of order.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise a point of order.

I want to submit to you sir, and I want to beseech you and I want to plead with you. I observe that the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) has come to his seat and I am very glad of that so that he can become party to this discussion.

I want to submit to you sir, that May—I do not, like my friend from London South (Mr.

White) have a copy of May at hand at all times—lays down in very strict terms the characteristics governing a Ministerial statement. They can be in relation to a matter of government policy, or the announcement of some happening pertaining to Ministerial responsibility. But May makes it very clear that such statements are not to be characterized by political partisanship or are not calculated to generate disagreement or provoke antagonisms on the other side of the House.

Mr. Nixon: May could not have said it better.

Mr. Sopha: Now in the light of those, I want to suggest to you that this statement, sir, being made today is nothing more than an act of political partisanship coupled with an effort to—it is alleged—set the records straight and engage in argumentive discussion concerning remarks made by my colleague from Port Arthur. It is nothing short of the type of statement that one would expect to encounter in the Throne or Budget debate—

Mr. Sargent: Right!

Mr. Sopha: —and it cannot cloak itself in any way under the characteristics set out by May, concerning Ministerial statements. Therefore, I am pleading with you sir, as a guardian of our rights I am pleading with you to say to the Minister of Agriculture and Food now, "do not go ahead with this statement." If you will, as you have indicated—at some later time when you have had a chance to consult the authorities—you then can lay down, on our behalf, the considerations that shall hereafter govern the making of Ministerial statements. But if you allow him to go ahead, sir, what makes me anxious is that not only may a precedent be set, but all rights may be infringed in a way that is difficult to rectify. Perhaps through you I could ask the Minister not to insist on his right; any right you give him to go ahead.

Mr. Speaker: I might express my thanks to the member for Sudbury for giving the House a very good résumé of some of the statements and rules laid down in May with which I must say I am not unacquainted.

I am not, from now on, going to put up with interruptions; and quite properly. The Speaker has the floor, and I want it perfectly well understood, because if it continues, I shall ask the House to back me and take steps to see that it does not occur continually.

I would ask the Minister, first of all, if his statement—as he wishes to continue—is a Ministerial statement or a point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is a point of personal privilege, and I do not want to offend my hon. friends opposite in the least degree. I simply wanted to relate to them the facts of the situation as they actually are, and to let them know what really is happening; because this newspaper statement, to me, is somewhat misleading. I am sure it is not intentionally misleading in any way, shape or form, and I do not want to leave the impression with you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members of this House, that the hon. member for Port Arthur—in the telephoned news report which he made to the paper in Port Arthur—did attempt to mislead anyone. I simply wanted to provide the information which I felt that the hon. members of this House would be pleased to have. With your permission, sir, I would like to continue to set this record straight.

Concerning this matter of excess milk production to fluid requirements that the hon. member mentioned, it is virtually impossible to gear production to fluid requirements, because there are times of the year when there is more milk produced and it cannot be used in the bottle trade. In an area such as Port Arthur and Fort William and the Lakehead area, because of economic conditions in the cost of producing that milk, there has been no industrial plant established to use excess milk.

Now, two of the dairies at the Lakehead, realizing that there is a problem, with some farmers not being able to gear their production to what they are able to use in the bottle trade, have installed butter churns. They are going to skim that excess milk and make the butter fat into butter. I thought this was something that we should all know about.

In connection with what the hon. member describes as "that piddly amount of $250,000 on agriculture in northern Ontario", this refers only to one item. This is the $250,000 special agricultural grant which is provided by the department through the extension service for special projects as designated by local committees of farm people working in co-operation with our extension branch.

A quick examination of some of our department's work in northern Ontario last year shows that grants alone have reached in excess of $3,616,000, and this does not include the provision of dozens of staff workers in northern Ontario, in the extension branch, in home economics, in veterinary service,

fruit and vegetable inspection, research, rural development, dairy inspection and our livestock and soils branch. In fact, we have a higher ratio of workers per 1,000 commercial farms in northern Ontario than in the rest of the province; a substantial number of these extension and agricultural department people are bilingual.

In addition to these outright grants in excess of $3.5 million in the years 1965 and 1966, we gave grants of $1,364,000 in northern Ontario to persons who suffered crop losses in adverse weather. We have provided to northern Ontario farmers many millions of dollars in loans, and in most cases with a government guarantee and subsidized interest rate: $331,000 for seed and fertilizer in 1966; $2,650,000 for adverse weather loans in 1966 and 1967; $2,596,000 in first mortgage loans on the junior farmer loan programme since 1963; and $218,000 in loans under the co-operative loans board. The subsidization of the interest rate on these loans and the administration alone is a very substantial annual cost.

In setting forth these benefits for northern Ontario, I have not included the thousands of acres of land that have been acquired for community pastures, for farm enlargement, for beef farms, for reforestation programmes and similar land assembly programmes. Neither does it include the multitude of special studies and research projects that we have financed in the north, and hundreds of northern Ontrio Indians that we have transported to jobs in southern Ontario and back again; nor the northern Ontario young people we have transported as part of the 4H and junior farmer programmes. I might, in this instance, point out the fact that we were very much honoured by the fact that a young lady from the Port Arthur area won the Ontario dairy princess competition and the Canadian dairy princess competition a few years ago.

Mr. Nixon: Out of order!

Mr. Speaker: Order! Perhaps the Minister will stick to the statement from which he is reading, which I believe was very good until he departed from it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I thought that was an interesting sideline.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that every service available to farmers in southern Ontario is available to farmers in northern Ontario, in addition to those special grants and services that I have just outlined. I would hope, with the revelation of these facts as they are, that my hon. friend would display the same haste to report to the newspapers these facts as he did in the first place.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Health. What printing errors occurred in the physicians' applications for involuntary admissions under The Mental Health Act proclaimed last Saturday? What was the cost of correcting these errors?

Hon. M. D. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in adjusting the spacing of the content of this form, three words were dropped from one line. The printer assumed the full cost of reprinting the form and the notice of the error when it was drawn to his attention.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister—these had been distributed well in advance of the proclamation of the Act, is that so?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot be certain but I think about ten days, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty) put a question to the Minister yesterday and because of the Minister's absence it could not be answered. The hon. member has asked me to ask it today—if you will allow it, Mr. Speaker—in five parts.

Is the Minister aware that Dr. Rygeil's home for children at 430 Whitney Avenue, in Hamilton, is near bankruptcy and may have to release 100 mentally retarded children for lack of funds? What will happen to these children if the home is forced to close? What special steps will the Minister take to keep the home open in the light of a comment of Dr. D. E. Zarfus, provincial director of services for the mentally retarded, that this home is, and I quote, "The biggest, the newest, and one of the best"? What is the reason for the difference between the per diem rate of $8.50 for the private homes and the $12.50 allowed government institutions? Finally, what special steps must the Legislature take to increase the per diem rate from $8.50 per day in this particular instance, bearing in mind the particular degree of attention each child requires?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not have the official information on this, but I can assure the hon. member that the home is not near bankruptcy. There is no intention of moving the

children and the movement of the children will not be necessary nor permitted.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That is not the situation as I understand it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Was that a question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker did not hear any comment.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Attorney General. Since the OPP have taken over policing in Blind River, how many of the town's former police force are still awaiting jobs as they have been assured?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that of the five man force, three have obtained employment and two are unemployed. I might say that when the mayor and council of the town of Blind River requested that the Ontario Provincial Police take over the policing some eight or ten weeks ago, it was mainly because of the financial condition in which the town found itself, with a budget of some $52,000 for policing.

The mayor and council told us that they would assist us in every way to find employment for the members of the town police force. We pointed out the problem of taking over on short notice; it was arranged that notice would be given in advance as possible. We undertook to give each of the members of that force a thorough consideration as members of the provincial police force. This has been done.

Actually, the conditions for joining the Ontario Provincial Police were relaxed to some degree, but none of the men qualified. Three, according to the mayor to whom I talked today, have employment, and two are unemployed. He informs me, and I will not use any names, that one man lacks desire to obtain employment, being more concerned with making statements to the press and radio stations. The other man has a bit of a health problem in his overweight condition, but the town officials with whom we have been continuously in touch on the matter, are attempting to assist. I have taken some time to expand that answer. I hope that the other two who still remain can get employment.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East has a question from yesterday, and also one today.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I have a question for the Attorney General. Is the Attorney General aware that the scene of a fatality is frequently altered prior to the arrival of investigating officers, the coroner or mine inspectors? And will the Attorney General take measures to insure that the practice of improving conditions on an accident site prior to investigation be stopped immediately?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have heard the suggestion made but at no time have I received any evidence which would support such an allegation. The persons making these statements have never been at an accident site to observe the procedure followed. Investigating mine inspectors and coroners have never seen any evidence at any mine fatality that any material, substance or structure has been tampered with prior to their arrival. If the hon. member has such evidence I would appreciate receiving it as soon as possible. I presume that he has not such or he would have made it available by this time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview has a question from yesterday.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Secretary. Will the Minister advise why no disciplinary action was taken by the liquor licence board against the Westmorland hotel after the recent conviction of its former manager on the charge of keeping a common bawdy house at the hotel for nearly three months last summer?

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the licensee of this particular establishment will be called before the board in the latter part of this month to show cause why the licence in question should not be either cancelled or suspended.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: A question to the Minister of Trade and Development. In a press report in the *Globe and Mail* on Monday, June 3, Mr. Robert Bradley, executive director of the Toronto housing authority, stated that Toronto leads North American cities in housing shortage. Would the Minister advise if he will approach the following agencies for housing loans: The international development agency; the American federation of labour; the CIO.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I will take the

question as notice and get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I have a question for the Minister of Education. Whereas many thousands of university students must pay room and board, either in residence or living out in private rooms where they attend university outside of their home city—and that is a substantial extra charge for education against a large segment of our Ontario people—what steps can be taken, in an arrangement with Ottawa, to permit this living expense to be allowed as a tax deduction for parents or students themselves?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I guess the question is properly directed if the hon. member wants a personal reaction from me. At the outset I would say that, of course, in our own student award programmes we take into account, in the calculation of financial need, the cost of room and board of students who have to leave their own communities. I think it is fair to state that this question of deduction or allowance for this cost on income tax has been brought to the attention of the federal authorities on a number of occasions.

I can only express a personal point of view here in this House, Mr. Speaker, and to me I would think that this should be considered as a possible legitimate allowance or tax deduction when calculating income of people with respect to children in the school system. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if I have the opportunity after the 25th—depending on what happens on that great date—I would be quite prepared to make my personal views known to the federal Minister who will be in charge because I think that it is to me, at least, a very logical request.

There may be some very good reasons why it should not be done but I, Mr. Speaker, of course, am not in a position to indicate what these would be.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question—may I say that in view of the fact that education is your responsibility and that there is a great discrimination here—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Income tax is not.

Mr. Sargent: Education costs are your responsibility, is that right? Then it is a great discrimination to get—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member will please recall that no matter how he feels, or what he wishes to say, he will observe the courtesy and decorum which are so necessary in this House.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister of Agriculture and Food can do it but I cannot do it.

Mr. Speaker: And any interruptions directed to the Speaker are directed to the rest of the House, not just to the Speaker in person. I would respectfully request that the member bear this in mind. He has the freedom of the House; he has much more freedom than many members and—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, what—

Mr. Speaker: Order. When the Speaker is on his feet the member will remain quiet in his seat. He will have an opportunity to discuss the matter thereafter if he wishes.

If so, the member who asked the Minister if he would accept a supplementary question, would ask a supplementary question and not make a speech, he certainly has the freedom of this House for that purpose.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member for Grey-Bruce would not intend to insult the Minister of Education except in a very subtle fashion, which would be hard to recognize.

I shall endeavour to answer the supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: I might point out to the Minister that the same words that I directed to the member apply to the Ministry too, who are members of this House.

The member will please place his supplementary question.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister agree, education being his responsibility, and as this involves millions of dollars to people in outlying parts of the province, that he could give those involved some protection insofar as a tax deduction against their homes or real estate or a provincial tax deduction allowance or rebate? This is very important to millions of people in this province.

Mr. Speaker: Order; The member has asked his question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not really sure that this poses a question. As I indicated to the hon. member, in the calculation of the awards to be made to the students, the cost of transportation and lodging is calculated in the award that is made and the funds that are then payable to the student come from the consolidated revenue of the

province. I think this is an equitable distribution of the funds. The hon. member, in his preamble to the supplementary question before certain matters were brought into discussion, was indicating that perhaps this discriminated against, shall we say, the taxpayers of the province.

I think in fairness—and far be it from me, I would be one of the last to defend the present federal administration—I do not think that it acts in a discriminatory fashion in this province more so than any other particular jurisdiction, except from the standpoint that we perhaps have a higher percentage of students enrolled in universities than is the case in some other provincial jurisdictions.

Mr. Sargent: We are still no farther ahead then. I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food. Would the Minister advise if his department plans to take any action to regulate the use of antibiotics in food producing animals in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in reply I would say that in order to obtain reliable information pertaining to the distribution and use of drugs used in the treatment of livestock in Ontario, a survey is currently being conducted by the Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food. With the wide usage of antibiotics, much of the information secured will pertain to antibiotics.

We work very closely with the food and drug directorate of The Department of National Health and Welfare, who are constantly concerned with matters pertaining to the adulteration of food and, therefore, any steps that we would take in governing the use of antibiotics in food-producing animals would be guided by standards set by the directorate and would be quite in keeping with safe human consumption standards.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister answer a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will try, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: In view of the fact that this is already in the FBA in the States—they already have regulations in force now protecting the people there in this regard—how long will it take us to get into the act here then?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Perhaps there is not the same wide use of such antibiotics in Ontario. The matter is under review.

Mr. Speaker: The member has a further question?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, very respectfully, again you have taken the questions and have cut them down to nothing, and it is hard to get any sense out of this. It is to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker: The member should be advised that the question which he is now going to ask is to be read by him as it was originally received in the Speaker's office.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I will stay with the question, Mr. Speaker, but you must realize in the supplementary I can only ask what I was going to ask anyway. So this is a comedy we are going through.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would like to point out to the member that for some considerable time, the questions coming from his pen have not been in accordance with the rules. I have accepted them and, on various occasions, discussed with him or the secretary in charge how they should be amended. This morning several questions came in from the member and several were sent back for rewording and they have been asked.

This particular question is now being asked as it was originally received in my office. I received it myself and, therefore, I know of what I speak.

If the member feels that it is not properly worded, then I suggest that the problem is his, and I also suggest to him that supplementary questions, as far as possible, should be included in the original question so that the Minister may be prepared to give an answer that is not off the cuff.

The member now has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Prime Minister advise if he wlll give financial assistance to the development of the north shore road from Owen Sound to Wiarton, in Keppel township, as a summer student employment programme?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I have made it clear, in answer to several other questions, that it is not the intention of the government to develop any make-work programmes for students this summer. This particular road is the responsibility of the local municipality; if they choose to repair it, or resurface it or do any other type of work on it, it will receive the standard subsidies and they can employ whoever they wish to do it. No supplementary question.

Mr. Sargent: You could not answer anyway.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury has a question.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege in a matter affecting the privileges of the House. Yesterday, tabled in this House, was the report on the problems of the Ontario council for the arts which, sir, contains the statement which may redound in unsalutary fashion upon the members of the House, and that statement says, and I quote that, "the report was printed by order of the legislative assembly of Ontario", and as a member I wish to make it perfectly clear that I, nor indeed do I think any member of my party, had anything to do with the printing of this piece of psychedelic flapdoodle that came out under the aegis of this organization. I have very great respect for the chairman of that council, and I seriously doubt whether he had a great deal to do with it either.

And I say, sir, that it is of such a nature as to be incomprehensible to the ordinary sense of reasons. It indicates at one and the same time serious and unwarranted imposition on the public purse, and aspersion upon all hon. members, and an indication of how much its authors misunderstand their functions.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): You are against culture.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests. Is the Minister aware that American tourists are bringing minnows in from the United States? Is this against the fish and game laws of Ontario, and if so will the Minister correct the situation?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in replying to the hon. member for Thunder Bay: Yes, I am aware that tourists are bringing live bait into Ontario. This is contrary, of course, to section 17, subsection (b) of the Ontario fisheries regulations. Whenever we are able to ascertain when this happens, we do take corrective measures, and if the hon. member is aware of certain information we would be very pleased if he would make it available to us.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Is the Minister prepared to extend crop insurance purchase one week to ten days for corn, soya beans and white beans due to the delay in planting of those commodities because of excessive rain in southern Ontario during the last week of May?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, first of all I think my hon. friend would agree that in most cases in southwestern Ontario, this is probably the earliest seeding on record. There may be a few isolated instances where the crop has not been planted, but insofar as soya beans and white beans are concerned, the deadline for insurance of these crops is several weeks away yet.

As far as the deadline for corn insurance is concerned, it is tied directly to the heat units in the various zones for planting purposes for the various varieties. While there may have been some difficulty in completing the corn planting in parts of eastern Ontario and, in fact, some parts of central Ontario, the general feeling of the Ontario crop insurance commission, who deal with these matters, is that the deadline should not be extended.

A farmer knows in making his plans what fields are going to be put into corn, and if he intends to put insurance on these fields he has all kinds of opportunities to do that. I would not feel that there is any real necessity to extend that deadline at the present time.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Spence: I understand that some of the farmers understand the stopping date for insurance for corn in southwestern Ontario is on May 31. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give you the exact date because I have a feeling it varies throughout Ontario, and I would not want to commit myself on that without finding out.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East has a question for the Minister of Mines.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, before I put this question to the Minister of Mines, I would like to clarify with the Attorney General that the question which I submitted to him today was first submitted on Thursday and has no relevance to the question I am asking the Minister of Mines now, outside

of the fact that this is further information I received since that date.

To the Minister of Mines: Is the Minister aware that evidence presented at the inquest into the death of Raymond David Tomson, following an accident at Copper Cliff plant, made it quite clear that the scene of the accident had been altered in spite of the instructions contained in The Department of Mines handbook, stating that except for the purpose of saving life, or relieving human suffering, no person may interfere with the scene of an accident until the investigation has been completed? Does the Minister intend to have charges laid against International Nickel Company for interfering with the site of the accident at the Copper Cliff plant which resulted in the death of Raymond David Tomson?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, the Minister is not aware that there was any such evidence presented and therefore the second part of the question is not applicable.

Mr. Martel: A supplementary question. Has the Minister checked into this?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The transcript has been ordered, but has not yet been received.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day, might I remind the members of the Clerk's luncheon meetings with respect to rules and procedure which will continue tomorrow, in committee room 1, at 12:30 p.m. May I also ask for the assistance and co-operation of each member of the House in having their picture taken for posterity, beginning Monday, and there will be a schedule passed round to you.

It is my hope that we can arrange to have the sitting for these pictures now in order that we may have that record which hangs out in the hallway, covering the period since this province became a province on its own. I am sure that each one of you would like to have a likeness of yourself as you are in the House at this time. You will be notified by the Speaker's office.

The Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: On May 30, the hon. member for Sudbury East asked a question in two parts. 1. Is it the duty of a coroner to obtain all information available to him when an inquest is held to avoid repetition of similar accidents or fatalities? 2. Would the Attorney General investigate why Dr. Pidutti, a coroner in the Sudbury district, refused to accept evidence in the recent Stacknic inquest, a fatality at Creighton Mines from officers of the united steelworkers of America?

My answer, Mr. Speaker, is that a coroner who is investigating the circumstances surrounding a death always endeavours to ascertain all the relevant facts for presentation to the coroner's jury. However, the coroner endeavours to determine the facts impartially. It is not his function to obtain the facts from sources which may have a special interest, or which may have a particular interest in a particular aspect of the case.

Dr. Pidutti did not refuse to consider any irrelevant or material evidence in the Stacknic inquest. What he did refuse to do was to meet privately with members of the union before the inquest, to hear its view of the evidence. The coroner was properly of the opinion that the police investigators would get all relevant evidence and that other evidence, if there was any other evidence which persons wished to give and in which they had a particular interest, they would be present at the inquest.

He therefore remained impartial, and presided at the inquest and produced before the coroner's jury all the relevant evidence. I would stress again that it is not certainly a coroner's duty, or proper course for him to follow, to go to parties prior to an inquest and hear material which they may put forth. I think it should all be put forth properly at the inquest.

Mr. Sopha: Very proper. A very able coroner.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: On the same date, May 30, the hon. member for Sudbury East presented another question, which was: In order that all parties have all questions which they consider important and relevant at a coroner's inquest asked in the manner intended, would the Attorney General advise coroners that direct questioning by all interested parties or their representatives be permitted?

The answer, Mr. Speaker, and I have indicated this on previous occasions, is that the law on that matter is quite clear. The coroner has a discretion to determine who may appear and be represented by counsel at any inquest. In the event that the coroner decides that counsel will be permitted to ask questions of a witness at an inquest, this is within his jurisdiction. The McRuer report makes some recommendations on this matter which are being considered at this time.

It has not been my policy to dictate any particular procedure to any official performing a judicial function, and I would think that everyone would agree with me on this contention. However, in the course of instruction to new coroners, we make it clear that they have such a discretion and that it must be utilized to ensure a full and complete enquiry. This provides persons with a legitimate interest the right to be heard at the inquest.

I put those remarks down rather carefully, Mr. Speaker, because I thought that the record should be very definite on that. And I would add that I think one can appreciate that coroners' inquests if anyone sitting in that room where the inquest is being held were free to examine and cross-examine witnesses, the matter would be impossible. The inquest is conducted almost invariably with the assistance of the Crown attorney, with the coroner presiding, and the questions are directed generally through council or perhaps counsel is permitted in the discretion of the coroner to question some of the parties. But to have any member of the public—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Any interested party should be able to cross-examine through counsel.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: As the hon. member knows, there is a discretion in the coroner.

Mr. Shulman: There should be no discretion.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There is a discretion in the coroner to conduct the inquest.

Mr. Shulman: It is a bad discretion.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: As I have mentioned in my reply, the hon. Mr. McRuer has made some recommendations and we are considering them. We have, as perhaps members of the House are aware, been considering changes in our Coroners Act.

Mr. Sopha: What the hon. member for High Park does not understand is what the coroners' courts are.

An hon. member: He never did.

Mr. Shulman: I have made the same recommendations for the past five years.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: He turned it into an inquisition.

Mr. Shulman: I turned it into a place for people to get justice.

Mr. Sopha: An inquisitor!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: On May 30, the hon. member for Sudbury East asked another question to which I have the answer. The question was: Will the Attorney General conduct an investigation into the complaints of local 6500, united steelworkers of America to Dr. H. B. Cotnam on May 24, 1968, that investigations of fatalities are conducted by police officers of the town of Copper Cliff, who also serve as security guards for INCO, and may therefore have a built-in bias in their investigations? If so, when will such an investigation commence? Will the Attorney General instruct the chief coroner that only non-INCO employees may be used to investigate the various INCO plants after fatalities and underground operations to assure complete impartiality?

My answer is, Mr. Speaker, that I have been aware of the views of local 6500 of the united steelworkers of America relating to inquests. As a result of correspondence carried on with the president of the local and with the chairman of the safety committee, I arranged a meeting in Sudbury, on Wednesday, May 22 of this year, between those officials and the senior officials of my department, Dr. Cotnam, Mr. Frank Wilson and Mr. Hills, of the coroner's branch. The matter of independent police investigation of mine fatalities was discussed along with several other subjects. I should mention, Mr. Speaker, that there is no evidence that investigation of mine fatalities by police who have some relationship with the mining companies have not been impartial and complete.

As I say there is no evidence of that but as a result of that meeting, we are studying the matter and reviewing it and taking it under complete and full consideration. The matter is open, in a sense, for further review.

On March 25, 1968, the hon. member for High Park asked me a question to which I would like to give the answer today.

The question was: On payment of the proper fee, will the Attorney General release the sworn testimony of Mr. Murray Mehlman, as given in the seniority investigations? I took that statement as notice at the time, and I have since reviewed the matter in considerable detail. For my part, I will not release that testimony given by Mr. Mehlman. Perhaps I should expand briefly on that.

It was an enquiry carried on by the securities commission. Allegations were made in the testimony, various persons named; I think that the principle here is that to release that evidence now in that type of enquiry—which was a departmental enquiry—would actually some years after the enquiry, bruit abroad names of persons of whom the allegations made in the testimony were not proven.

To release that sworn testimony would allow Mr. Mehlman to publish it. He knows what he said. He does not need his testimony to refresh his mind. His purpose, I think, in seeing it is so that he can publish it. It did not stand up in the enquiry and I do not propose to release it to him.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs):) Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the answer to a question posed by the hon. member for High Park with respect to the firm of Ord Wallington and Company Limited.

I am informed that as a result of the Ontario securities commission auditor's interim report, the registration of Ord Wallington was suspended on April 16, 1968, pending the clarification of its financial position. Both the commission's auditors and the firm's auditors, Messrs. McDonald Currie and Co. had been proceeding with independent audits. The facts developed to that peak were inconclusive insofar as demonstrating that the public clients were likely to suffer loss.

At this hearing, Mr. Arthur B. Francis, CA, the registrant's former auditor, was called by the firm. Mr. Francis' business was acquired by McDonald, Currie and Company. Based on his evidence, the commission's director concluded that the public interest and the interest of the clients of the firm would not be served at that time by preventing the completion of the purchases and sales made for clients. The principals purported to stand ready to inject further capital to ensure the public clients against loss, and in fact subsequently did provide an additional $25,000 in working capital.

In light of these facts, the director stated and I quote:

> While the company will not be permitted to undertake any business during the period of suspension it is permitted to complete the trades for which it has already contracted and to make delivery of its securities to its public clients, apart from officers, directors and shareholders of the company.

And that is the end of the quotation from the director's ruling.

On May 3, after a trial balance as of April 30, 1968, had been taken off, it became apparent that, notwithstanding the injection of the additional $25,000, there had been no improvement. The commission took immediate steps to ensure the existing assets for the benefit of clients by issuing orders under section 26 of The Securities Act, 1966, "freezing" the assets of the registrant. Subsequently one of the clients petitioned the company into the bankruptcy under The Federal Bankruptcy Act. A trustee has been appointed.

In the light of the appointment of the trustee in bankruptcy, the commission does not have any power to require the delivery by the trustee of either securities or money. The commission, through its staff, have pursued every question put to it by or on behalf of the firm's public clients concerning the position of that client. The commission's investigation continues.

Mr. Shulman: Could the Minister explain how it could be that one week after the suspension of such trades, this company accepted funds from a public client and yet did not deliver the securities?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Could you give me or identify the situation you have? If you could, I would be pleased to look into that as well.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: 24th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT
(Concluded)

On vote 2204:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask of the Minister if there are any American-owned freight lines operating with a licence in the province of Ontario.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are.

Mr. B. Newman: There are? When were they granted a licence?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to provide the member with a list of American operators that have licences in Ontario with the dates of the issue of the licences, if that is what he would like.

Mr. B. Newman: Yes. Are they allowed to pick up freight in Ontario and distribute it in Ontario also?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This would be within the terms of the licence of some; it is quite conceivable.

Mr. B. Newman: I would appreciate it if the Minister would supply me with that information. He does not have to now; he can give it to me by letter later on. May I ask of the Minister—it is on the next vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss with the Minister for a few moments the plight which class K licensees, the heavy equipment haulers group under The Public Commercial Vehicles Act, Mr. Chairman, find themselves in. And it is that, as specially licensed movers they find their business and their area of activity being steadily and rapidly eroded by carriers of other classes, principally those in class A.

Three years ago, the K class heavy haulers submitted to the Ontario highway transport board a lengthy submission describing to the board and the Minister the difficulties the K class haulers were finding in facing competition which should not have been permitted by the board from these other classes of carriers.

I want to remind the Minister that, in his Act, he has set up these various classifications of licence in order to protect such groups as the K class haulers. The A class carriers, I understand, cannot haul automobiles; they cannot haul household furniture and household equipment; yet the K class haulers find themselves facing increasing intervention by the A class carriers, in particular, in their own specialized field.

The heavy haulers are using flats to move boilers, heavy industrial machinery, equipment like presses and construction equipment where the construction firms do not have their own moving equipment. They supply, along with the moving facilities, millwrights, plumbers, electricians, all of the supporting services required for not only the moving of this equipment, but its removal from the plant and its installation in a new location.

Now they want to know why they have not heard, in the three year period, some answers to their complaints from the board or the Minister and I would like the Minister to comment on the particularly difficult position that they face at this time.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the K class carriers are a restricted group with a very specialized line and they have usually very specialized equipment. There are not too many other operators which can carry the kind of cargoes that the K class carriers are designed to carry. I do not see the K class carriers losing too much to the A class carriers, whose rates are usually a good deal higher and their equipment not too well suited to it.

I would like to know the specific problem that is being met by the K carriers and the particular section of K carriers—that is, the nature of the cargoes they would carry that are being affected by this.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, the problem is, in some detail, that the A carriers do not have higher rates than the K haulers. In fact what the K haulers are suffering from are the common carriers' generally lower rates of haulage, lower tariffs, so that an A hauler can simply drive up a flat to the plant from which the heavy equipment or heavy machinery is to be removed, and carted off, and put that equipment on a flat and drive it off with one of their tractors.

The A carrier does not have to support the kind of staff and work crews that the K hauler has to have on his staff and the K haulers consequently find very, very severe competition facing them from the ability of the A carriers to compete more effectively through lower rates, because of the fact they do not require these staffs of skilled workmen, millwrights, electricians and others to remove the machinery and re-install it elsewhere.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the point the member is raising. The K licence, of course, does not give the K carrier an exclusive and an A class carrier could intrude and pick up that business if it is available. I expressed the thought that I did not think too many of the A carriers would have the equipment to do it. I may be in error there because I do not think too many of the A's have, but the A class carrier could carry that kind of cargo if he were equipped to do it.

I presume what the K class carriers are wanting, and what the member raises in his remarks, is that they would like to have an exclusive that would preclude the A class carriers from competing in those specialized lines for which the K class carrier was particularly suited and licensed. Right?

Mr. Peacock: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. I would think that the Minister ought to provide the same protection, as I said earlier, to the K class haulers as he has afforded the movers of household furniture, office equipment and the auto carriers who have exclusive jurisdiction in those fields and cannot be challenged by the other classes of carriers.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I shall look at it, yes.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, for the last six months, the Ontario highway transport board has been calling the class F carriers, the gravel truckers, before the board for a review of their licensing privileges. Many of these truckers have gone to some expense and inconvenience to appear before the board and have arranged for representation for their hearings.

As far as I know, most of them have come through with an award very similar to the type that they had held previously, but in the midst of this, the department makes the decision that the whole class F arrangement was going to be changed and many of them found that the basis of their business had been undermined by the decision that was embodied in the Minister's bill passed just a few days ago.

I wonder how the Minister can explain the fact that the highway transport board was undertaking their review of the situation while the other part of the department, the administrative end, was undertaking an entirely different approach to a very serious problem.

Surely the two arms of the Minister's responsibility should have been in closer touch so that the gravel truckers would not have been put to this inconvenience and expense.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the review of the F licences involves more than just looking at those that are licensed to carry aggregates and road-making materials. And the review of the F licences where the licence covers more than just road-making materials and aggregates will continue, but the review of those that just have limited licences for road-making materials and road servicing and aggregates will not be further.

Mr. Nixon: None of them were called in, is that so?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would not say none of them were, I say none of them will be henceforth.

Vote 2204 agreed to.

On vote 2205:

Mr. B. Newman: Under vote 2205, I would like to speak on a topic that has been brought up a little earlier in the discussion, but relates directly to safety co-ordination and promotion. And this is concerning noise, and its effect on the human body.

The Minister stated in respect to a previous vote, Mr. Chairman, that one of the difficulties facing him in securing effective prosecutions against noise-makers was the lack of an objective means of measuring noise, one that could be zeroed so that it will give him the same kind of result in similar noise situations.

Mr. Chairman, I want to stress another approach to the highway noise problem, in relation to our total noise pollution problem, because this relates closely to highway safety co-ordination and promotion.

I would like to see the Minister provide a sum of $10,000 added to the grant of the Ontario safety league for the purpose of establishing a research fellowship in the noise environment. And I would like to see the recipient of this award, which would last for one academic year, directed to produce a paper that would have two themes.

The first theme would be the relationship of the interior sound environment of the automobile to the safety factor. Today, we do not have only car radios, we have car stereo and reverberation systems and tape players, and the effect of these devices, which may possibly be heightened by temperature contrasts between the car's inside temperature and that of the outside air, is to isolate the driver from the road environment. Add power steering and power brakes and the sense of reality is further taken away. I would like to see a paper produced that will correlate accident statistics with the preoccupation of the senses, particularly through the swamping effect of sound.

The second theme has already been suggested by the British magazine *The New Scientist,* dated May 16, 1968, which in commenting on Dr. Pearl Weinberger's remarkable seed growth studies in sound-saturated environments done at the University of Ottawa, goes somewhat further than Dr. Weinberger is herself prepared to go in extrapolating her results.

Dr. Weinberger's story is that human cells of different kinds have different characteristic resonant frequencies, like organ pipes or echo chambers. In her experiments, Rideau wheat seedlings were found to have a resonant frequency of 5,000 hertz; that is, cycles per second. When exposed to this sound over a period weeks, the cells amplify the tiny amount of energy they receive and it stimulates cell growth. She has grown wheat 300 per cent above normal and has produced a fourfold crop of grain shoots in her Ottawa laboratory.

Now she is preparing grain for subsequent growth on federal experimental farms. It is no longer fantasy, Mr. Chairman, it is fact.

A few years ago a soft drink bottling company tried a sound experiment in the theatre. A frequency was used which stimulated the throat membrane to dry out to increase cell activity and, of course, the sale of soft drinks soared.

Now *The New Scientist* wonders out loud if teen-age growth is related to continual exposure to sound of predominantly low frequency. Children may be growing taller than their parents, the magazine says, because their growth cells may be responding to the endless broadcasting of pop tunes and the endless auditing of juke box and similar sounds. In Toronto, CKFH and CHUM may be responsible for actual physical biological changes in our children.

So the second part of the paper would follow this matter up and look for correlation between continuous exposure to road noise of a single predominant frequency and the safety factor.

Are motorists aggressive because of the exposure to their own muffled exhausts to any degree? Do long-distance truck drivers suffer special kinds of perception fatigue because of the drone of their diesels? Is biological or physiological damage evident? And if so, to what degree?

Mr. Chairman, I know that a $10,000 grant will not even begin to open up this new area of research. However, Dr. Weinberger's early work in Ottawa started with a less amount. This small grant might stimulate further endowments from a great many sources, including industry, which must surely be concerned with the biological effects of noise. If human beings are undergoing physical changes apart from deafness because of noise, if the actual cells of the human race are being affected because of the highway environment, then we should know about it.

I hope the Minister will look into this matter and consider a special grant in aid for research on the physiological aspects of sound in relation to highway safety. This, Mr. Chairman, would come appropriately under 2205.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would just say that the member's dissertation on the physical aspects of sound and the work being done by Dr. Weinberger in Ottawa intrigues us all. We have a grant here for the Ontario safety league and I will be seeing these people. I do not know whether I can promise him that we are prepared to increase that grant at this time, but I would not be beyond suggesting to them that part of it might be utilized in some such study with possibilities of the one suggested by the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, with all sincerity that the Minister look specifically into the effects of sound in relation to safety. We have the illustration of the motorcyclist, and we look upon him as being a very hardy breed and tending to be a little on the pugnacious; we look upon truck drivers as being real robust individuals and sometimes we wonder as to whether the fact that they are driving heavy trucks, carrying heavy loads, sort of makes for adaptation to environment as far as they are concerned. I think studies undertaken in this field certainly could have a lot of merit in respect to individual safety and highway safety.

May I ask, while we are on this same vote, whether the Minister has given any consideration towards having a standard crosswalk system throughout the province?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the Act defines the crosswalk and these bylaws for crosswalks, I think, are all approved by our department. There is some experimental work still going on. I know there are variations being tried, and I think that is necessary if we are to improve what we are doing, and if some municipality wants to try a variation of the existing system that has promise of

being a better one than we are using, I do not think we would want to stand in the way of it.

Mr. B. Newman: Does the Minister think that the Toronto system is the best system he has devised or that anyone has devised so far?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would not want to put the Toronto system second to any.

Mr. B. Newman: The reason I bring it up, Mr. Chairman, is that people coming into the town for the first time do not have a clue as to what it is all about. Unless some standard is set throughout the province, driving is too confusing. The safety factor has disappeared from misinformation, or lack of information, on the part of the public.

May I ask the Minister, while I am still on my feet, concerning the scramble corner principle. Has he given any further consideration to its adoption? The scramble corner; sometimes referred to as the "Barnes' Dance" signals?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the scramble system is used in some municipalities in Ontario and it is useful in some locations. I can tell you that in my home town of Ottawa, it may be rather provincial, on some of our main corners we do have scramble walks.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, since it is used, the department should have some policy on crosswalks. What is your policy on scramble corners?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would say, Mr. Chairman, there are just some locations which are suitable and, where it is and the municipality desires to adopt it, we are in agreement.

An hon. member: The local option; instant policy.

Mr. B. Newman: The hon. member here mentioned that that was instant policy.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is right. Under The Traffic Act there is provision for it.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, the fact that there is provision for it does not necessarily mean, Mr. Chairman, that it is going to be adopted by municipalities. To me, if the Minister in his wisdom or in the department's wisdom thinks it is the right thing, then it is the thing that should be implemented at specific intersections.

I can see in some downtown areas, I will not have to say in all, that can be a real assist to both pedestrian and to the movement of vehicles; and, as a system that we have today, where an individual makes a left hand turn at an intersection but the pedestrian sees the green light and crosses—only to hold back traffic and make for a poor attitude on the part of the driver as well as the pedestrian. I think there is a lot of room for improvement in that aspect.

Is the Minister considering legislation preventing jaywalking, on a provincial level?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, Mr. Chairman, we have not got a jaywalking law and we are not contemplating it.

Mr. B. Newman: No intent of introducing jaywalking laws?

Does the Minister not see any value in the provincial legislation preventing jaywalking?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would say this, that the enforcement officers would like it and yet there is a real difficulty in enforcing it.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): You have a section in The Highway Traffic Act that makes it an offence to walk on the wrong side of the highway; is that not some kind of jaywalking law?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We go further than that. We have offences in The Highway Traffic Act prohibiting walking on certain roads.

Mr. Singer: That is what I said—yes.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, have any discussions been carried out with other jurisdictions on this continent with an eye to changing the lighting system, the warning lighting system, on automobiles?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, this would come properly under 2203—vehicles. I have quite a dissertation on that and I was almost disappointed somebody did not ask me about it last night.

Mr. Deans: Would you answer it now?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Not if it would take an hour and a half to tell you, but I would like to share it with my friend from Wentworth because I have an excellent article on rear-end signalling, it is called.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, just as important as this vote; from the great county of Grey we have in the east gallery, a handsome group called the North Derby women's auxiliary—glad to have you here.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oxford.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister, and I think it is under this vote, regarding the flashing lights on school buses. I think you mentioned that it should be brought up under this vote.

There has been some concern on the type of flashing signal. I might recall to the Minister the fatal accident that occurred near Hickson in our area. It was claimed that the sun reflected on the windshield of this particular car and they did not really see the flashing signals on the bus. Consequently, there was a fatal accident and I recall that there was almost another one almost the same place and under the same circumstances.

An hon. member: School bus?

Mr. Innes: School bus. I wonder if there is any type of flasher that is being experimented with that would counteract this type of thing.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think we were dealing with school buses under vehicles at 2203 and drivers at 2202, but I am happy to take the member's question in this respect.

The flashing light on a bus is, no doubt, a problem having regard to the fact that many buses operate on our roads in the late afternoon and the bus can be seen against a setting sun; in the middle of the winter you see the bus against the rising sun if you are travelling east. This is a problem how to pick out a light against the stronger light beyond; it does not only apply to lights from school buses.

It is a general problem and we have looked at alternatives to the present mounting. In New York state they use a semaphore arm with a light on it. We have done some study of the use of a panel behind the light that would block out a bigger area from the sun of the sky behind and so show the light without that competition. The problem there, in part, is the amount of wind resistance that the panel would offer.

I hope that we will have some story on this with, possibly, a solution from the study that is being made by the Canadian conference on motor transport authorities. These are the senior officers from the motor vehicle registration departments or areas of all the provinces; they were given an assignment and they will be reporting back to this Ministers' conference, I think, this summer or fall.

That is a study with regard to the overall construction of buses, the equipment of buses, regulations regarding their operation; and I am sure that they will have a story on lights. If they can come up with anything better than we have or suggest substitution of a semaphore such as New York state uses—some people think this is better—we will be happy to give it every consideration. If we can find a better solution to what we are doing we will be happy.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister how many accidents actually came about by reason of such reflection; do you know?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I have to say to the member that we would not have a record. I do not think I could put my finger on a figure that would identify school bus accidents in which the failure to see the light was responsible.

Mr. Innes: But you have had several complaints about that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, we are aware of the problem. There is no question of that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I cannot help wonder how the Minister arrived at the fact that the discussion between jurisdictions on the changing of rear lights would fall under the vehicles branch. Why not under the highway safety co-ordination and promotion?

Surely co-ordination and promotion, this is what I am talking about—getting together with other jurisdictions to improve highway safety in this manner.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is a new connotation to put on the word co-ordination. That is not what is intended but I appreciate the member might have thought that was what it was. Highway safety co-ordination is our relation with various factors in the community and government and municipalities that relate to highway safety and its promotion.

But the rear light signal system is essentially a part of the vehicle. If he had in mind that it must relate to other jurisdictions he is perfectly right because one of the arresting or precluding factors in developing new safety

practices or new safety equipment on cars is the need to co-ordinate, to get uniform action. I understand his use of the word co-ordination in that sense.

It is very true and that is why I explained, when I replied to the Opposition critics—yourself included—following the introduction of my estimates, that the big difficulty in making fast forward strides in changes in this direction is limited by what we can do by way of getting uniform action from other jurisdictions.

Mr. Deans: Now that we have agreed that co-ordination fits in, what has been done in this area? Have we been negotiating or discussing this with the other jurisdictions on this continent and have we reached any sort of consensus?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, there have been some excellent papers done on this. It is under current study by the CCMTA and by the American association of motor vehicle administrators. Our people are members on these study committees.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, a matter of highway safety that does pertain to school buses—I know we have discussed it to some extent in the previous vote—has caused me a great deal of concern. A member of the Minister's own department was somewhat critical of recent regulations requiring the traffic to stop in both directions. I know that the Minister is aware that this particular regulation, while a good deal has been done to advertise it and to enforce it, is still breached on many occasions. Does the school bus driver have the authority to lay a charge when a car goes roaring past without obeying the regulation in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the school bus driver could not lay a charge, he could lay information. I think they have found good co-operation from the OPP.

Mr. Nixon: It is sufficient, then, simply to report the licence number of the violating automobile? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It would be helpful certainly and I think that we have had prosecutions follow up on just that method.

Mr. Nixon: It seems really that there is a lack of uniformity in the way the drivers regard this particular regulation. Perhaps the Minister, in his own experience has seen a bus come to a full stop, as they are required to do in the driving lane, with the lights flashing; the children then get off the bus. He keeps the lights flashing, supposedly, to stop the traffic both ways while the young children proceed across the road.

It really is sometimes hair-raising when you see the difficulty on-coming traffic will have in order to obey the rules. It is really beyond our competence to say that the regulations are not perfect in every way. It is the Minister's responsibility to have the very best information as to what will work in our jurisdiction and what is working elsewhere. Uniformity is an important part of this particular measure but I am very fearful that the number of accidents relating to the on-coming cars hitting the children who are crossing a road without any regard to the traffic at all, that the number of accidents is going to continue at a very high level.

Now it seems to me that we ought to be training the children to step down off the bus, stand at the side of the road and wait until the traffic is clear and, in their judgment, they can then cross the road. Otherwise, we are setting up an artificial situation that has been serious and is continuing to be serious.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that has been discussed year after year and we have sought to get the best system. The only change made two years ago was that in addition to requiring overtaking traffic to stop, there was also the requirement that the on-coming or approaching traffic likewise must stop when the school bus is stopped in an over 35 mile an hour area and has its lights flashing and it is taking on or discharging children and the approved procedure is, as the hon. leader of the Opposition has outlined, mainly that the school bus stays stopped with its lights flashing while the traffic in both directions stops —and the children cross in safety.

We have had that law in effect for about two years. The results, I think, must be accepted as inconclusive. If there is any change it is only a very moderate change. There was not much change made in the regulation for all the talk that has occurred since. There has been, this last year, a slight increase in the number of collisions, there has been a reduction in the number of children killed; the number of collisions that increased was not on account of the new part of the law requiring the approaching traffic to stop.

So how do you put it together? We think we have done what we have done in an

attempt to reach the best and most acceptable procedure and we have used the basis of continental uniformity as one of our reasons for doing it.

I argued it myself for some years, that our system of stopping just the overtaking traffic was in the main, the better. But in the interest of uniformity we accepted this other.

Now let me say to my hon. friend that we are doing our best to educate those concerned. We put out, I think, one of the best advertising campaigns about the school bus stopping law when it came into effect a year ago last September. People told me that driving through the north, every half hour on the hour every radio in northern Ontario was broadcasting the story. People from the north—our own people up north. Letters went to every school bus operator, every owner of a school bus operation.

Mr. B. Newman: Were they printed in other than English?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No. I want to classify that—I do not think so.

To every school teacher, every principal and all the OPPs who have been doing the instruction and—

Mr. Sargent: Why do you not run a full page ad?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, you would have to pass the bill for that and there was an unlimited amount of advertising material sent home with the children and the OPP. Our safety co-ordinator officers in every area of the province have given lectures to the children and I think it has really had excellent promotion.

I would like to send this across to the hon. leader and if anyone else wants one, I will see they get it because I think it is an excellent brochure. Would you make note for one for the member for Wentworth?

We are doing the best we can. I think the situation is ironing out as people get used to it. We just have to wait a couple of years and if there is anything wrong with it, we have to be prepared to change it. I hope that it settles down and proves that it is the best.

Mr. Nixon: Really, Mr. Chairman, the part of it that is most frightening is that these younger students, particularly the little ones under ten, are obeying the regulations as they have been drilled into them.

The bus is standing there with perhaps no car in the on-coming lane to block other cars that may come up without paying proper attention and these children are walking across, obeying all the regulations that the Minister has promulgated, and it is under those circumstances that they are in the greatest danger since the speading cars coming in towards the bus may very well be unable to stop or the drivers unaware of the tremendous responsibility upon them.

As the Minister has pointed out, we still have those drivers who will pull out around a stopped bus and accidents that happen under those circumstances are really unthinkable. I often feel myself that if the young children are trained to step down from a bus and stand by the side of the road, let the bus go on and then they use their own judgment in crossing as they must really when they are on the highways at any other time other than associated with the school bus. It might be better in the long run in training them for a safer approach to walking on the highways.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in the last number of years, we have brought up the reflectorization of licence plates and I would like to, at this time, ask the Minister—we are under highway safety, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Vehicle licence plates were in vote 2203.

Mr. B. Newman: All right, let us say the reflectorization of vehicles anywhere, be it licence plates, be it simply the back, the side, the front of a vehicle, but reflectorization or even the use of reflector tags as has been recommended. It was originally adopted in Sweden and now is in use in most countries in the world but not used to any extent in Ontario.

Does the Minister consider that reflectorized licence plates have some basic safety advantage or not?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Too minimal to be seriously considered, Mr. Chairman. Our study into this was very conclusive in this regard. We checked out the extravagant claims of a promoter and found that they were not substantiated with our enquiry made directly to the motor vehicle administrators of every state and province on this continent, and I say that categorically. We

stated our position on the basis of that and this is our position with respect to reflectorized plates. I made a categorical statement, we were not considering them.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the signs on the highways—stop signs and so forth always use reflectorize materials. Why do you not require the use of reflectorized materials on the back of the vehicles?

Hon. Mr Haskett: We do.

Mr. B. Newman: All vehicles—I know but you require what—nine square inches—12 square inches? The amount that you do require is so minimal, Mr. Chairman, that its effect is lost right there. Why not require a sizable amount of reflectorizing material?

Mr. Sargent: He does not know. He has to look it up.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. B. Newman: Would the Minister reply?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Just to correct the statement of the misinformed member for Grey-Bruce. I was looking to see if I had here the safety requirements of the national safety bureau of the United States, to see what it said with respect to reflectorization. They are not calling for or suggesting the use of licence plates that are reflectorized but they do deal with reflectorization and that is what we would likely adhere to.

If there is any change to be made it will be made in that direction. We were discussing with the motor vehicle manufacturers, three years ago, the provision of side lights and now we have them or, in lieu of lights, reflectorized materials on the sides and I think that we are meeting the situation in that respect.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, I can understand, Mr. Chairman, that the size of a licence plate does not give you a sufficient amount of reflectorization. But you could require a sizable amount on all four sides of a vehicle. In addition to simply vehicles on highways, I think you should insist that rolling stock, trains, buses and heavy trucks, likewise have a sizable amount of reflectorized material on all four sides. And I would like to say, while I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister should require trains to have some type of identifying light. Simply the white light of an approaching train is probably not enough warning.

But the flashing light of an OPP car or of an ambulance is spotted immediately. Why could the Minister not require rolling stock or trains to have something like that if they are going to cross the highways in the province of Ontario? The Minister will tell me it is a federal affair, but he can still insist that they come along and follow some of these safety features that we have mentioned.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It is a good suggestion but I have no jurisdiction.

Mr. B. Newman: If the Minister would talk to the federal people, I think he and his persuasive ways would not have any difficulty convincing them that there is the safety of the people of the province of Ontario involved and I know they would smile gently at him and follow this suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will think of that.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the Minister if he is going to promote the use of reflecto tags, especially among elementary school students? The Minister knows what it is, just a little tag—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I know, but I am just inquiring if our safety branch has taken any steps in this direction. We had a demonstration of it, in fact we have had a number, but I do not know if we have taken any steps yet to put the safety tag programme into our promotion for school children.

Mr. B. Newman: The Ontario safety league promotes it, Mr. Chairman. Surely they would not be promoting it if it was not useful.

May I ask the Minister, in an attempt to promote safety on municipal roads, that he consider possibly asking the municipalities or taking a study in municipalities of requirng, say, every seventh lot in new subdivisions to be left vacant so vehicles can be removed off the streets and parked on parking locations, but not on municipal highways?

In this way we would not have any vehicles parked on our roads. Our roads would be used for the purpose for which they were built and that is movement of traffic and we would require vehicles to park somewhere. As it is today, in built-up cities you do not have any place to park, but where you had every seventh lot in a municipality set aside, you might have somewhere to put these vehicles.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, in some European countries they have spots along the highways, what they call lay-bys, on

which cars can pull off. This is what I think the member is suggesting, that this should be extended into built-up areas, that there should be pull-off areas for disabled cars?

Mr. B. Newman: Well, no, I am not referring to disabled cars, I am referring to taking cars right off the road 24 hours a day.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Oh, off-street parking completely?

Mr. B. Newman: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This we can talk about with my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough). I think that would be his problem.

Mr. B. Newman: Right.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago we had the honour to have the director of highway safety in our community and he did a very good job in outlining the projects that they are undertaking to promote safety. I was wondering what recommendations to promote safety the department makes, say to The Department of Highways in regard to some of our two-lane highways which are no longer in a proper state of construction. Does this department recommend to The Department of Highways what corrections should be made after a series of accidents?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think The Department of Highways would have its own report on the accidents occurring on their highways and they are very thorough and very complete. We have not had any occasion, I recall, to recommend to The Department of Highways that they should undertake the reconstruction or rebuilding of a piece of road on account of the incidence of accidents on it, because they are very well informed on every accident that happens on one of the roads under their jurisdiction.

But we have excellent liaison with The Department of Highways with regard to signs and traffic studies and all the rest. If we should have information with respect to a dangerous piece of road that they were not acting on, that they were not aware of, I can assure the member we would be in conversation with them.

Mr. Worton: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, calling it a dangerous road would not be the right terminology. What I am speaking of is the fact that our speed has increased and we are still dealing with highways that have been established 30 and 40 years. It seems to me that highway safety has an important part to play in co-ordination with The Department of Highways to promote a better type of highway, and I am wondering whether this department is making recommendations to this effect.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, we make recommendations back and forth; we rely on Highways to make some of the studies that enable us to set speed limits because the setting of speed limits is our responsibility. So there is this constant liaison both ways with regard to highways and traffic administration.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, my colleague, who was Opposition critic on these estimates in his remarks in this debate, made quite a point of the fact that between five and nine cents per capita across the province is being spent on safety publicity. I see in this estimate we have a total estimate of $386,000. To spend between five and nine cents a person across the province is an insult to us because of the great number of lives lost.

Can the Minister tell me why he does not embark upon a programme of a full-page ad at proper times in the year that has some impact; the way any public relations firm would do it? This piecemeal approach to it is rather a waste of money. If you cannot do a thing properly do not do it at all. And you are not doing it properly on this scale.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I appreciate the encouragement I get, Mr. Chairman, from my friend, the member for Grey-Bruce, because I would like to have a bigger programme. But let me say to him that the amount of dollars represented in the item is not the whole story by any means. The amount of free publicity and the amount of free time on radio and television we get is tremendous. The larger use of advertising space is possible but the advertising we do is only one factor.

Mr. Sargent: You get nothing for nothing. You have to pay for what you get. If you want to get action, you have to advertise. Any time given on radio is time they cannot sell, and you have no listening audience. To have impact you have to hit it hard and at the right time and the right season. But the approach the Minister has is negative and I think it is a waste of time and money. Either wash this money out or do it properly.

Mr. B. Newman: I have a few other suggestions I wanted to make to the Minister

and one was concerning the schoolboy patrols. The Minister's publication mentions the fact that they are making a continuing effort to create interest in patrols in schools throughout the province. Mr. Chairman, what has been the drawback in implementing—the fact that you do not have schoolboy patrols throughout the school system in the province? What stops the Minister from setting one up?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, it is not within our jurisdiction to set up the school patrol. We are happy to give training and help in it but the decision rests with the school board and with the municipality. We do not have universal acceptance of it for all that we do approve of it, and in some places it has worked wonderfully well. It inculcates a sense of responsibility and training on those who act on the patrol and more than that, it teaches the children in a way that perhaps adult leadership will not. The results of these school patrols in some places where they have been used is unbelievably good.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I can speak from experience in my own community. It has the schoolboy safety patrol programme and it is wonderful. I sometimes wonder why other communities would not adopt this system, or why the Minister's department would not forcefully encourage its adoption throughout the length and breadth of the province. May I at the same time suggest to the Minister that just as the industrial accident prevention association has some type of award—they use the public speaking method to provide awards to individuals engaged in speeches on industrial accident prevention—maybe the Minister could implement some similar type of programme.

It could provide to the youngsters one year's free tuition to a university or something of that sort, and really encourage the idea of safety among the younger students in the schools.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, we do so in quite a measure and I have made presentations. But I think that it was on behalf of the Ontario safety league, the promoters, and we have the work actively advanced by our highway safety co-ordinators. I understand there are some 23 schools now considering adopting the school patrol.

Mr. B. Newman: This is such a small number, Mr. Chairman, we are only nibbling at the problem. Up until the time that we get very serious with the thing, we are not going to accomplish very much. In reading your publication under traffic safety education for adults, I notice that the library loaned about 100 films a week. That is nothing at all, Mr. Chairman. 100 a week is only 4,000 a year. Heavens, you should be loaning out your films at the rate of 1,000 a week. There should be that much interest in safety created by your department. One hundred a week will get around to maybe one school a year, and that is not enough.

May I ask the Minister to consider the publication of some of his information sheets in languages other than the English so that it could get among the ethnic peoples, and they likewise could be better informed as to safety rules and regulations?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will just add to what I said to the member by way of correction that more than 1,000 schools now are using the school safety patrol. Twenty-three of our officers are promoting it at this time.

Mr. B. Newman: That amounts to how many—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: My colleague, the Minister of Education is missing.

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, you see 1,000 does not mean a thing. If it is 1,000 out of 1,100, then it is important; if it is out of about 8,000 it is minor.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if the setting of speed limits comes under this vote or have they been discussed?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: They have not been discussed and they may come under this vote. We have not discussed them and if the member has a question I would accept it.

Mr. Spence: We hear from time to time that you are going to increase the speed limit on Highway 401. Will the speed limit on 401 be increased this year, and what is the decision of your department?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is a question that I answered in the House, I think, a couple of weeks ago. I said that there have been some recommendations with respect to increasing the speed limit on the freeways from 60 to 70 maximum. We have had recommendations from groups and from interested parties with regard to trucks and large vehicles, that the speed should be retained at a maximum of

60. There is some objection to having a differential; and others are arguing in favour now of having a differential. We are receiving these recommendations and on the basis of them, I think before too long we will have a determination as to whether we are to have a 70-mile-an-hour limit on the freeways or a divided 70 and 60. It is right in the middle at this moment.

Vote 2205 agreed to.

On vote 2206:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wellington South.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister what steps he is taking to bring about compulsory automobile insurance in the light of the fact that the figures indicate that there has been a considerable increase in the amount of money that you have received in the past five years into the uninsured vehicle fee fund.

There are two reasons for asking this question. One is that I am getting an increasing number of people who are losing their licence due to lack of insurance; then they are forced to pay a $25 monthly payment. I might say that you co-operate in every way that you can to accomplish this.

On the other hand, the people who are paying this money are the people who can generally least afford it.

The second reason why I am bringing to your attention is that if a person who has no insurance strikes me, and I am covered by collision and my accident is paid for, the insurance has no recovery from your fund. Yet due to this accident I have an increase in my cost of insurance because they have paid out for that amount of damage to my car.

I am suggesting that from the figures I got one month ago from the Minister—and it will not be perfect—it is high time that you brought about a compulsory insurance scheme in this province. We must do our utmost to prevent a large number of people who, perhaps due to lack of consideration of others, pay the $25 fee and then think that they are covered. Then in later months they have to deprive their families of some of the necessities they need to carry on, plus the fact that they cannot continue with their job.

I would like to have your thoughts on what is developing with this accident claims fund in the last two years?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the matter of compulsory automobile insurance generally rests with my colleague, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, in whose hand the entire matter of automobile insurance rests. We operate a motor vehicle accident claims fund that takes over and compensates victims of motorists who are not insured. That is the entire purpose of our motor vehicle accidents claims fund; that is the limit of its operation.

Mr. Worton: You are not making any recommendations, Mr. Minister, after the experience that you had, that it is time now when you should recommend to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs that you should delve into this and see if he cannot come up with a better plan than we have.

I agree that it had come a long way, but I think that we have taken one step and we should explore further, to make it still better. We will never be able to do away with this fund, but I still maintain that we are hurting a lot of people who, in the end, would be better off if they were asked to pay for compulsory insurance when they buy their licence.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I will leave this with my colleague and we can bring it up with him when he is discussing insurance.

I would point out to him and the member for Wellington South and to the House that compulsory insurance is no cure-all. In the jurisdictions that have had it longest they have more people escaping from coverage by insurance, proportionally, than we have in Ontario. For the victims of those drivers who, in a compulsory jurisdiction, have escaped paying insurance, there is no relief. If he is hit by someone who has not paid insurance, or whose insurance has expired or been cancelled, a hit and run driver, or a driver from outside the jurisdiction, he has no satisfaction.

It is to care for those situations that we have this motor vehicle accident claims fund. It is entirely apart from the system of insurance that is provided on a voluntary or compulsory basis.

Mr. Worton: We cannot do away with this accident fund. I agree, but I am suggesting to you that according to your figures in your report we have gone from $1.5 million in 1963, when I think the $20 fee was brought in, to over $3 million this year, which would

indicate that the number of people taking advantage of this has doubled.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is not the point, Mr. Chairman. There would be an increase in the number but the fee was increased from $20 to $25 in the interim, and I find that—

Mr. Worton: Only $5 over the last five years?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, but I find that the intake for 1967 for $3,394,000 and for 1968, $3,297,000, so that there is a reduction in the fees even with the higher fee and the number of drivers overall.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I find it difficult to understand how the Minister can separate responsibility and opinion, insofar as this whole field raised by my colleague from Wellington South is concerned, and say that it is all up to my Ministerial colleague, the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree). Now, when we had a select committee in this House and studied the matter, it was a committee that depended upon the civil service advice of The Department of Transport. Your present registrar of motor vehicles, who sits in front of you this afternoon, was counsel to that committee. He was a very good counsel to that committee because he came with a background of substantial knowledge of the functioning of that department.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, when we get into a field that may overlap two departments that we get one Minister who, in my opinion, should offer definite leadership in this field and another Minister who probably has the mechanical responsibility of carrying it out. We are tossed backwards and forwards and we cannot get the kind of answers that we are entitled to from the Minister whose department deals with the matter of automobiles and injuries on the road every day. The question of insurance overlaps and the role of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, in my opinion, is only incidental.

If the House directs that there be compensation without fault, then it will fall the chore of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs to carry out that direction with the appropriate legislation. Surely this is a matter that touches all of the problems that relate to the responsibilities of this Minister.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say that this Minister has a responsibility to us, no matter what other of his colleagues have opinions; he has a responsibility to this House. To tell us again what his opinions are about the theory of compensation without fault as recommended by the select committee as recommended by that very illustrious committee of the benchers of the law society; as recommended by the all-Canada insurance group; as recommended by Professor Linden, who has done studies for the Minister; as recommended by all these people that the Minister has commissioned.

I think the Minister has a responsibility now to stand up and say either he is running his department or somebody else is. Is he not going to answer?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's opinion on this matter is very clearly on the record.

Mr. Singer: Well, what is it?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It is that we are running a motor vehicle accident claims fund here that takes over in the case of an accident involving a driver without insurance, and we settle with the victim in a way that is not excelled in any jurisdiction I know of.

Mr. Singer: Is the Minister ignoring the report of that select committee? Is he ignoring the recommendations given to him by people he appointed himself? Surely the Minister must have an opinion on these things. Is the Minister satisfied that Ontario does not need any system of compensation without fault? Is he satisfied that the courts should continue to be cluttered up? Is he satisfied that there should be thousands of people injured on the road who get no compensation at all?

Is this Minister going to sit here this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and tell us he has no opinion? If he is, he should quit. Surely we expect from Ministers that they be responsible, and what the Minister has told us this afternoon is far less than responsible. It is an abandonment of his jurisdiction and his duty here to the people of Ontario, being a Minister in charge of transport, to have an opinion on this vital issue.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, we have heard from this member year after year after year praising himself and the committee on the wonderful work they did when they came in with a report on compensation without fault. We have seen that matter analyzed; we have come to a determination on it, and he and the House know very well what the decision is and that we are satisfied that the job we are doing is being well done and is

not exceeded anywhere so far as caring for the victim of an accident involving an uninsured driver.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, maybe we have an opinion now. Maybe what the Minister has said is the proper expression of this government's opinion at the present time. They repudiate the chairman of that committee, the member for Haldimond-Norfolk (Mr. Allan), who was the chairman of the committee; they repudiate the now Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett); they repudiate the opinion of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme)—all those three gentlemen were members of that committee; they repudiate the opinion of the experts—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Singer: I think this is most appropriate, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: It does not come under this vote.

Mr. Singer: Oh it does, it does. It is the care and attention and concern about people injured on the roads, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister had no money to vote for this particular—

Mr. Singer: This Minister never has any money to vote for the safety of the people in Ontario. That is the tragedy.

Mr. Chairman: I suggest you take it up with the other Minister.

The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the member for Downsview, I feel that we ought to have compulsory automobile insurance. I am getting a little alarmed at the proportion that this fund is reaching. Here we have a 20.9 per cent increase this year in the moneys to be voted and we have a 21.5 per cent increase in the moneys that were spent—the disbursements—out of the fund. Now how do we equate this? Is this going to continue to grow by leaps and bounds yearly and is it going to be at the expense of the people of this province?

I feel that the reasonable way to deal with this would be with compulsory auto insurance and the Minister says that one of the problems would be making sure that everyone had it. I think that this is a very small problem—easily overcome. Auto insurance ought to be compulsory and it should be issued at the time that the licence is obtained. If anyone should then cancel, assuming that it was not a government-run operation, if anyone should happen to cancel that insurance they would automatically lose their right to drive.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the hon. member for Wentworth is a very obvious one. On the face it appears that compulsory automobile insurance means everyone is insured. In fact, it means that this is not so; that there are more people uninsured in those jurisdictions with compusory insurance than we have uninsured in this jurisdiction where you have the choice. That is the fact, because there are more people escape—

Mr. Deans: How can they escape?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: They take more devices to escape it because in those jurisdictions the cost of insurance is mostly unduly high. This is the fact. The state of Massachusetts has had compulsory insurance, I think, longer than any other and their situation there does not compare with ours. There the insurance premium for a comparable situation with the city of Toronto—say in Boston of comparable size—is two to three times as much for the same kind of coverage, and yet in that jurisdiction they have more people escaping. I am leaving the matter of deciding whether a man wants to insure himself or not to his own choice.

Mr. Worton: You do not force him to pay insurance?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No we do not. He does not pay his insurance, he merely pays into the funds enough to keep the funds solvent so that he can—

Mr. Worton: You lock the door after the horse is gone, my friend, that is what you do. After he gets in trouble you say now pay $25 a month and buy insurance, and I do not think this is just.

Mr. Deans: And that is not all. We are spending millions of dollars of public funds administering this. Surely we can do better than that. Surely it is not such an insurmountable problem. What about the Saskatchewan plan? Do you not feel that this type of plan might possibly work in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would not care to comment on the Saskatchewan plan because I have never been able to get the facts on it. If I knew, I could say yes or no; but we have not been able to get

the story on it. We do not know what it costs to operate and I do not know that any jurisdiction that settles with its victims of uninsured drivers to the efficient way and to the extent that we do in this province.

The member asked me a pointed question. He deals with the amounts on a fund that keeps growing, and that is a matter which I think we might look into with some concern. If you look at the end total of the balance on hand, and see how it mounts up year by year, you will find that if I were to go back here to 1965 there was $13 million; in 1966, there was $17 million; in 1967, there was $21 million. You wonder why this is necessary. Let me point out that the revenue peaked in 1967 and we see a decline of some $500,000 in revenue this year. We find on the reverse that the amount of claim settlement has been growing apace and that is what the fund is for; to see that the innocent victim of an automobile collision involving an uninsured, whether it is a hit and run, whether it is somebody from outside the jurisdiction, somebody over which we have no knowledge, or over which we have no control, gets settled for his claim.

We find that the claims paid out in 1965 were $3 million—I am giving you round figures—$3,300,000; in 1966, $4,100,000; in 1967, $5,200,000; in 1968, $6,400,000; so we have a very rapidly accelerating outgo.

Now, in addition to that let me say that we have to take a responsible view of this rest fund.

In the 1966-1967 fiscal period, the report on the motor vehicle claims fund shows payments from the fund to a total, I am going back one year, $5,212,000; an increase of 27 per cent, or $1,100,000 over 1965-1966. During the period the fund balance increased to this last figure I gave you, $21,005,000. During the previous period of operation the unsatisfied judgment fund and motor vehicle accident claims fund, the latter since 1962 has been the practice in reporting on the financial status of funds to show only the claims paid as against the insurance, the income.

It has become increasingly apparent that an actuarial approach to the financial status of the fund is necessary. This means that liabilities should be estimated in relation to claims created, and identified, but not paid claims involved in litigation in the courts, of which the fund has no knowledge, but eventually will be liable to pay. At the end of the last fiscal year, there were 3,145 claims outstanding which required an estimated actuarial reserve of $5 million. This estimate amounts to $1.5 million increase over the estimated reserves for the previous year. The reserve fund of some $20 million is the backbone of the financial status of the fund. However, in any financial operation of this size, there must be an actuarial review in respect of not only the paid losses, but also in respect of the dollar value to be placed on: 1. claims created but not paid, and also 2. the creation of a reserve for the losses not reported, but which will create a definite liability on the fund eventually.

Mr. Deans: Is the cost of administering this fund paid out of the premiums that are paid in? This $982,000 is deducted from the premiums that are paid into it by the people who are paying the $25.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Let me continue with this—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): What is it you are reading?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is a synopsis of the liabilities of the fund.

Mr. Sopha: Prepared by whom?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: By our people, expert in insurance. We have a very excellent group handling the fund.

Mr. Sopha: I am going to say something about that.

Mr. Worton: Can I have an explanation, then you can continue. The point that I brought up, sir, is that you said that the people who buy insurance are not penalized. I say they are, and the fact that an uninsured driver injures me or damages my vehicle, my insurance pays my bill, and in turn my insurance rate goes up. You do not contribute funds to my accident claim. Now this is the explanation I would like from you. How do you say that we are being protected by this fund? I do not think we are completely against an uninsured driver.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: You are being protected against an uninsured driver, but in your case you have bought insurance in the first claim. This is purely a matter between the policy holder and the insurance company. I say that is purely insurance, and I am not getting mixed in that, because I am dealing with the residue.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: You did not have a very good lawyer.

Mr. Sopha: I do not know if you had a good lawyer, but you lost.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In the fiscal year 1967 over 100 of such loss cases I was mentioning reached the fund in actions which had occurred as far back as 1962, and in the developing years of 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966, but application for payment out was only made during the period of 1967, and reserve of one million and one half has been set up to meet these contingencies. The reserve fund figure at present, therefore, is appropriate to the liabilities created each year and would represent considerably less than many financial institutions and insurance companies are carrying as reserve figures as their overall portfolios.

There are additional factors that must be taken into consideration and establishing a reasonable reserve in the operation of the fund, and these have to be taken into consideration. I think these are very considerable.

1. The enactment in 1967 of the gross negligence law which will present a very definite increase in the number of claims, and the significant potential dollar value to be paid from the fund;

2. The possibility of increasing of the limits of the fund beyond the present $35,000 maximum, any such consideration must be carried on in the light of a situation that may develop within other provinces and within the insurance industry, and

3. The ever increasing dollar value being awarded for damages in the courts.

I am not unmindful of the present financial position of the fund as maintained. Claims can be continued to be handled expeditiously and the number of outstanding claims maintained at a reasonable figure with the dollar value reserve and the judgment cases which are in the hands of the legal fraternity brought more quickly to the fund. There may always be the possibility sometime in the future of a review of the uninsured motorists' fee, but all of that is dependent entirely on what the tangibles are that I have outlined, and what they can mean in dollar value involvement in view of the inflationary trend.

I say, in the light of those facts, I think it is a very sound and reasonable and proper operation.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, I should like to know a couple of statistics in order to put into focus what I have to say. What are the number of drivers who pay premiums into this fund? Perhaps better still, the percentage of motorists?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: While that one is being sought—

Mr. Sopha: Has any calculation been made of the amount for an uninsured driver that has been paid out, as against the amount paid out by all insurance companies under judgments in Ontario, for insured drivers?

Has any per capita calculation been made? You will see what I am getting at very easily. I would like to have some idea of the averages of the two groups; all motorists falling into either one or two categories—either the insured or the uninsured.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It will take about five minutes to get these figures for the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: All right, fine. The Minister anticipated to some extent. I want to say that my experience with the fund demonstrates to me how efficiently it is operated, the courteous manner in which those responsible for the operation of this fund treat one, and indeed the seriousness with which they engage upon the task. In fact, the only inhibition against the complete efficient administration of this fund is the inhibitions of those who have to hire lawyers in the community, and the—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is not so.

Mr. Sopha: —lack of awareness that many of the lawyers of Ontario who are good—and especially in the field of motor vehicle litigation—are Liberals; but they are proscribed apparently from sending the files to anyone who is not a Liberal.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: May I interrupt the member for just a moment? I would like to be able to agree with him. I just find that I have a great row always over my head from followers of our party who complain about the cases all going to Liberals. This is a fact.

Mr. Sopha: Well it is true. I can only speak for my own community and many of these are Conservative lawyers who are very able lawyers.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Well!

Mr. Sopha: They are not all able—ability in the legal profession in Sudbury transgresses

party lines, if you follow me. Some able lawyers are Liberals, but only the Tory lawyers get the files from the motor vehicle accident compensation. There is no lawyer in Sudbury more capable than my good friend David Lawson when he gets a file from the fund. You know that you are going to get ahead with the settlement of the matter with all possible despatch, in an atmosphere of fairness and moderation. But that does not tie in with all the rest of the Tories in Sudbury, and I say it is the only inhibition against a completely efficient administration. What I really want to say about this fund is that it has always lagged behind reality, and especially in regard to the limits. In the prehistoric days, the limit was a ghastly $5,000 and that imposed tremendous injustice on—a cruel injustice on—litigates, frequently $5,000, in those old days, would not pay the medical bills that the litigant suffered. Sometimes, we are told, it would not pay his lawyer and he would end up with a mere pittance. Then after pressure, the limits went up to $10,000 for one person, $20,000 for all and it was recognized after a very brief period of time that that was inadequate. Then, they were raised to $35,000 for all persons. I am saying that is not enough. That does not even keep up with inflation which is going on at the rate of 3 per cent a year.

I learned from my friend from Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) that it is idle and a waste of one's time in talking in generalities, especially when you are dealing in the field of justice. It is better to cite a pointed example.

Supposing you have five men who are travelling from Sudbury to Toronto in search of work. They are in search of work because there has been a wildcat strike at the International Nickel Company and they are going down to Hamilton, let us say, to seek work rather than stand on the picket line They are struck some place south of Parry Sound, by a drunken motorist who is proceeding in the opposite direction, not far out of the wet canteen at Camp Borden. Let us suppose that two of them are killed—pardon me, let us suppose that three of them are killed. Three of the workers, all married men, all with children, are killed and two of the occupants of the car survive.

Now there you have three fatalities, leaving three, five, eight, 12 dependent children; three widows from whom the income earner has been snatched by the negligent act of this motorists. And you have two survivors, very seriously injured with multiple fractures. What is $35,000 in a situation like that? It is a mere pittance and to distribute $35,000 means that, in fact, the law—in this fund of philosophy upon which it is based—is, in effect, working a tremendous injustice.

The late Dean Wright, the great Caesar Augustus Wright, who departed this life fairly recently, spent his lifetime in a study of this matter. He pointed out that the philosophy of the law in the collective society is directed toward the spreading of losses. We spread losses nowadays over the whole of society, rather than ask the individual to accept the loss that he experiences and bear it as best he can. Frequently, if we do that, his Christian fortitude and his belief in prayer will sustain him a great deal more than the sustenance that he can wring out of the litigation in which he engages.

I would think that the Minister and those who advise him in regard to these matters will have noticed that the courts are fairly consistently awarding higher judgments and properly so. We have lagged behind our American counterparts in that regard. From almost every point of view, without belabouring the matter, it would seem to be indicated that $35,000 is inadequate, and terribly inadequate in the circumstances that I cited.

That was an actual case, but it is not a case against the fund. It is a case in which an insurance company responds but it might be against the fund because my 15 years' experience in the civil courts dealing with motor vehicle litigation tells me that the uninsured motorist, on a per capita basis, is involved in far more accidents than the responsible insured individual.

I would think, if any statistics are kept by that fund at all, that they would demonstrate by way of statistical proof the validity of that proposition. These people who are content to pay $25 when they get the licence are a bad risk on the highway and are involved in a great many more accidents than their counterparts who have insurance.

From every point of view, I would think that the time has really gone past when the limit should be raised.

Let me go back and say a word about that committee which has been mentioned here this afternoon. Ever since that committee reported I have heard an annual reference to it. Let me tell the Minister, through you, that I guess I was the only member of the House who was not on the committee who took the trouble to go before that committee and present a brief. They did not handle me very well from the point of view of the adoption of the recommendations that I proposed. But one of the recommendations I made to the committee

was that the fee be $50 for a person to really put the bite on them. What does an insurance policy cost? If you go and buy insurance, it is going to cost you upwards of $100 for it, so what is half and a good deal more? So really what is the point of the token payment; that is what it is.

It is a token payment of $25, and you put the individual in the position where he can act irresponsibly by not having insurance and you let him off lightly. You let him off lightly by only charging him $25. I would think that if you want to be realistic about it and take account of the $6 million that you are asking this Legislature to vote, Mr. Chairman, then a minimum of $50 would be felt to be, indeed, a very modest amount.

My friend from Windsor-Walkerville tells me that the Minister wants $1 million more, $1.2 million this year than he had last year. I say if that is the case then the problem is becoming very aggravating indeed. We are now, in the space of one year, being asked to pay out $1 million more on behalf of these irresponsible people who will not seek out insurance and really, the burden on the public purse is intolerable and unacceptable.

I do not know why the Minister is shaking his head. You are asking us to vote it—$1.2 million more than you asked for last year. It must bear some resemblance to reality.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: To this fund?

Mr. Sopha: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: To this fund?

Mr. Sopha: Look at page 137, $6,482,000 my friend from Windsor-Walkerville who has the documents tells me it was $5,200,000 last year.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is against receipts of $8 million.

Mr. Sopha: Do not talk to me about receipts.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The House is not voting money—

Mr. Sopha: Do not talk to me about the receipts. I am talking about the amount of money you are asking us to vote you to pay out on behalf of this irresponsible group that will not get insurance.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: You are only paying the operating costs of the fund.

Mr. Sopha: All right. Let you and I stop and have a little exchange. How much do you get in receipts?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Last year $8,880,000.

Mr. Sopha: From the uninsured?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Some $3,400,000 from the uninsured.

Mr. Sopha: That is a disgrace. You are running $3 million in the red. How much did you pay out?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We paid out $5,200,012.

Mr. Sopha: And you got $3 million; you are running $2 million in the red. I must say I have always been suspicious of the book-keeping and financial ability of this government, but this is really astonishing. I ask the Minister quite directly and without—

Mr. Sargent: What is $2 million?

Mr. Sopha: Quite directly and without going out of my way to engage in political partisanship, what is wrong with the proposition that these uninsured motorists who look for sustenance from the state to meet the cost of the damage they do, what is wrong with them completely underwriting that cost? I invite an answer to that question.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I will answer it in part by saying that receipts from the uninsured and the fund operation with repayments from the uninsured—on whose behalf claims were paid would amount to about $5.3 million, which is just about the amount paid out last year.

Mr. Sopha: All right.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The receipts from the regular drivers' registrations were $3.5 million; the uninsured motor vehicle fees amount to $3.4 million; repayments by debtors $850,000, and returns on the fund $1,056,000, for a total, including the drivers' $1 annual fee, of about $8,880,000 less the $3.5 million that the divers paid would be about $5.3 million and paid out was $5,212,000. Pretty good.

Mr. Sopha: All right. Let me offer a personal illustration in order to give point and focus to what I say. If I pay, as I did a couple of weeks ago, $270 to insure my wife and myself, and then this is reflected—I apologize for using the illustration—but it is reflected in thousands of homes across this province; if I pay $270 to make sure that I carry $250,000 limits on the two cars I am fortunate enough to own, then what is wrong with the proposition that the individual who does not choose to have insurance should pay the

total cost of the amount that the Legislature authorizes to pay out on their collective behalf? What is wrong with that proposition?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Well, that is one approach to it, Mr. Chairman. But as I pointed out to the hon. members of the House, what we paid out was just about the total amount received, exclusive of what was paid in—

Mr. Sopha: The Minister has said that before, and usually I understand the first time.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: —and that is what is being paid out. In addition to that, we have a fund that is there for the protection of you and everybody else against the uninsured motorist.

Mr. Sopha: Yes?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: In order words, you are asking the three million motorists of this province to contribute their annual licence fee as payment for the irresponsibility of those who will not seek insurance. That is where you have left yourself.

Oh, yes. Well, what else? Do not shake your head, what else is the dollar—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Does the hon. member not understand that he has protection against the uninsured motorist from outside the state, or the province; he also has protection against hit and run. Has he not?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Is there any value in it?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Well, acknowledge it then.

Mr. Sopha: I have protection and all I do is insist, as a matter of principle, that collectively everybody who does not have insurance, all that group, that amorphous mass that do not have insurance, pay collectively for the damages and the havoc that they wreak. Now, what is wrong with my proposition? With a $2 million deficit—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Let me tell you, one thing that is wrong with it is that it perhaps is not practical. I would take the condition of the state of Connecticut, where they had an operation like our motor vehicle accident claims fund in measure. They had an uninsured fee of $75, but they found that there were very few people carrying it and they were escaping the payment of it just like the motorists in Massachusetts were who did not want to get insured and so they reduced the fee in Connecticut to $37.50, cut it in half, and they got about ten times as many uninsured drivers without reducing the number who were carrying insurance.

In other words, there is a cut-off place beyond which the uninsured will either buy insurance or escape it, and it is to prevent the escaping that we set the fee where it is. It was originally $5, it was raised to $20, now it is $25, and we are receiving in return an increasing amount that will go over $1 million this year—

Mr. Sopha: That is what I was going to ask.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This year there will be more than $1 million paid back into the fund by uninsured drivers on whose behalf payments were made.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): How do they escape?

Mr. Sopha: How do they escape? If the Minister saw to it—and those who assist him to write the statutes—that those who tried to escape pay a minimum fine of $50. Did you know that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Sure.

Mr. Sopha: Fifty dollars is the minimum fine. There is no discretion in the magistrate at all, either you produce your insurance certificate or the fine is $50. And I have got to tell you the way the statute reads: If the member for Wellington North leaves his at home he is still liable to $50 because he did not produce it.

An hon. member: Wellington South.

Mr. Sopha: Wellington South, forgive me; it is not a question of whether you are insured at all. The way the statute reads, it says: "will produce when required to do so."

I think there is something in the statute that you can rush home and get it, there is some little leeway. You can rush home and get it and take it to the nearest police station and show it to them and escape the $50 fine. So the mind boggles when the Minister gets up and starts to tell us how they escape. If the fee is $50, if it is $50 to start with when the fellow does not pay, then the first time a policeman stops him and asks for production of the certificate the government is going

to get the $50. They will get the $50, they will get $100, because they will get a $50 fine and they will get the $50 insurance premium.

I would think that Treasury board, over there, that spends money like it is going out of style, like sailors on leave in Panama City, should be approached at the earliest time. It is a suggestion I make, approach them at the earliest time and say: "Look, we have concluded that a fair and reasonable fee would be $50 a year instead of the measly $25 that we are charging now."

I think that is a sensible suggestion. And your assistants, your associates, the Minister himself might well consider whether the limits might go from $35,000 to something like $100,000, because I believe completely—and I want to put it forward as a matter of experience—I believe in the principle of spreading losses.

I wonder about the sophistication of the society—a society that considers itself enlightened and sophisticated—which permits a situation to exist where the widow, the woman at home getting supper ready—let us say she is married to an executive who makes $25,000 a year—and she is getting supper ready expecting her husband to come home. He is crossing the street with a green light and he gets hit by some drunk that just came out of the Queen's hotel, and went through the red light. Let us make it as bad as possible—the drunk went through a red light and hit him. And let us say that she and her husband are 40 years of age; she is limited in this society that considers itself sophisticated to $35,000.

There has to be something wrong with a system like that and it will not stand up to the searching scrutiny of rationality. That shows you what the limits do! That is not in this Minister's department; we will turn to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs when he comes under review and ask him about that.

But what is in the Minister's department is the limits paid out of this fund, and this fund could begin to lead the way by raising the limits to a realistic, human amounts such as, say $100,000. That would be a good realistic figure—

Mr. Sargent: Geared to the times.

Mr. Sopha: Indeed. It would be geared to reality and geared to the just society, also.

An hon. member: Right.

Another hon. member: Very true.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Do not get political.

Mr. Sopha: I am not. It is a very captivating phrase upon which the people of Canada will rule on June 25. Now I leave it.

An hon. member: And in our favour.

Mr. Sopha: I want to turn to another aspect and by way of interjection I mentioned about the Minister being in court in regard to this fund. The now famous, or infamous, case, depending upon which way you want to look at it, is the Minister of Transport against the Great American Insurance Company. The Minister lost throughout, he lost in all the courts and I am not prepared to make any assessment of the legal talent that he hired—that is beyond my purview. I do not know those lawyers at all, I had never seen their names before, but they lost, all the way through the courts.

But the issue in the case has not been corrected by legislation and I said then and I say again, that it is a not only curious but rather astonishing situation to see the Minister of Transport in the courts arguing about the meaning of the legislation over which he has jurisdiction, instead of doing, what I think is the rational thing, and changing the legislation.

You know that is the great advantage of being a member of this place. If we do not like the rules, we change them! You see, we have the insurance companies by the neck. We have got them, because if we do not like the rules, we change the rules.

What was the issue? The issue was simply this: Whether an insurance policy attached if one carried passengers for hire in a motor vehicle.

It was argued successfully by the insurance company that the insurance never attached and this was a case where it was either the Minister of Transport which paid the money out of this fund about which we are talking, or the insurance company—the Great American Insurance Company—paid it. They won and the Minister paid. And by the time he got through all the courts that he went to he paid a great deal more than the original amount for which he was liable. Not only is he taking his licking to his pride, but he is taking an awful one to his purse as a result of all these lawyers.

Now there is no point in me getting up and regaling the Minister about losing the case; I lose lots of them and nobody gets up and denounces me. Not very often any-

ways. But the only point in raising it is to plead with them to change the law. So to say simply that from now on, whether the insured carries passengers for hire in a pleasure vehicle, which we all own—everybody owns a pleasure vehicle—shall be irrelevant to the issue of whether the insurance attaches.

If the insurance companies faced with that change in the law want to raise their premiums, then that is their own business. They may have to answer to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, but he is our paid watchdog in that regard, and he can straighten them out if they raise them too much. But for heaven's sake I do not see the point of all this exercise through the high court, through the court of appeal. I forget whether the case went to the Supreme Court of Canada; I think the Minister quit embarrassedly before he went to the final court.

But here is where the injustice is done; that it is simply this under motor vehicle law in this province: If you are going to go out and get in an accident; if an accident is going to happen to you; if you are a driver on his way to the happening of an accident, then you have got to pick very carefully the person who hit you. You have got to pick. Because depending on the character of the driver—that is to say, the insurance character—that comes out of that side road and hits you, it is going to be reflected in a very dramatic fashion on the amount of money that you are going to collect in the court. So if you want to have an accident, make sure it is the solid citizen that hits you.

Mr. Worton: There are 43,000 that are uninsured.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed, and for heaven's sake if the injuries are serious, make sure you do not get hit by one of the drivers which the Minister protects.

My point is this, that litigation in respect to motor vehicle accidents is just a jungle, just a jungle of artificiality surrounding. The time has come to introduce some rationale to it, and to proceed from the principle that we believe in spreading losses. We take the loss off the individual and spread it out over the whole of society. And that is the principle from which the select committee proceeded.

Then if this province really pretends to be first in the universe as we hear from day to day, from week to week, then here is an area in which it can proceed post haste to bring justice to the many thousands of litigants who seek damages as a result of injuries and loss that have occurred to them on the province's highways.

You can have the finest highways in the world, that is as we pretend to have, but if you do not do justice to the users of the highways who are at all times subject to and at the risk of sustaining heavy losses, then you cannot say that you are very enlightened in your approach to the problem. I want to make it clear that this is an area where I have some acquaintance, because here is where I earn my living. These are the problems which I deal with all the time.

For nine years I have stood in the House and asked for rectification of some of these things, because if you have any sensitivity at all, you have got to feel very wounded when you see some the injustice that happens to some of the people who go through our courts and the disillusionment, dismay and the cynicism with which they leave. And how do you really, finally, explain to a number of litigants injured in the same accident that they have to cut up only $35,000? How do you explain that? If their judgments total $120,000, you have to start applying fractions, then those people have got to wonder about the society in which they live as they—as so often the case after cutting up the $35,000—are left through physical disability in a position where they cannot earn an income.

Mr. Singer: Assuming they do not get caught by contributory negligence.

Mr. Sopha: Yes indeed. But of course. My friend from Downsview reminds me of the matter, that he and I will take up with the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs when we arrive at his estimates.

I leave off where I began, and that is to say that I am very pleased with the association that I have had with this fund. They do a very good job and they are very prompt. The promptitude they demonstrate to me in replying to my queries and doing the necessary things under the statute—I have no way of knowing—I expect is reflected with everyone who does business with them and is not a special consideration, because I am a member of the Legislature. I rather like to think that they treat all the applicants that way.

There is a difference between night and day from what it used to be in prehistoric times of 10 or 15 years ago. I give them every credit for the method which they employ. Perhaps when all is said and done,

and it is the last thing that I say, that after the session is over somebody responsible over there will sit down and read what I had to say about this and determine by the application of the rational processes whether there was not some merit in what I said; and another legislative session I will stand or fall on whether there is merit in it; and another session will see the reforms brought forward in legislation which I have advocated in my place today.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Halton West.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): I would like to agree with many of the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury. I think the stipend should be at least doubled in payments to the fund. I think that everybody should have insurance, automobile insurance, and at maximum coverage. However, if an operator cannot afford the premium, maybe because of a poor driving record that appears to date, at least his payment to the fund should be increased.

I do not think $50 is unreasonable. As has been said, it is a rare thing that the good responsible driver does not have insurance. It is usually the person that is not a responsible driver that has paid his $25 into the fund, and on this basis it would seem logical that the ratio is higher for the uninsured driver as far as accidents are concerned.

The hon. Minister says that if the fee is too high, the operator will not bother with anything—either insurance or payment of the fee. I agree with this proposition, but I think that this can be controlled through licencing and through enforcement. I think the main points as made by the hon. member for Sudbury is that the coverage, the maximum coverage, should be increased, and that the fund should be kept solvent. I think, as he has said, that where we have judgments of twice as much—sometimes as three times as much as the maximum coverage under the fund—it is unreasonable that the victims of that accident should not be adequately compensated.

I think, for example, that if the payment, assuming that the fund is pretty well solvent now, and I believe this was the purport of remarks of the hon. Minister, if the fee was say $50 and the compensation was increased to at least $70,000, this would be an improvement.

I would also like to add my remarks to the effect that I think that the fund is well operated. I think the service is, shall we say, a speedy service. There is great co-operation with the members in the department with those who are involved in litigation with the claims fund.

Mr. R. T. Potter (Quinte): Mr. Chairman, I too would like to agree with the member for Sudbury. I feel that this fund certainly is not doing efficiently the job that it was intended to do.

I think that the figure of $35,000 today is unrealistic. I wonder if instead of suggesting we increase our rates, that we do away entirely with the fund and require everyone to show a certificate of insurance of $100,000 before they get an automobile licence.

I know that they will say this is going to be hard to administer, but I see no reason why, if someone notifies the insurance company that they are going to cancel their insurance that they must give four weeks' notice and the licences of the car could be picked up within that four weeks. This would solve much of our problem.

I think we will agree, in this day and age when there are so many cars on the road, that many of those who do not carry insurance are old cars that should not be on the road anyway. If an individual is not prepared to pay the insurance that will cover him for $100,000 coverage, then I do not believe he should be driving a car.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: On the same point?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir, on this very briefly. Most insurance premiums in the insurance business are made up based on experience. Is there any reason why the amount of money to be paid out cannot be based on experience and their fee based on the amount of moneys needed. In other words, if you have 143,000 people who are uninsured paying $25 a year, this brings you $3.5 million a year. If you double that fee, it will give you $7 million a year. Is there any reason why this could not be done, based on experience?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder just how I could deal with the suggestion from the member for Grey-Bruce. I do not know how it would work into the operation of the system on the basis of experience. I do not know how he would apply it.

Mr. Sargent: You know the amount of of money you would need to take care of the number of people who are uninsured. You base the fee on that.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is, you would adjust the fee each year on the basis of the previous year's operation. Well, that is a thought. But I would like to express, Mr. Chairman, to the members who have contributed to this debate, the various thoughts they have put forward. Before the member for Sudbury spoke, I did refer to the need for solvency in the fund, having regard to liabilities that were known and unknown and also with regard to the possibility of increasing the limits of the fund beyond the present $35,000 amount, in the light of the developing situation. Also, having regard to the eroding value of the dollar with our inflation. All those things are before us and the contribution to the debate has been very useful.

Vote 2206 agreed to.

On vote 2207:

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in the area of transport planning, what is involved in this amount of $619,000?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the transportation planning division has taken over the section that was engaged in the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study that has come to an end, and on which we will be having reports shortly.

Mr. Sargent: What study?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The Metropolitan Toronto regional transportation study. It has ended.

Now, out of that, I think we will find there is considerable study and work to be done by a large number of departments involved. When the report is made public and I table it in this House and the members have it, and it goes into the hands of those engaged in transportation planning in this area—and in other parts of the province—and they begin to see the implications of it and the value it can be to them, we will have before us the benefit of that work. But, in the meantime, the residue of the nucleus of the staff that remains in transportation planning is being distributed gradually into the departments most concerned with areas of the work. Their places will be taken in part by those who will be engaged in general transportation planning, but particularly with regard to the airport section that we have now incorporated into this section.

And the hon. member will see that for this year, the major part of the transportation planning budget of $619,000—which includes the salaries of that staff—the most of it is $500,000, apportioned this year to start our airport work, beginning in the northern part of the province.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, a year ago, in other words, you had an airstrip programme. How many did you build?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, we did not have an airport Act through last year. It had just been given assent by this House, and this is the first money we have had available for it. Without having—

Mr. Sargent: Running two years behind. Two years ago, you announced in a Speech from the Throne that you would have an airstrip programme.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, a year ago that was. And this is the story that is developing—this last year without any particular moneys for it. We had co-operation from The Department of Highways, Lands and Forests and such, and we had three crews out making surveys originating from the Lakehead, Sault Ste. Marie, and Timmins, and working on corridors spreading north from those three centres. We have provision here to carry forward and develop our programme, beginning with a few airstrips this year.

We have not the facilities, we have not the staff to do a big job yet, but we have a number of approaches to the subject. One is we would like to get into the north with some equipment and get experience building airstrips in the remote areas that do not have all-weather landings, or all-weather facilities of any kind. Places that just are not connected with transportation at all.

Those we give priority to. The next group, of course, will be the airstrips that are presently existing, or needing improvement or where we can do work on land, probably belonging to the Crown.

Again, we have provision in our Act also for making grants to municipalities or other bodies that want to build, or have airstrips and want to improve them, and we will develop a grant system with this in mind, a proportional sharing.

The need to co-operate with the federal Department of Transport that has jurisdiction

in air matters is important, and we are developing that liaison and endeavouring to ascertain the extent of their contribution in these various projects and to learn what priorities they are prepared to give them. Because in some cases we understand that the federal government will assume probably the major part, if not the whole part, of some airports if they have some body or presence that can accept the contract on behalf of Ontario where there is no existing municipality.

And finally, we have work that we will be forwarding in connection with ground controls and beacons and this kind of thing. That is where we are. We are just starting, I am not representing to the House that we have any programme under way other than the sketchy outline of the work we have thus far done. If we get this estimate through and the House is generous in voting this amount, we will try and get ahead with it.

Mr. Sargent: Anything would be better than nothing in this field, but you must admit that this is pretty feeble. Your approach to this very important subject of airport strips.

Repeatedly, over the years, we have suggested that when you are building a new area of highways in this province that you allot 2,000 foot strips alongside every 25 or 50 miles. This has never been adopted by the government, they have just turned their head. There are so many areas where you could become a part of our times, but you are so far behind. Half a million dollars in this field amounts to about a half mile of highway at the current expense.

So, we are just laughing at what you are trying to do; because if you had spent the whole $500,000 in capital financing this year in this field you might be effective in building maybe 10 or 12 strips in Ontario, which is only a drop in the bucket. And I understand that your approach to this is in northern Ontario first, and this is good.

But why do you not stop kidding the people kidding us? Half a million dollars in the great north is just like, well I am not going even to talk about it. So insofar as transportation is concerned it is just a joke insofar as flying, private flying in Ontario is concerned.

The real problem which I would like to talk about is the fact that in the transportation needs of Metro Toronto you say you have this study coming up, the Metro study, which has been in the hopper for a while. This in effect has been responsible, I guess, for getting people to the downtown Metro area, that is probably what they will end up telling us.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that to date these transportation studies have resulted in spending $20 million on a GO transit system, bringing people to downtown Toronto. This represents possibly two to three million you have spend—say $20 million to date, or $7 per capita—you have spent in the Metro area on transportation. In the same area, in the rest of the province, you would have to give us possibly $60 million across the province to bring us into line with the amount of money you spend here in Toronto on transportation.

Mr. Kerr: The reason is traffic. One word, traffic.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I respect his opinion and I think he works for his people, but there are great problems in transportation in every area in this province. Every city has its transportation problems. The Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) promised this House three years ago that he would do equal amounts of spending across the province in this area, and we have not seen one 5 cent piece. And this is the kind of stuff that is going on in the estimates here. You sit down and make up your budget and no one has any planned approach to the needs of the province. And I say today, if each municipality in this province were to come down with the mayor and the council and say: "On the basis of what you are spending in Toronto on transportation and the GO transit, you owe us $7 per capita," it would mean to the city of Ottawa probably $15 million. It would mean to the city of Hamilton possibly X million dollars. And in Owen Sound it would probably mean about $200,000 to us for our transportation problems. But these are things that are wrong, Mr. Chairman, insofar as these estimates are concerned, and asking us to vote with you, to give you $105,000 for salaries for transportation planning is ridiculous. What are you planning?

We had the estimates here of The Department of Highways and we had a vote. One firm got $1.5 million last year for consultants' fees, one firm got $1.5 million. And what can they do for $1.5 million? Tell them how to build better highways? They did not build the highways, they just got that for consulting fees. Last year you spent in The Department of Highways $5.7 million in consultants' fees,

$5.7 million in consultants' fees in one department. Now you are asking us to give you today $619,000 for transportation planning, and you have $500,000 for airstrip development—which amounts to about a half a mile of highway—which is so ridiculous.

So I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if you are going to do an honest job in this area of airstrip development—in every other state in the union down there they have laws that make it mandatory that airstrips be lighted at night for the sake of the lives it will save. But nowhere in this province is there a law which says airstrips must be lighted at night. It will cost peanuts. But these are things you could do.

I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, how much capital financing is available to a municipality from you for airstrip development?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the member points out clearly that there is only a very small amount available this year. I think he would appreciate that if we had come forward and asked for two or three million dollars this year to start an airstrip programme with no sophisticated airstrip or airport staff available to me—we are just making the transition now from those that were the nucleus of the MTARTS staff—he would have every reason to criticize me for making even a show of being prepared to spend money wastefully.

The $500,000 is a pittance, it will help us get started this year—get the staff together and get sophistication in the work we are to do, and lay out the plan. I do not want to jump in building airstrips without having some plan, without having arranged the corridors we are going to use. Then we will be dealing with the setting up of a programme of grants to municipalities. Some of these we have to pay entirely ourselves, some of them will be very simple and not too expensive once we get machinery in—walking machinery in, once the land freezes up this winter.

Then we will have to deal with these municipalities which are coming forward to us and indicate need—the member knows exactly the situation, and the urgency there is. We have had 52 municipalities come to us and ask us to help them with their airports. Well, this is putting our whole album together and we want to deal with the federal government on this because they are the senior partners in this, and I am not going to tread on their toes. We want to co-operate with them and not to try to either elbow them out or take over from them, and a good piece of co-operation is being established.

I point out to the hon. member, sir, that the federal government has a programme for assisting airports as we can do. It is an all-Canada programme and it has only $1 million. I hope that as we escalate the amounts we put into this, and make available on a shared basis by way of grants to municipalities, that we can induce our confreres in Ottawa to go along with us, because I think it is the kind of programme that is going to take a particular piece of co-operation between the two jurisdictions and we will have to work out a shared programme with municipalities, the provincial government and the federal government in some cases—perhaps in some cases between the provincial and federal governments alone—and some places it will have to be purely provincial government based.

I am not making any representation that we have a grandiose plan here, but I think it is an honest beginning and I think that the member for Grey-Bruce and my colleague, the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. MacKenzie), will appreciate the future of this programme, and how we are getting into it belatedly, but recognizing the need there is for an acceleration of work in this direction because wheeled aircraft are coming into their own fast.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: I still have the floor, Mr. Chairman. Every municipality of 5,000 people or more across the province has its own industrial commissions and part of their selling point, what they are going towards, is their own airstrip or airport.

To be competitive in today's fight for industry, every municipality needs landing facilities, at least 3,000 feet for a twin-engine aircraft. But for the Minister to say that the Ottawa people have a programme—I might say respectively, Mr. Chairman, that most municipalities cannot conform to DOT standards for a DOT airport. I am not surprised they have 50 applications and I think you would have an awful lot more if we thought there was any chance of getting any help. I would suggest the way you move in this government it will take ten years before we get any money for airports.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member will appreciate, and think, would approve of our approach to it, that the best way to get ahead with this is by developing a good liaison with Ottawa and developing

a programme in conjunction with the area or the municipality, if there be one, and with the federal government on the other hand. We do the job together.

Mr. Sargent: This is so ridiculous. There are many aircraft flying today with no place to land, and you are far behind the times. We are talking about the Metro study. How long has this been in force and how much has it cost?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the Metropolitan Toronto region transportation study originated about four years ago and altogether I would—

Mr. Sargent: And you have not had a report for four years?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have had interim reports but we are bringing out the final report a week from Thursday. I think the total cost has been in the neighbourhood of $2.5 million for the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study; that is what the province will have put up. Metropolitan Toronto will have contributed about $500,000 to $600,000 in computer time about $2.5 million for the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study including—that is what the province will put up, Metropolitan Toronto will have contributed about half a million—$600,000 in computer time and we have had tremendous co-operation from CNR, CPR, the various departments of government involved, including agencies like the Ontario water resources commission and the Toronto transit commission, that the amount of money I tell you that was spent on it is only the output of money and all these other agencies have contributed their top staff members and abundance in time and effort.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, to say I am shocked at cost is an understatement but who would approve a $2.5 million steady contract? Who okayed that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There was no one contract and the hon. member himself questioned some of the contracts, over the last two or three years, that were given for various consultants and for pieces of work that were done on the study. It was a joint effort under an executive committee comprising the Ministers of Highways, Municipal Affairs, Trade and Development, Transport, and the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Sargent: How can anyone earn $2.5 million when that represents all the pay of the members of the Legislature for two or three years? So this group received more money for a study for one single problem than we get for all the multitude of things we handle here in three or four years.

This is a shocking thing and I think there should be an investigation and an inquiry into how you people can spend. This year you will probably spend $20 million in these studies and findings for consultants and somewhere along the line someone has to say, "Whoa and stop this nonsense." This is ridiculous—$2.5 million for a pile of paper which was of no use anyway.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2207—the member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I too am a little disturbed by the fact that upon reaching the completion of the Metro study, the department has not now gone into an overall Ontario study, a sort of stock-taking as I mentioned at the beginning, of the transportation available in this province and what ought to be done to improve it.

This piecemeal approach that you are taking, deciding this year we are going to handle air strip development. Maybe next year it will be something else. If you have not completed this it will not be anything else. It is going to take too long. We must have a study into the complete transportation of this province and surely, under the transportation planning section of your department, this is where it should be undertaken. This section should be the biggest, the most important section of the whole department instead of being the tiniest, the tail of the dog. I would hope that you would take a look at the possibility, the great need to study the transportation available in this province and then to move into the fields where we can improve on it rather than just to sort of limp along from year to year, doing one, dropping off, doing another, with no tie in of any kind.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, may I just summarize what we are doing. With the presentation of the MTARTS report next week, I am sure it will be referred to all the departments of government and agencies concerned for study. It covers—some members will realize—the two or three thousand square miles from Oshawa to Barrie to Hamilton, a very important area to be considered in the future development of our country.

When this report becomes available, it will be distributed then for study in all the de-

partments and agencies concerned and we will then be able to use the tools that have been developed here—not the material, the data collection that is pertinent to this area alone—but to use the tools and the skills and the techniques that have been developed here for transportation studies in other areas.

I would say to the hon. member for Grey-Bruce that that is what the Prime Minister had in mind when he said that these studies would be made in other areas of the province and I share with him the hope that my area which I think is one of the critical ones in need of a transportation study of this kind—

Mr. Sargent: Give us the money. That is the whole problem.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is it, as soon as we get this study digested, I would hope that these comparable kinds of studies will be done in Windsor, Owen Sound and even Ottawa and I would say to the member for Wentworth that we are not in a position this year to utilize this knowledge because it is going to have to go into the departments concerned and come back to us.

This branch of our work, this amount represented in this item will probably accelerate next year and grow considerably, but it would have been foolish to have represented that we would do further studies this year because I think it will take to the end of this fiscal year for these departments to come back to us with the kind of help we need to make meaningful studies elsewhere.

Mr. Deans: What I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, is this that by the time we digest this study of the area of Metro Toronto, and then move on to the next area, and to the next area, it is going to be 20 or 25 years before we finally get around to deciding what is needed in the north. I would hope that by next year, the Minister can bring in, in his estimates, a request for money for a transportation planning department that will be all encompassing, that will somehow bring about a co-ordination of the transportation systems available and needed in this province.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in my introductory remarks I mentioned to the Minister a study of bus commuter services and I would sincerely hope that he does not wait for the results of the transportation commission report but implements some type of study in some communities having a population of from 100,000 to 200,000 people now, so that we could find out whether a commuter service using buses would be a feasible type of project to alleviate the transportation problems of a given area. I speak specifically from my own area because of the geographical location. As we are a city bordering the United States, our transportation problems are unique from those that you will find in the large metro areas around Toronto. So I would sincerely encourage the Minister to get into some type of commuter studies in any community in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. H. MacKenzie (Ottawa Centre): I would just like to take a minute, Mr. Chairman, to compliment the Minister—

Mr. Chairman: Order please! I want to point out to the member that there is one particular member who apparently did not understand the Chairman's suggestion the other day that we would no longer recognize a list, or employ a list. If the members wish to speak they will rise and address the Chairman.

The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. MacKenzie: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I feel that the Minister is being very courageous and moving in the right direction with regard to his Act respecting the establishment, extension, improvement and maintenance of airports. There is little question that this is a step in the right direction. There is also little doubt that the Minister had to do a fair amount of talking to get some progress on it. It is a courageous step and I compliment him on it.

His integration with the federal Department of Transport is surely another step in the right direction. There is little doubt in my mind having travelled quite a bit in the air in this country, and landed on a lot of airports both here and below the border, that the federal government has been successful in building some of the best airports in the world. I have not found any yet which rival the airports we have here in Canada and, as I say, I think when the Minister integrates his programme with the federal Department of Transport, surely something worth while should come out of it.

With regard to municipalities and giving them grants—helping them furnish their own

airports—I do hope that the Minister in making arrangements with municipalities will ensure the standards are upheld on these municipal airports. I cannot think of anything worse than having municipal airports where proper standards of maintenance, lighting and so forth are not properly laid down and adhered to.

I just want to read into the record the amount of money which is made available to Ontario from tax on aviation fuel and I have it here in an item that was published some time ago, which says:

> In the province of Ontario the total gallonage of aviation turbo fuel and aviation gasoline in 1966 totalled 107,499,105 gallons. For 1968 a 15 per cent increase can be expected and this is a conservative estimate. The province takes 3 cents tax on every gallon of aviation fuel sold. In 1968, the province should expect to realize $3.7 million in revenue.

Now add to this the revenue which occurs indirectly from the aircraft industry in maintenance parts and that sort of thing and I think the revenue is there. Surely as time goes by the Provincial Treasurer will see fit to provide the Minister with the money that he needs to progress with his plans with regard to airports.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Chairman, I would like to get from the Minister some indication of what his department has in mind for transportation planning in northern Ontario.

To hear some members from the Metro area speak, you would think it was the only part of the province that had a transportation problem, that had a traffic problem. There is very little indication in any of the departmental estimates that anything of a tangible nature is being done in the north where transportation is the most vital and the most important issue and where there are such huge distances between settled communities.

As everyone knows, that is where the vast stores of natural resources are in the mining and forest products industries, where we have a wonderful opportunity to develop and exploit our tourist potential; it is the only free area of economic concern that we have going for us in the north, and about the only ray of hope is assistance for airstrip development and the Minister, in answer to previous speakers, did not offer anything of a concrete nature as to what will be done.

He has, by his own admission, had something like 52 requests from many municipalities, for assistance. And I am sure the Minister—I have spoken to him about it—in his travels and his canoe excursions through the north, knows the terrain up there and knows the problems that we have in regard to transporting raw material and getting into remote areas to see what the potential is in the various areas of concern that I have mentioned. And $500,000 seems to be a very insignificant amount if he intends to tackle this problem in a meaningful way.

There are several areas where they have makeshift airstrips at present; one case in particular that I have brought to the Minister's attention was at Nakina. It had just been vacated within the last couple of years by The Department of Transport, federal jurisdiction, and it is being used during the winter months by the licence holders of air transport licences.

If it is not taken over within the very near future, the condition of it will degenerate to such an extent that it is going to cost a terrific amount of money to reopen it. Apparently it is quite a large strip; there are houses there; there are many facilities that were in use when the airstrip itself was in use and are still intact. It seems to me that if the Minister wants to start a programme of airstrips and designate air corridors in the north, he should start from a base of airstrips that are already in existence.

I am sure he knows where they are, and I would like the Minister, if he will, to explain just specifically what he has in mind for this year; if he asks for $500,000 he must have a definite plan—I do not suppose he just picked $500,000 out of the hat and said, "Well, we will spend $500,000 and see what we come up with."

I do not think any government or any Minister should operate in that fashion; he must have a definite plan; I would like to know what it is. How many airstrips does he plan to do this year with the $500,000; where they are going to be located; how they are going to be operated; and any other information with regard to this expenditure of $500,000 that the Minister can give me?

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister wish to reply at this point or does he want to hear any other speakers? The member for Port Arthur, I believe, had the floor first.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think this legislation to establish northern airstrips by this department is just tremendous, and I am sure that municipalities will respond with tremendous enthusiasm—so much so that I dare say this department is going to have some very difficult decisions to make once the backlog comes because with $500,000, as you have already admitted yourself, through you, Mr. Chairman, it is not going to go too far.

You are going to have to set up a list of priorities, and I would hope that the people from the north will have a decision when you decide on what is going to come first. I think it would be a wise idea to establish some kind of a committee of persons who would be able to generally best reflect the opinion of people across the north because there are some areas that will require these airstrips more than others, and perhaps from the point of view of need would be more deserving.

So, I would like to recommend to the Minister that he establish some kind of a committee of people in the know, on transportation, and especially in the airline transportation business, to recommend and to make proper suggestions to him on this.

We are talking about planning and studies in transportation. It may not seem at first to be pertinent but I live in a mobile home, and all people who live in mobile homes are very strongly dependent on this department and its laws for moving their homes. Transportation is a feature of having a mobile home; and it has been pointed out to me that the length limit on mobile homes can be drawn along Ontario highways is 60 feet, and I think that if this industry is going to expand, and truly serve the needs of people today, it should be extended to 65 feet, or 67, or even 70 feet, as it is in certain states of the United States and other provinces of this country.

I wonder if the Minister is giving any thought to studying this industry, to see how it has grown, and to see if it is not now time to extend the length that is permitted for mobile homes to be hauled? It occurs to me that a lot of people living in southern Ontario and other parts of Canada might be inclined to come into northern Ontario if they thought that they could bring their home with them, or take it back with them if they did not happen to like the north, or if things did not work out. The only way to do that is with a mobile home, and for this reason, I think that when you talk about the big transportation problems of northwestern Ontario, you have got to say that one of the answers to transportation problems is to be found in mobile homes.

Anything that this department can do to facilitate the movement of these mobile homes back and forth across this province, is going to enhance this industry; it is going to make it easier for people to own one of these homes and more attractive; and in a way it is going to help the housing problem.

I have wandered somewhat, Mr. Chairman, but I would just like to leave this to the Minister; we who live in mobile homes are very much dependent on his department, because the mobility of the home is gone if you cannot move it. And unfortunately we are confined to a 60-foot length, while we see our neighbours in certain states of the United States and certain provinces of this country living in much longer ones and much more comfortable ones because the laws of this province do not permit transportation of a mobile home over a length of 60 feet. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, it might seem, Mr. Chairman, that we are talking with special emphasis today, but I might say that the remarks of the member for Ottawa Centre are very timely because he has just returned from a trip to the Caribbean, flying his own plane, and he is knowledgeable of what he speaks; the member for Northumberland (Mr. Rowe) is licenced to fly jet aircraft; the member for Halton East (Mr. Gisborn) made some great contribution to flying, as in a bill he is putting through the House here; and the member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) is an old pilot of great skill.

I feel that there is an area for knowlegeable information that can make this programme even better than it is when you realize that this year you will be receiving $3.7 million from the aircraft industry in revenue, and you are only going to spend $500,000 to study how you are going to develop this. And, if ever there was a lopsided arrangement, we have it here. I think a strong lobby of the members I have mentioned here could get on your tail; maybe you could revise your programme. There is a great imbalance here if you think of the fact that you are receiving $3.7 million and you are only going to expend peanuts to back it up. I think that you should take a new look at it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Halton East.

Mr. J. W. Snow (Halton East): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a few words on this vote. I would like to congratulate the Minister and his department on the implementation of this programme for the establishment of airstrips. This is the first step, I understand, by the province of Ontario to aid in the aviation industry in any way.

The province of Ontario, or a great deal of it, was built around the aviation industry in the bush flying and the bush operators. It is these small bush carriers who are still doing a great deal to supply, in many cases, the only means of transportation into some parts of our province.

These northern municipalities that use aircraft for their only means of transportation are presently tied to float-equipped or ski-equipped aircraft and, of course, this cuts them off from transportation for a month or two months spring and fall during the freeze-up or the break-up. I think it is most important that this programme go ahead as quickly as possible in order to establish, not large airports but at least landing strips, where ski-equipped or wheel-equipped aircraft can service these municipalities.

I think that the $500,000 that is included this year can be easily expended before the programme gets very far off the ground. Considering this, along with the $100,000 for all of Canada that the federal government have been supplying for the past few years, I think this will be of great assistance.

I had a question regarding how many airports were proposed and how many applications were in. This has already been answered. I would again ask the question as to when we propose to start on this programme and where it will be.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, first a word to the hon. member for Port Arthur. He is quite correct that the overall length limit on trailers is 60 feet. There are special permits issued on occasions, both as regards length and width of oversized vehicles.

The member for Thunder Bay asked specifically for the outline of the programme. I think that I have given it in as much detail as I am prepared to do at this time.

Among the some 52 municipalities who have asked for airports, there are a number that we think will have to be given some measure of priority insofar as they are otherwise inaccessible, and have no all-weather communication at all with the outside world. But among the airports that we have been considering chiefly are those on the corridors moving north from the Lakehead, from Sault Ste. Marie and Timmins. We have looked at 11 of them. We have consideration of airports at Nakina, and Wawa, and Chapleau, Nestor Falls, Dryden and Moosonee. These are some of those of which we are looking at right now.

The important thing is also to get our people involved in this work, informed on how we are going to get our equipment in and when we can get started working on it.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2207. The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Knight: I would like to ask a question about the possibility of a northern committee to help in deciding where these airstrips should be located.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman understood it was just a suggestion to the Minister.

Mr. Knight: Oh, I see. It did not impress him too much!

Vote 2207 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates for The Department of Transport.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I anticipated that perhaps my estimates would have been carried by the time I got from there to here.

In presenting the estimates of the Department of Education for 1968-69, I would ask permission to depart from my normal practice of providing the House with a somewhat exhaustive account, and I am sure exhausting to some members, of the various departmental programmes. Rather I propose to offer for the consideration of the hon. members some reflections on the extensive developments in education which are taking place and the underlying philosophy which in influencing the evolution of education in Ontario.

I am also providing, Mr. Chairman, a rather larger document of additional information for the members so that they can base, perhaps, some of their questions or discussions on the document which I am not including as part of my forte speech.

It is most important that we who are so closely involved with government periodically

make an effort to stand back from our everyday commitments and re-examine not only our functions but our basic assumptions about the nature of our responsibilities to society. One thing that emerges from such an examination is that the role of a Department of Education in a pioneer, underdeveloped jurisdiction is quite different from one in a sophisticated and complex industrial society.

In the early years of this province, the department became involved in a variety of activities, principally because in a pioneering society, it was the only appropriate agency available. The educational system which was established in Ontario was in my opinion a truly fine one, and the development of this province over the past 150 years was in no small measure due to the soundness of that system. However, attributes which at one time were advantageous can, I suggest, in a changing environment, lose their usefulness and require modification. One such attribute, necessary in its time, was centralization.

J. M. McCutcheon's book, *Public Education in Ontario*, published in 1941, contains an interesting passage by Watson Kirkconnell:

> In considering my father's success, we shall need to keep in mind the contemporary state of secondary education in Ontario, for the circumstances were such as to limit strictly the pedagogic originality of the individual school. Secondary schools in Ontario from The Grammar School Act of 1853 down to the present have, apart from rare intervals of relaxation, been subject to a rigorous process of centralization under bureaucratic control in the provincial capital at Toronto. Apart from a few small private schools which follow the traditions of the English residential schools, the secondary education of the province has been carried on entirely in high schools and collegiate institutes, whose curricula, equipment, teachers' qualifications, examinations, and modes of instruction are all prescribed and inspected by the government. Such a system was first evolved by officials like Egerton Ryerson and George Paxton Young, in order to rescue unwilling municipalities from the chaos and incompetence of the pioneer schools, and its success in this regard led later bureaucratic experts like George W. Ross and John Seath to push official prescription to a fantastic extreme, The result, by the time of Seath's death in 1919, was a highly efficient educational machine, uniform throughout the province of 3 million people and reaching its maximum competence in the great collegiate institutes, where the staffs were made up exclusively of university graduates, each department head was an honour graduate and a specialist, and the plant and equipment measured up to high technical standards. "Faultily faultless, icily regular", the provincial system was at once one of the most uniformly efficient in the world and one of the most paralyzing to individual initiative in teacher or school.

This, I stress, Mr. Chairman, was the judgment of Watson Kirkconnell.

In all honesty, we must admit that while the tradition of a centralized system of education served the province well, it did lead to an undue emphasis on regimentation and conformity. This was, perhaps, a necessary evil in a pioneer society.

Over the years, The Ontario Department of Education, to its credit, has played an important role in the development of local educational authorities to the point where they have become responsible agents, capable of assuming many of the functions which were hitherto carried by the department. This evolution has required a fundamental re-examination of the role of the department. While it will continue to play a most vital part in Ontario education, the distribution of emphasis on its activities will be radically changed.

At a time when the size of government at all levels seems to be increasing at a tremendous rate, our aim will be to reduce the size of the department while at the same time increasing its effectiveness, measured in terms of service to education.

In the course of this major shift in departmental policy, many departmental functions will be decentralized to appropriate authorities. In some areas this process is already well advanced. A key step was made in this regard with the establishment of colleges of applied arts and technology. As the members are well aware, the province had a well established system of institutes of technology, vocational centres and institutes of trades which were operated directly by the department.

Rather than extend this system of post-secondary education under departmental control, it was decided to establish colleges under local boards of governors. The departmental institutes all have become the responsibility of such boards and in many cases have formed the nucleus of new institutions.

In a parallel development, it was announced in September 1967 that regional offices would be made more responsive to local needs through a de-emphasis on regulatory functions in favour of assistance in educational innovation and experimentation. Department of Education subject inspectors were given a new role as programme consultants available to schools on request. With the establishment of the new county and divisional boards of education, the need for departmental supervisory staff such as area superintendents will disappear since the new boards will appoint their own professional staff.

In reviewing the role of The Department of Education, I feel that it is necessary to return to first principles. The fundamental reason, in my view, for the existence of a Department of Education is to enable the government of this province to carry out effectively its responsibility for providing wise and appropriate measures for the education of our citizens.

It follows that the function of departmental officials is to develop and continuously review a comprehensive philosophy of public education. This educational planning—which must cover an extremely broad spectrum, taking into account the social and economic needs of all citizens—is then expressed as policy in two principal ways: through the medium of the educational laws, which form the framework for publicly supported education, and through the distribution of funds, which are not unlimited and therefore must be invested with some wisdom. Being centrally located, the department is also specially qualified to be a resource centre for new information and a clearing house for worthwhile ideas emanating from within and outside the province.

These are, Mr. Chairman, the three basic or principal responsiblities of the department, and all other involvements, it seems to me, can only have the effect of diluting the considerable effort required to do those jobs well. With the decentralization of many of the traditional departmental functions to local authorities which are situated more closely to the public they serve, departmental officials will be better able to concentrate on those responsibilities which they are best equipped to perform.

The main condition needed to bring about this ideal situation is that local educational authorities should be large enough to be able to provide a full range of programmes plus the highly specialized staff of psychologists, reading consultants, speech therapists, and others that are required if all children are to be given the opportunity to achieve their maximum potential.

Realization of such an aim will call for co-operation, highmindedness and quite frankly, some sacrifice. This centralization at the local level is in no way inconsistent with the philosophy of decentralization at the provincial level. We should strive for an optimum local organization which is close enough to the local scene to be fully conversant with its problems, yet large enough and well enough staffed to receive delegation of responsibility from the department. This delegation of duties will provide the local staff and specialists with the flexibility and freedom from artificial constraints which will enable them to operate at maximum effectiveness.

The point I wish to stress here is that a distinction must be drawn between "operating" functions and "policy-making" functions. I am suggesting that, in a highly developed and mature educational system such as we have in this province, "operating" functions are most effectively and appropriately the responsibility of local agencies such as boards of education and boards of governors. The central Department of Education, on the other hand, must be responsible for overall planning.

In order that there should be no uncertainty concerning the positive and vital role of the department, I would like at this point to outline some of the basic responsibilities and priorities of the department which I see for the future. In an era of change such as ours, this list cannot be complete and I assure you should not be regarded as fixed. In fact, one of the elements required is a degree of flexibility that will allow the department to respond to changing realities. I would sincerely welcome debate and suggestions on this important matter, particularly as our deliberations on the role of a Department of Education may well be examined with interest in other jurisdictions as well as our own. The evolutionary process in which we are participating seems to be a matter of interest and common experience throughout the world.

I would suggest that we can best focus the role of a central Department of Education by investigating some of its broad strategic objectives and resulting responsibilities. These

might be stated as follows, and not necessarily in order of priority.

1. The department is responsible for ensuring that all citizens have suitable educational opportunities. This involves the setting of objectives, the provision of leadership and the establishment and involvement of appropriate authorities to implement the necessary programmes.

Leadership cannot take the form of dictation from a superior authority to other levels. To be effective, it must be based on mutual respect and recognition of the special contributions which can be made by all parties to the total educational enterprise. For example, classroom teachers and local authorities are particularly qualified to take part in the development and implementation of new approaches to meet specific circumstances with which they are familiar. The department, on the other hand, because of its central location, is uniquely equipped to disseminate locally developed techniques to other parts of the province.

2. The department should delegate the operation of institutions to other bodies, for example, local education authorities, which, through legislation, are given sufficiently wide powers to ensure that all educational needs of society are met.

From this premise, it follows that the department must encourage the establishment of authorities suitable for the task; such authorities as large local education jurisdictions, colleges and institutions, to which responsibility can be delegated. Such agencies should be given encouragement to innovate, with as much freedom from regulation as is consistent with the central authority's responsibility.

3. The department must provide financial resources to local education authorities and establish priorities so that resources which are scarce may be allocated in the most judicious manner. Here, the primary needs are analysis and long-term planning.

4. The department has a responsibility for research, whether it engages in it directly or encourages local education authorities and other agencies to search for fresh approaches and better educational methods.

5. The department must provide assistance to local education agencies in the form of consultative services, proposals and new ideas for curriculum development, and must assist in providing suitably qualified personnel.

These suggestions concerning the appropriate role of a Department of Education are based on a number of assumptions. The first is that the true strength of a democracy lies in the opportunties which it provides for individual growth and development, and that this can best be achieved through the scale of diversity and flexibility which is only possible in a decentralized system.

Another assumption is that, in educational matters, locally elected representatives working with professional teachers can be counted on not only to maintain existing standards but to achieve new heights of excellence, which will ultimately be of benefit to all.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize such assumptions constitute an expression of confidence in our Ontario school system. They are based on the record of many years in which a high sense of public responsibility has been demonstrated by the electorate, by its elected representatives and by professional teachers alike. Such public spirit cannot, I say with respect, be legislated by a government. It can only be achieved by a society that has evolved an educational system with depth, with self-awareness and a clarity of goals.

I would like now to turn, just for a few moments, to a few instances of the type of educational activity and innovation on which we base our confidence in the ultimate success of our policy of decentralization.

I feel that such examples are quite significant, for this reason. Educational policy making must always have as its central concern the student in the learning environment. Hence, there is a need for feedback from the schools to help us determine whether the department's philosophy of education does in fact have validity and viability when put into practice. This is the focal point around which all our deliberations must revolve. That is why I would like to cite several of many possible examples of the creative responses which have been forthcoming from local boards and schools as a result of the greater freedom to innovate that is provided by our philosophy of decentralization of education in Ontario.

It is no coincidence that many recent developments stress student involvement in out-of-school situations. This reflects an increasing and healthy awareness that the ultimate test of any system will be the extent to which it encourages growth and participation among its students, and provides them with real, as opposed to vicarious, experience of the world.

Many schools are accomplishing, Mr. Chairman, truly remarkable things in providing students with just such experiences. For

example, large numbers of students have been exchanged over several weeks between Fergus district secondary school and an equivalent French-speaking school in Quebec. Fergus is the school that managed to send not just a delegation but very nearly the entire student body to Expo 67. The students themselves earned almost $40,000 to finance the project and parents were specifically asked not to assist by paying for the trip themselves. The principal, Mr. Richard B. Gilman, described the project in part as follows:

> Students were divided by the organization committee into groups of their own choice and over 100 student leaders were trained for supervision tasks. Four large institutions were rented in Montreal and visits were made to plan sleeping accommodation, meals and so on. We deliberately attempted to involve as many as possible in real organization and we tried to avoid using those who were already in positions of responsibility, such as the student council or school prefects.
>
> Meanwhile practically every subject department—and I think this is really highly relevant—integrated into its courses worthwhile information concerning what students would see. The English, history, geography, commercial and language departments were especially busy and this culminated in the production of a 34-page tour handbook for each student and staff member.
>
> Statistics prove little. But there was a certain satisfaction when the school returned to normal after 1,300 miles of travel with two special trains, 160 buses, four trucks, four cars and 13,000 booked meals —all made possible through the raising of nearly $40,000 over a period of eight months.
>
> Not only had the students gained experience through the magnificent displays and exhibitions of arts, science and technology at Man and His World, they had also participated in writing assignments, discussions and historical and geographical surveys during the school term in preparation for their trip.
>
> In short, the positive values of the trip appeared to be fourfold: Knowledge, experience, morale and community spirit.

Mr. Chairman, the surprising thing to many of us of another generation is the extent to which the students themselves organize and participate in planning such endeavours, and therein, probably, lies one of the chief values.

Symbolic of the movement towards integrating the experiences of an individual student in school is the project on secondary school organization that is now in progress and I think was mentioned in answer to a question by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman) during the early phases of this House. In the 1967-68 school year, six secondary schools were encouraged to introduce modified programmes covering individual timetables, subject promotions, and additional optional courses. The modifications were left sufficiently flexible to allow for a start to be made in bridging the five-year and the four-year programmes, as well as in breaking down the barriers between the three present branches.

With subject promotion and a credit system established, these schools were also able to reduce the demarcation between grades and thus take a first step toward the non-graded secondary school.

It may well be and I emphasize this, that in the future the traditional distinction between the arts and science, business and commerce, and technical and vocational programmes will decrease and that students will be offered a much wider selection of interests, regardless of their ultimate choice of career pattern.

Care is being taken, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that the students are enabled to meet the requirements of post-secondary institutions. The department has made provision for publication of the results so that other schools and jurisdictions may benefit from the experience gained. I would be happy to arrange for any interested member to obtain a copy of this publication.

In the primary and junior divisions of our elementary schools, the principle of non-graded classes is being actively explored by a significantly increasing number of teachers and school systems. The ideal of continuous progress for each child is still an elusive organizational goal, but at such schools as Allandale Heights in Barrie, children and their teachers are coming close to that ideal.

The interim revision of the programme of studies for kindergarten and grades 1 to 6, issued during 1966 and 1967, have provided encouragement for such developments. Grade designations are becoming less rigid and, in the first six years of school, the kind of carefully planned "freedom in the presence of knowledge" that more and more children are experiencing should no longer be termed experimental.

In the intermediate division, new dimensions and possibilities are being explored in the schools for kindergarten to grade 6 pupils and in the senior public schools. Students in these middle years must be given opportunities for a wide range of experience across the broadest possible spectrum of subjects and themes. Schools such as the Bertie senior elementary school at Ridgeway, and Alexander Muir senior public school in Toronto, are developing programmes which incorporate theme-centred activities by students, co-operative planning by teachers, considerable out-of-school experiences, and the rapid development of cross-disciplinary studies.

School organization, Mr. Chairman, will be the subject of intense study by my department in the year 1968-69. More flexibility is needed to meet the wider and more diverse interests of students. Our aim will be to preserve the best of the traditional methods, while providing more and more avenues for the development of each student's potential.

Mr. Chairman, if the members would like to recess before I conclude my remarks very briefly—

Mr. Chairman: If the Minister has only a few more remarks—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I think it would take about another 15 or 20 minutes and I would not want to upset the hon. members' dinner hour.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 106



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, continued 3889

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 3922

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 1968

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
(Continued)

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, we had reached page 20 of my speech at the time we adjourned for some nourishment and, I gather, some refreshment.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): We did not see the hon. Minister there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was not there as a matter of fact.

I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that in the intervening two hours, the statement that I am now presenting, plus the additional information, has been made available to all the members, and perhaps if you have a chance, as we get into the individual votes, you will find a fair amount of material in the yellow-covered booklet.

Mr. Chairman, continuing our somewhat philosophical discussion of education.

As some of the basic concepts of school organization are re-evaluated, one significant trend seems to be emerging: this is a greater integration of the school with the community. Just as schools are making greater and greater use in the total learning environment of the resources available in the community, so the community in turn is coming to regard the schools as valuable public assets which are capable of serving the needs of adults, as well as young people, in pursuit of education as a lifelong need.

An example of this interchange is the improved consultation among, and effective integration of, community library facilities of various kinds in a number of centres, to the benefit of both students and citizens. It has been common for students and schools to use local libraries on both an individual and a group basis. In recent years, a number of well equipped school libraries have been made available in the evenings as reference libraries for both students and members of the general public.

Many schools are being utilized in the evenings and in the summer for both regular students and adults. Programmes offered range from academic and technical to community service projects, such as swimming lessons. Much good work is being done, but I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come for even greater efforts in this direction as continuing education becomes a factor of growing significance in the lives of all our citizens.

We are indeed fortunate in this province to have facilities for public education which are second to those of no other jurisdiction in the world. Visitors from outside the province and from other countries, including those that are among the most technically advanced, have been most complimentary and the use of adjectives such as "superb"—and I put that in quotation marks because it is their terminology, not mine—is not infrequent.

Second to none.

An hon. member: Well at least they were polite.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I think, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize the next sentence. Facilities of such quality should not sit idle and should in fact be in use around the clock, if necessary, where programmes are in demand by citizens who work during the hours allocated to daytime courses. I would suggest that school boards should give a high priority to making maximum use of school facilities for all citizens.

In relation to the regular school programme, this department will encourage school boards to increase summer programmes to cover the requirements, not only of students who desire to make up previously-failed courses, but of those who wish to broaden and enrich their knowledge, or progress more rapidly through the regular programme.

I just interject here, Mr. Chairman, I just cannot see the validity of a student who, shall we say, passes all but one subject in a given year and is failed in the total year because he has missed. And if he can make this up during, say, a 6-week course during the sum-

mer months, then this may thus make up a total year. To me it makes a great deal of sense.

Mr. B. Newman: (Windsor-Walkerville): It took you a long time to realize that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it has taken the department a long time to realize it. It is not always easy to translate this to the boards.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, the integration of schools with the community also involves school students in learning activities outside the regular classroom, and I would like to mention just a few of the effective programmes now under way.

In Atikokan, two programmes take students out of doors. Last September, students enrolled in the natural resources technology course surveyed the route through the area of forest and lake reserved for the Atikokan high school by The Department of Lands and Forests. In this project the students have, in effect, an outdoor laboratory.

This is also the school from which, last March, the students in the "Outers' programme" set out on an all-night march, although the snow was blowing and the temperature was in the twenties. By morning they had reached their destination at a lumber camp where breakfast, prepared by other students, awaited them. This part of a programme, that that particular school designed to devolp a spirit of initiative and self-reliance.

During the current year, thousands of children have left their own schools for residential schools where education continues out of doors. Sometimes camp sites become classrooms, as happened in Midland; there the public school board and the YMCA cooperated in organizing a June camp where young boys had a chance to examine the rocks and minerals on Beausoleil island.

Out-of-classroom activities are not limited to hiking and the study of science and conservation. Evidences of the past are just as exciting as the world of the present. In the summer of 1967, some 41,000 students visited the restored site of Ste Marie among the Hurons. Boys and girls from Toronto were so interested that they took part in archaeological digs in Huronia. To give more pupils a chance to dig for themselves, the Metropolitan Toronto separate school board has secured an option on an Indian site near Midland.

An indication of the eagerness of The Department of Education to encourage such activities can be seen in the appointment of an official in the curriculum section to devote his full time to gathering information and developing materials relating to educational programmes outside the regular school environment.

More and more, we are learning that the school building should be utilized for the things that can best be taught there, and that the entire area of this province, and even places beyond its boundaries, are becoming extensions of the school, where students see things directly, and do things with their own hands.

In support of this development, the department is preparing a memorandum to suggest ways in which individual parents, groups, and school boards can conduct educational student tours. The memorandum will be an explicit plan for such a tour, with detailed suggestions to show how maximum learning growth can be achieved.

I would like to mention two other examples of innovation from—literally—thousands that come to our attention. Again this year, schools in Welland and Lincoln counties, on the Niagara peninsula, have sponsored their continuing seminars in humanities and science. Young people from grades 11 and 12 meet one evening a week throughout the winter for the "seminar for exploration of advanced studies." Topics ranging from theology to astrophysics are discussed by young people with prominent scholars and specialists from all over the country.

In Napanee, school children from the area had a special reason to take pride in the town's store window displays. In January, a history fair on the Napanee area was held by teachers and students of the social studies programme. The Indian children of Mohawk Landing and area were more than a little proud because their display showed their neighbours what Napanee was like before the coming of the settlers from Europe.

One of the great advantages of decentralization is, of course, the scope it provides for local initiative in developing new solutions to individual, and often unique, local problems. One such interesting development has occurred in Hamilton.

Since September 1965, the Hamilton board of education has operated an extensive compensatory programme for inner city children. The programme is entitled ENOC, which stands for educational needs of the older city. Four schools are currently participating in the programme, which includes junior kindergartens planned to meet the needs of this younger group; special emhpasis upon reading

and language skills using specifically trained teaching personnel assisted by parents and volunteer teacher aides; extended guidance counselling; reduction of pupil-teacher ratios; the use of additional audio-visual equipment; and participation in a broad range of field study trips.

Every effort is made to acquaint parents with the many phases of the ENOC programme and to encourage their support and active participation. "Read-to-me" and the "Let-me-read-to-you" programmes encourage children and their parents to become interested in this phase of the project. Parents are invited to the school frequently to hear about the work of a certain grade; to see the results of children's work; to be guests at assembly programmes; to view a film which their children are seeing; to assist with field study trips; to help repair books and assemble reading materials; and to construct visual aids.

Such visits lead to a mutual understanding of the goals of both teacher and parent and promote a feeling of affinity for the school on the part of the parents. Schools concerned in the ENOC programme periodically distribute newsletters to keep parents informed about developments in which their children are involved. It is also hoped that parents will continue, at home, some of the activities and interests which they see being promoted at school.

The Hamilton board of education has given recognition to the fact that the ENOC programme's success depends primarily upon the influence of enthusiastic and dedicated teachers who understand inner city pupils, and their parents, and the strengths and weaknesses of their cultural background. Such teachers must be prepared to try different approaches in order to make school more interesting and relevant and therefore more profitable. A concerted effort is being made to provide meaningful in-service programmes which will enrich the children's background and renew the enthusiasm of the people involved. ENOC is only one of a number of programmes of this type which are being conducted in various urban centres.

I would like to refer, briefly, to a very encouraging phenomenon in which the schools are involved, and that is the expansion of cultural interest in this country and in Ontario, particularly in the last 15 years. Never has so much interest in the arts been shown in the schools as at the present time. Plays, motion pictures, art in its various forms, and ballet are all being actively practised in schools. One has only to observe the cultural renaissance in society at large to realize that our school programme is one of the main stimulators of the new enthusiasm. In recognition of this highly important manifestation of change in Canadian life, the department has appointed an outstanding teacher to develop programmes in fine arts.

The primary difference, I guess, between what is happening in the schools at the present time and what was accepted for a great many years in Ontario's earlier history has been in the field of curriculum.

During the early period, there were comparatively few changes in the course of study. Dr. Egerton Ryerson's earlier syllabus of subjects for elementary schools comprised 19 subjects, most of which were simply not taught. After he retired, this vast number was substantially cut, many of the subjects being transferred to the secondary level; some of them were left for the universities.

There was, for many decades, a strong bias toward classical subjects, which proved hard to alter because of the immense prestige these subjects had in English-speaking education everywhere. Languages, some of which had been dead for centuries, were taught to be read, not spoken. Mathematics was conventional, addicted to formulae, theorems and logarithms. Geography was lists of places and products; history was tied to kings and battles; spelling was words you would never hear again.

It is a far cry, Mr. Chairman, from those conventional days to the present curricular ferment. The purpose of the major and continuing reforms of the curriculum has been to bring the benefits of varied educational experiences to the innumerable varieties of temperament, interests and abilities in Ontario's 1 million, some 8 thousand, young people. The programme of reform is well under way, but it will continue into the future as long as the growth of knowledge and the demands of change persist. It is impossible to believe that curricula will ever again stay unchanged for long periods, as once was the case.

Hon. members will recall that there was a basic revision of the secondary school programme a few years ago, a reform which has had substantial effects on the ratio of student retention in the Ontario schools. The programme itself is being worked over and continuing improvements are being made to increase its value. One of its chief merits has been to open up new fields of study. These new fields of study represent additional

options which greatly enrich the educational offerings of our schools. It is our hope that many of these "new" subjects may be added to the optional selections in grade 13.

It would take hours to describe the vast activity in curriculum in this province, Mr. Chairman, and while I recognize the members would be very tolerant, I do not really intend to get into that in great detail. I am submitting, as I said at the outset, some detailed information in printed form for you. One of the key features of this activity is that present-day courses are not prescriptions from which deviation would be a perilous policy, but rather outlines, supported by suggestions for resource material to which teachers and students can turn for either broad or intensive treatment, as they might wish. The result, it is hoped, will be better informed, more closely interested pupils and students, whose future life will be given permanent benefit by training in how to find out what needs to be known.

We would all agree, Mr. Chairman, that a modernized curriculum by itself, necessary and desirable as it might be, is so much the better with good teachers. Active steps are in progress to give effect to the very complex requirement of raising the educational qualifications for admission to the teaching profession in Ontario. In time, it is hoped, virtually all teachers of all grades will have at least a basic university degree or its equivalent. The modern world demands a great deal more varied and extensive preparation for the significant function of teaching than was acceptable in the simpler days of the past.

It is relevant, I think, Mr. Chairman, at this point, to comment on the developments in teacher education in this province.

Hon. members will recall that the decision was made to terminate the summer school route for the training of secondary school teachers next year. Consequently, the last classes to enter the two-summer programme will do so this summer, and these candidates will complete their work in 1969.

The great majority of secondary school teachers will in future enter programmes requiring a longer period of training, largely through the provision for practice teaching in regular school classes during the school year. This policy was adopted after consultation with representatives of the Ontario teachers' federation, the Ontario school trustees' council, the association of directors and superintendents of education, and the deans of the colleges of education. Other interested groups also made representations advocating the same change. All accepted the fact that there would be some difficulties—and there is just no point in minimizing it—but there will be some difficulties in terms of the supply of teachers for secondary schools, and all agreed that they would assist in the development of plans to meet the situation.

I am pleased to be able to say that Mr. Tom Boone, who is the director of education in Etobicoke, and who served as chairman of the joint committee that recommended termination of the summer course route, has agreed to undertake the duties of chairman of a new committee representative of the same organizations. This committee will consider new and additional programmes designed to provide suitable routes for the education of teachers at this level.

Associated with new programmes is the necessity to provide additional facilities to accommodate more students for a longer period of time. In this connection Althouse College in the University of Western Ontario is wholly operative, and is capable of providing for double its present enrolment. The college of education in the University of Toronto can take an additional one-third of its present enrolment, and plans are being developed for a substantial addition to the present facility. The advisory board of the college is participating in the discussions regarding the expanded facilities there.

McArthur College in Queen's University, Kingston, will begin operation in September of 1968, with an initial enrolment of 200. It will be accommodated in classrooms within the university and in administration facilities provided in temporary quarters on the university campus for that purpose. In the meantime, the university will proceed with the construction of the new McArthur College building on the west campus. When this facility is completed, it will provide for 600 students and the temporary quarters being provided now will be utilized by the university for other purposes.

Discussions have been held with the officials of the University of Ottawa, and I am pleased to be able to announce that approval has now been given for the university to proceed with the planning of a college of education to accommodate 200 French-speaking students entering the secondary school teaching field who will staff, in particular, the new French secondary schools within the public system. This college will also provide accommodation for up to 400 French-speaking candidates for the ele-

mentary bilingual schools. Teachers for this latter area are already being trained in rented quarters provided by the university on its campus.

Considerable progress, Mr. Chairman, has been made in the area of the training of elementary school teachers. During the year, I announced that the minimum standard for admission to teachers' colleges, effective in September, 1969, would be 55 per cent in grade 13. If the number of applicants continues to increase, it is quite possible that the objective of 60 per cent for admission can be reached one year later, in 1970, rather than 1971 or 1972 as originally contemplated.

Courses in the teaching of French, to English-speaking students, have now been established at eight of our teachers' colleges. A total of 284 students, whose ability to speak French met the required oral admission standards, were enrolled in these courses in September of 1967.

It will be recalled, Mr. Chairman, that a special course for candidates who already held a bachelor of arts degree and who wished to teach at the elementary school level was established a few years ago. This course is attracting an increasing number of applicants and 241 were enrolled in the past year, a 26 per cent increase over the previous year.

In all, the enrolment in the teachers' colleges increased by 5 per cent for 1967-68 and reached a total of 6,853 candidates. The number of graduates is sufficient to relieve some of the pressures that have existed in particular areas in the past, and permits the conclusion that, combined with the lower birth rate, the situation of teacher supply at this level will steadily improve. These developments will permit a gradual increase in the academic requirements for certification towards the minimum objective of a university degree for all teachers.

In this connection, it is relevant to point out that a new college to train elementary school teachers is under construction on the main campus of Brock University and that in September of this year, the college will occupy space in the main buildings of the university until the new college is ready in July, 1969.

Tenders have been called for a new college on the campus of Laurentian University at Sudbury, to train bilingual teachers for elementary schools. Construction will begin this summer, and it is expected that the new college will be ready for occupancy by the end of 1969. In the meantime, the college is occupying space in the main buildings of the university. Many advantages to students are already evident as a result of the close association which location on the university campuses makes possible.

A decision has been reached to provide a new college for training elementary teachers as part of the educational centre to be developed in North Bay in conjunction with Nipissing College, an off-campus college of Laurentian University, and Cambrian college of applied arts and technology, which will also incorporate a regional school of nursing. This centre will permit the provision of many of the auxiliary and ancillary services which could not be made available to the institutions if they had developed as separate entities.

During the year, there have been numerous discussions with several of the universities towards finalizing the transfer of the administration of the teachers' colleges to the universities. Discussions have also been held with the subcommittee on teacher education established by the committee of Presidents of Ontario universities, and a further meeting has been scheduled for the very near future.

It is anticipated that it will be possible to resolve any remaining problems involved in the transfer of teacher education and that, shortly, agreements giving effect to the transfer can be concluded for several of the colleges. Provision has been made in the estimates to permit them to be financed through the universities as soon as agreements are signed.

Preparation of teachers for the field of special education is an important element in our teacher education activities. Last September, I announced the appointment of a new officer to the teacher education branch who would devote his full attention to special education problems. This officer has reported on a broad range of colleges and universities in the United States which offer an organized sequence of special preparation for those engaged in the education of exceptional children of all types—gifted as well as handicapped. Some of the fields deal with gifted children, testing, evaluation, limited vision, orthopaedic cases, neurologically impaired children and so on. An interim report from this officer, on his investigation up to this point, indicates that 20 different centres offer programmes which could be applicable to Ontario conditions. More programmes offering elements suitable for Ontario teachers will, no doubt, be found available in the future, as the officer continues his studies. One very important outcome of his work to

date, concerns the development of clinics with an interdisciplinary approach to the diagnosis and educational handling of exceptional children. From the knowledge acquired in these continuing studies, it is already possible for the department to provide guidance for developing programmes of similar types in this province. At the same time, our own regular summer courses in the fields concerned are being constantly updated. In addition, discussions are being held with a view to providing an institution for the preparation of teachers in the area of special education.

This, Mr. Chairman, is illustrative of the whole condition of education, that is, to the extent one can do it in a relatively short period of time. It needs intensive examination, revised methods, higher standards, and new outlooks. Our civilization, in its present phase, owes its character and direction to research. Recognizing that educational research lagged far behind other forms, we have established the Ontario institute for studies in education. This institution, which has university status and is affiliated with the University of Toronto, combines many forms of educational research with graduate studies in education, and research and development in curriculum. It is reaching the point where its productive value will be increasingly evident, and it is our hope that it will remain as it is—virtually unique in world education.

The broad review and rethinking that the age of change has imposed on all our social institutions has deeply affected education. We are increasingly conscious that the old ways and old forms fall far short of meeting the challenges that are rising with such force in our country, as in almost all the others.

The problems of ignorance and poverty are the new frontier of social action, and in the effort to meet these problems, educational systems have, in my view, a profound responsibility. Hon. members may be assured that we are keenly aware of the crucial need to find solutions that will in truth and reality, open to the victims of these social deficiencies, the opportunity for a better life.

Schools, I suggest, by themselves, are not the sole answer to ignorance and poverty, and broad policies will have to be developed to achieve what is necessary. In all countries, including the wealthy democracy to the south, effective solutions to these problems have been difficult to find.

This challenge points to many elements of growth and experiment which still face us. How can we open to the underprivileged the resources and the privileges of a vigorous society? These ways we must actively seek. But just as important are the needs which are emerging from the technological revolution, which is rapidly providing North American society with an increasing degree of leisure. I have already referred to the cultural renaissance becoming so obvious in Ontario and, indeed, in Canada, as exemplified in the triumphant success of Expo 67. It is apparent that new steps must be adopted to assist our people to find useful, enjoyable and absorbing ways of living the new life of leisure. This, like the problem of poverty, is not exclusively an educational responsibility, but education can, and will, play a substantial part.

In such a programme, it may be assumed that a considerable expansion of library service would have a priority. Along with books, other forms of communication—including records, tapes, television, museums, art galleries, concert halls—would play their several parts in the cultural enrichment and intellectual growth of our population. The basis of a far higher civilization than has ever existed, I suggest, is within our grasp. This is the challenge of the last third of this remarkable century.

Mr. Chairman, in the midst of our unquestionable educational advances at all levels and of the nation-wide cultural activity of which I have spoken, all who share responsibility for education have to ask themselves: What is their common purpose? Stocking the minds of our pupils is not enough; we have to be concerned not only with their intellectual development but with their values. It is impossible, today, to consider education divorced from values.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): It was impossible in any day.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In our search for progress, we could not do better, I believe, than be guided by some words of Sir Alec Clegg, one of the leaders of educational thought in Britain today. They were spoken when he was our Commonwealth visitor in 1966.

> Progress must indeed mean that new peaks will be reached as the centuries pass but educationally it is just as important (in my view more important) that many now floundering should be able to master the heights now attained only by the few and these will be heights of compassion, of courage, of integrity, initiative and of tolerance as well as heights of the intellect.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, it is an honour and a delight to share the enthusiasm of the House tonight with the hon. Minister of Education. He has had an opportunity to deliver to us, this afternoon and this evening, his view of some of the higher slopes and, in fact, peaks of the education system as he sees it during the past year, and as he predicts it for the year that lies ahead. Naturally, it is his responsibility to be objective and, his nature to be optimistic. His natural tendency for modesty was lost at least on two occasions, perhaps three. I lost count at one stage, during which he indicated that once again our department and our educational programme was leading the world and, of course, we have come—it was at least twice —and I will draw them to the hon. Minister's attention during the less formal part of our deliberations.

But, Mr. Chairman, we know, that for the money we are investing in our system, that we can expect it to be one of excellence.

I know that the hon. Minister may perhaps get his reaction to the efficiency of the education system from what he learns around the breakfast table at home, at least as much as from the officials that pass on their views to him. It is when you hear the discussions, from the groups that assemble there day by day, about what went on the day before and what they are expecting in the day to come, that we realize, that while there are these outstanding examples of progress and enlightenment in the system that we have developed in the province, that there are still a good many run-of-the-mill schools like the Minister probably experiences in some areas in his locality—as there are in mine—where every-day teachers are working with every-day students in a programme in which they are trying to overcome a good many educational drawbacks that I believe leadership, at the provincial level, could do much to eliminate.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nixon: Now it may seem crass of me to begin my remarks by drawing your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the costs of the programme that the Minister is administering during the coming year, because we know that in his dual capacity, with two departments, he does command the largest single vote that this Legislature has ever been asked to approve for a department or a Minister. We know, beyond that, that his policies and attitudes, and his approach to modern education, imposes itself, if I can use that phrase, on the financing of education derived from funds raised at the local level. I have taken a moment to gather these figures together, Mr. Chairman, and in connecting the various estimates involving education, we find under this department, a grand total of $876,364,-000; and under The Department of University Affairs, $285,982,000; plus grants paid by the Provincial Treasurer—I suppose these cheques go out under the direction of the Minister—first, from the education capital aid corporation, $175 million; and university capital aid corporation, $174 million; making a total of $1,511,346,000.

Mr. Chairman, this, of course, does not include $7 million for industrial training voted to the Minister of Labour, and $660,000 for teaching costs to the citizenship branch of the provincial Secretary's office. To this, I believe it is proper to add the expenditure of $600 million raised by municipal councils to finance their half of the cost of education. The policies of this department, then, and the direction of this Minister, control $2.1 billion to finance the maintenance and expansion of our educational system for 1968-69.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He is yawning, too; he is yawning.

Mr. Nixon: It approximates $300 per capita, but that is not a meaningful figure either. When we consider, however, that in this coming year the Minister's policy is going to have direction of the expenditure of $2.1 billion, we realize that, without doubt, his responsibility is one of the most important in Canada and, undoubtedly, the work of this department is the most important responsibility that we have as members of this Legislature. So, I want to take some time tonight to offer my views on matters that I do not believe are covered specifically by votes in the estimates that we will be perusing for some time following this evening, and to gather together some of my thoughts in this matter which I consider the chief responsibility of the province of Ontario.

While the figures that I have read to you, Mr. Chairman, are startling in their impact on our budget and economy, the real story is told when we look at the predictions for future education costs. Based on the work of D. M. Cameron reported in the *Ontario Journal of Educational Research*, Autumn, 1967, predicting costs to 1975, the costs of public, separate, and secondary schools are expected to increase by 120 per cent over 1965 to a total of $1.7 billion. This is simply the direct costs of elementary, secondary and separate

education. With the Smith committee predicting our post-secondary costs, will be seven times larger in 1975 than in 1965, it is obvious our future commitments will be impossible to meet with the tax base and distribution of public funds remaining as they are.

I want to emphasize that the future of education, more than any other provincial responsibility, rests on the reform of our tax system and the federal-provincial fiscal agreement that must be arrived at before the end of 1968. Our decisions on these matters must hinge on the transference of a greater share of the costs from the property tax base to the provincial revenue base.

In my view, federal involvement is something that is going to become more direct in education in the future than we have ever thought possible up until this time. There is no doubt that federal responsibilities are for equality of opportunity in the broader sense than we see it here. And while federal programmes in the future may be designed in such a way, and I am sure they will be, that they will not interfere with curriculum and day-to-day operation of the education system, I feel sure that there will be some sort of a programme within the next ten years which will provide funds to equalize educational opportunity across Canada. This will put Ontario in the position which we have occupied historically, in paying a large share of these funds. It is a responsibility that we must accept as citizens of Canada, ahead of our citizenship in this province, in this particular regard.

But, you know, some very well known educators have been talking about federal involvement increasing in intensity in recent months. Mr. Stanbury, who has been a federal member for some time, and Mr. Lowes, who is attempting to become a federal member in the next few weeks, are both talking on precisely the same wavelength, and I suppose that wavelength represents an up-to-date one in this regard, when they talk about a federal office of education. Both of them, I believe, are shying away from any direct involvement other than the federal responsibility which already exists for Indian education, and certain other programmes involving the financing of our universities and manpower training efforts.

But I would predict that the feelings among provinces that have been so strong for 100 years against federal support financially for education programmes, are going to deteriorate rapidly when we approach the tremendous financial burdens that lie in the immediate future. I am talking about an increase of 120 per cent for ordinary costs, and at the post-secondary level increases in costs amounting to 700 per cent.

This means that when our negotiators travel to Ottawa some time in the next few months, and when our select committee on tax reform is listening to the submissions from many sources in the province that are going to require additional funds, they must cast their minds over the broadest view of financing and see that this is, in fact, developing into a co operative responsibility in which no level of government can be excluded.

But we as Liberals want to reinforce our position that the present heavy dependence on property assessment to meet education costs must be abandoned to provide real relief of tax burdens at the local level, and to finance in an orderly and efficient manner this greatest responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, there have been many programmes that have been mentioned in the Minister's brief remarks, or abbreviated remarks, that are bringing about some far-reaching changes in the approach to education. I have already accused the Minister of having his views on education shaped by perhaps the response from his own family; I understand there are five of them in the group and there will be plenty of advice coming to him around the table. But, he is probably aware of the fact that his new approach to examinations has released a good number of these young people from school at the end of May.

We now find that the schools are relatively empty, practically abandoned for a full three months of the year. Therefore, I welcome his remarks, which were probably introduced into his statement for this very purpose, to assure us that the school plant—if we can use that phrase; it is not an attractive one, but one that is usually used in this regard—may be used on a year-round basis and in hours longer than the ordinary nine-to-four basic time.

I believe that there is a great deal that can be done to improve the utilization of the schools, and I want to talk about it in some detail at this time. One area in which research can produce real results in the utilization of schools and institutions during the summer months. We are all aware of the problems—wrong-size furniture for adults, special workshop areas and machine tools to be safeguarded, laboratory equipment to be kept inviolate and so on. As a former science teacher myself, I know what it is like to come into the laboratory on Monday morning,

or after a night school, and find that precious equipment has been used for purposes never designed, and these are problems that the education officials are very much aware of. Nevertheless, the problem would seem to be more difficult in the area of 24-hour use of the building, than it would in the case of year-round use during more normal waking hours.

I can frankly see no reason why we cannot undertake substantially greater utilization of school buildings, which represent such a great capital investment. None of us would countenance our liquid assets lying idle in the way we allow our schools to lie idle for a quarter of the year. Just as we would put our money to work, so we must put our schools to work all the time. I want to see summer schools, for pupils who have failed their grades during the regular school year, become the rule rather than the exception. Progressive boards have introduced this in years gone by, but there are a good many areas which still—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: —such as the area represented by the hon. member who is barking from the back row, where the educational opportunities perhaps have not been as progressive in his case as some others. But in this particular area surely the days when school boards are not prepared to have these summer schools, and export their young people to other communities for this assistance, should be long gone.

So I would say beyond this that there is no doubt we should see adults moving in and out of schools with ease and without that kind of self-consciousness that still affects so many of us even today. Our schools should be supermarkets and not cloisters with regard to education. They should be open and a lively part of the community. In such revitalized institutions I would expect to see a continuing succession of classes in language instruction, in art, in physical education and in the practical mastery of the English language skills in speech and written expression.

And beyond this, I would look to each school to have a lively liberal arts programme—if it would assist the Minister in any way we can say progressive. There should be a programme ranging from discussion of great books, music appreciation, new maths —all sorts of progressive courses that could be available to the whole community. All this could happen. The public is ready, eager to learn, bored with superficial amusements and the consumer atmosphere, and ready for the in-depth experiences that education can offer in modern settings.

In these circumstances, it is absurd that for the greater part of every day and for three months of every year our schools should stand empty and idle. We have to plan our affairs differently in the future. The ultimate responsibility for the voting of education moneys lies with this Legislature and we have a heavy responsibility with regard to this estimate.

We have this present opportunity to make clear the feelings of the House in this important matter and I sense the attitude on all sides is that we can make use of our expensive, super school plants in a more effective way than has been possible in recent times.

Having the schools open for a greater part of the year and having adults using them more would also have another effect. We have also noticed how very many more people are motivated towards the vocational than to the liberal aspects of education because they can see the end or tangible reward of effort in the vocational area more clearly.

Feeling comfortable in the learning situation, we are told, is associated both with higher motivation to learn and with better learning outcomes. But the very presence of adults in the schools might well have the long-term effect of predisposing them in the direction of a liberal education once vocational needs have been met. This will anticipate the predicted course of work and leisure patterns in the years to come.

We ought to be showing many more people how to be usefully idle rather than bored. Once the immediate challenge of upgrading through vocational courses is over, it is essential that the schools retain the interest of their new adult pupils for more modern features of education. To do this they will have to be hives of activity with lots of interesting bits of completed work lying around to be admired and to set up motivation of this second order.

During the last few years, we have been treated to a programme—an organized programme on the part of the department, the whole educational system—to impress upon our young people and others the need to assign values to technical education, at least as high as those previously assigned to academic education. I sense that the pendulum is beginning to swing back and that the Minister should be emphasizing once again the need for a strong core of liberal arts

subjects, not only in the secondary and elementary section of our system but also at the colleges of applied arts and technology.

These are matters that we have discussed before, but it is too easy to over-emphasize the technical aspects of education in response to such reports as have been available to educators at all levels. I do hope and recommend to the Minister that when we are embarking on a somewhat new approach to education, a retreat from centralization, the establishment of the department as a resource centre rather than a directing centre, that these resources can have at least as much emphasis on the importance of academic instruction and the appreciation of this approach to education as the other.

This is perhaps the way that we shall move into French language instruction for a good many people who do not see the immediate need for it in their daily lives in predominantly English-speaking Ontario. We have been treated in this Legislature—at least in the facilities provided for the various members—to at least a taste of modern language instruction and I am told that it is very effective indeed.

And programmes such as this in the school systems across the province, pertaining not only to French but other languages—and the Minister is well aware that competent teachers in these other languages would be readily available from the communities in so many parts of Ontario—would be a basis for a core of liberal education that could make use of the schools more efficiently than at present.

The amalgamation of school boards to become effective in 1969 will undoubtedly further increase the costs that I recounted to you, Mr. Chairman, at the opening of my remarks. No area of the new jurisdiction will settle for less than the best already achieved by other boards in the new school divisions.

We will see the universal acceptance of kindergartens, special facilities for students with perception and other learning problems, better transportation, more high-priced supervision, and better facilities for the education of the retarded, all adding heavy cost increases to an improved system. The Minister promised us in his remarks tonight that the size of his own department was about to decrease. We will keep careful measure of this, of course, because as he decentralizes his responsibilities we can see that the growth of supervisory staff is going to be tremendous in the county boards.

And we want to see this balanced and more than balanced by a decrease in similar staff under the direction of the Minister and his top officials. But the better facilities are something that we all look forward to. Equality of opportunity costs real money and it is our job to see that the money is not only available but that it is spent with the maximum care and efficiency.

First, before the new school divisions are established, the department should establish standard accounting procedures and supervise them with a continuing general audit. This is one area in which the dispersal of the Minister's responsibilities is unnecessary, since the large bulk of the funds are voted by this Legislature and he has direct supervision of the policies that use those funds. Surely then he can require standard accounting procedures and auditing procedures that would undoubtedly make use of the computer facilities that are already in the department and growing in their usefulness.

This will permit efficient methods worked out by some boards to be shared by all and it will point out the relative inefficiencies of the 100 boards supervising education in Ontario. There was a time, of course, when schools were rated by the number of students who got certain standings in grade 13 or grade 12 levels. When departmental examinations were abandoned at the grade 12 level, it came to be a rating of some importance as students would accept their grade 12 matriculation and go out into the world of further education or the world of work, and the status of the matriculation depended upon the particular school involved. This is something that I believe will recur again on a financial basis. We will be able to rate the education programmes that are established by the new county boards and compare them with the costs associated with the programmes. This rating will have some great significance indeed for those of us here who are called upon year by year to vote such tremendous sums of money.

Second, the facilities of the centralized purchasing branch of the government should be available to the school boards for their equipment needs. This is particularly true for the establishment of new services and technological facilities in setting up and expanding libraries and the purchasing of textbooks. I do not want any misunderstanding here. I am not suggesting that the textbooks, in their establishment or approval would be restricted, but that surely the purchase of these features of modern education would be better done in

large quantities. The Provincial Treasurer's centralized purchasing agency in the government might very well be brought into play.

And third, a greater effort is needed to cut building costs by standardizing plans on a module basis. I will have more to say about this in detail, but the Minister, year after year has in his own inimitable way pooh-poohed this approach. There has been some sort of a holy attitude that would indicate—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: The interjections are very valuable and I for one appreciate them. Mr. Chairman. The attitude in the past has been: "Yes, we will look into this." As a matter of fact a whole branch of the department has been set up to look into this in what I feel has been a superficial way, but it took the school board of Metropolitan Toronto, under distinguished leadership, to actually accomplish the modern approach to this problem that could have saved us tens of thousands of dollars over the last 15 years. Now the school board in Toronto has really undertaken research that has been proved to be meaningful—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Partially financed by The Department of Education.

Mr. Nixon: Partially yes, and mainly financed by the Ford foundation from the United States. As a matter of fact, they paid more than you did.

So, I would say to you that I do not hesitate, Mr. Chairman, I do not hesitate—as I admit I have sometimes in the past—to say that there is a field for real economy in a new approach to the governance of school construction. I believe it is there. I believe the government—this government and this Minister have wasted public funds because of inactivity in years gone by and I—

An hon. member: He should resign.

Mr. Nixon:—and I call on him to remedy that particular position.

Fourth, I believe that we can harness the kind of interest that was exemplified by the Ontario chamber of commerce some days ago, in providing management experts to take an objective look at the values that we are receiving from our $2.1 billion. I would suggest that these external management consultants, people who are knowledgeable in business procedures, could work through a select committee of the House or the standing committee. This could, by the approval of the Legislature, meet in the period between sessions—if such a period eventually develops. We could use those people, in business and in the community at large, who have expressed the same kind of fears that the chamber of commerce has expressed and who want to have a hard, objective look at the expenditures that are taking place.

We cannot, under these circumstances in this House, undertake an extensive audit. We have given this responsibility to the provincial auditor and to the committee on public accounts—which, I am told, has just completed their 27th meeting of the session. But to undertake a careful examination of the expenditures this department, I believe, is something that is required, is overdue and is something that could be undertaken by the standing committee in the way I have described.

Fifth in this particular list of recommendations, Mr. Chairman, I return to the point I made earlier. An established policy that will put the school buildings, libraries and other facilities into year-round use. With the end of grade 13 departmental exams and a promotion policy that releases students from writing final exams at the secondary level, if they achieve 60 per cent or better, we find the secondary schools and community colleges deserted for two to three months of the year. There are exceptions, but in general, you can shoot a cannon down a main corridor of any of these schools tomorrow morning and not hit anybody.

Now these schools are, relatively, out of service and out of use for at least two months, and under the new promotion policy, for almost three months of the year. There is a change here that surely can be worked for an improvement of the efficiency of the system.

Mr. Chairman, with the staff at the colleges of applied arts and technology being organized by the civil service association of Ontario for bargaining procedures being an accepted and strong decision on their part, I believe still, that a single professional organization representing the profession at all levels would strengthen the involvement of teachers in the consultation that should precede policy decisions by the Minister. His efforts in this area have been seriously inadequate.

It should be basic that those experts and those involved in education must have a full opportunity to state their views before new policy is imposed on the system.

The Minister is not using the facilities that are available to him in this matter. He should encourage the amalgamation of teachers' professional organizations such as the elementary teachers', now divided into men's and

women's organizations, as well as on a religious basis. He should consult the OSSTF, the Catholic teachers' organization, the colleges of applied arts and technology and the university organizations, so that their recommendations on policy will reflect a balanced overall view of the system.

No one objects to the maintenance of the present multiplicity of organizations for bargaining and other internal purposes, if that is the wish of the people concerned. But the Minister's concern is with the professional aspects of teaching and I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the community, the profession and the Minister, in his responsibility, would benefit from this cohesion and coherence of recommendations from the profession.

I also believe the Minister should insist that these and other recognized organizations receive an annual invitation to present their views to the standing committee on education. These should be convened early in each session, not just when legislation is sent to it by this House.

I also submit to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that he should use the elected members of the House in select committees relating to education. There has not been such a select committee on education for many years. He has a full array of royal commissions and ministerial committees that have been examining the aims and objectives of education in the province; the teaching of religion in the schools; the improvement of grade 13—a whole panoply of subjects, including teacher education.

The members of this House have only, I would say, a limited and inadequate opportunity to investigate the educational procedures in the province under the direction of this Minister. I would submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that this has been inadequate in the past and it should be improved; it would be in the future surely.

I am not making any political predictions, it is a little soon for that; we will do that maybe a year or two from now, but I would submit that this Minister, more than any other, is the one who ignores the members of this House. He ignores the involvement and the communication that can be accomplished by the individual members. He has not given us the opportunity that select committees should give to become expert in educational matters and involved in procedures and policies.

My final recommendation in this regard, Mr. Chairman, is that it is the Minister's responsibility to see to it that these consultations are not just head-patting procedures to soothe groups who do not agree with his or the government policy, but a meaningful advance in the democratic process.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to dwell on that subject. The Minister is a master at soothing these people who, perhaps, come before him or he travels out to visit, who have objections to his policy. He is an able politician. There is no doubt about that. I have accused him of being an amateur psychologist and even a psychiatrist on some occasions. But, surely he must accept his role of being the leader in the development of meaningful consultation with all parts of the educational establishment, with the citizens of the province, before the imposition of the policies that have been the earmark of his particular responsibility in recent days.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister, the member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman), and myself, are of one mind in our desire to see continuity in the school system, as children progress—ideally at their own speed, but practically in groups of equal ability—through the school system right up to grade 13 and perhaps even beyond. Continuous progress has so many advantages that administrative barriers must be bulldozed out of the way to allow this kind of development to take place. But what I want to advocate today is the downward extension of this desirable continuity, right into the nursery schools and the day nurseries in many communities in this province.

The day nursery programme, under the direction of the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko), does not really fill the need for good facilities for the young families of working mothers. A similar programme associated with the school system could provide neighbourhood facilities for younger children at public expense—a programme that would meet the needs of our rapidly changing economy, with its work force including both parents in so many cases.

More important, however, it would provide the great impetus to education that properly planned programmes for pre-grade school-age children must develop. I am not recommending exclusively a baby sitting service at public expense. The Minister would agree, I am sure, that, with modern techniques and modern knowledge, the young people who are even of pre-kindergarten age in many of the centres that are characterized by inadequate home life, inadequate community facilities—many of these young people would

benefit tremendously if, in the school system itself, we could provide the facilities that I have described.

I want to see proper staff qualifications being extended right through—a head start type of programme, not all at once, but as we can afford it and in the communities where obvious advantages would be forthcoming.

I notice some enthusiasm from my hon. friend, the member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid), who has expressed on many occasions his feeling that programmes of a head start type to partially compensate for the inadequate home life and community facilities in the centre city situation—that this is a matter that we could deal with through an expanded appreciation of the school system.

I do not want to anticipate the debate on the estimates of The Department of University Affairs. However, the public is quite clearly looking at education as a whole, as we should in this House, and not in the fragmented form that this department has endowed. And, since we have in the one Minister the embodiment of university affairs and the total educational picture, I want to use this opportunity, rather than a later one, to relate the present stance of our universities to the desire of the public to gain access to these institutions of higher learning more readily, and particularly by transfer from the colleges of applied arts and technology.

The committee of Presidents of the universities of Ontario, in its announcement of May 16, took a forward step. But it was a timid one, and one that will not satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the people of Ontario, to share the opportunities that are only obtainable today through access to higher education. When people are refused higher education, they are condemned to a permanently lower standard of living. Because, while we favour advanced techniques of discovery and learning at one's own rate at the lower end of the spectrum, there comes a moment of truth when society imposes its iron will and demands paper qualifications.

At the moment this critical point seems to be hovering around grade 13. For many students it is in the colleges of applied arts and technology that the sudden realization strikes that is is not enough to be good at one's job, one must also have formal academic disciplines in hand to make the grade in the present social structure and reap the rewards of conformity. This is unfortunate, but it is abundantly true.

The announcement of May 16 says that the universities of Ontario are, in general, prepared to consider for admission to second-year courses students who achieve high standing in three-year programmes at Ryerson, or one of the colleges of applied arts and technology. Thus the typical transfer student will enter community college after grade 12, complete a three-year course there with high marks, if he is going to proceed—and I would presume it would be in only a few of the selected courses—then take a two-year course at a university to receive a general bachelor of arts degree. It will only take him one year more than the majority of degree bound students who take grade 13 and then a three-year university course. So in this connection, I believe that the consent of the presidents in their attitude as we presently understand it is an improvement. Their statement says:

> Some universities will expect first class standing from students to be considered, others will expect high standing. Some will base their consideration on the standing of a student in the final year of his three-year programme, others on his standing throughout the programme.

So there is by no means a clear academic pathway leading to degree situation.

Now I do not want to impose on the university's prerogative in this and yet the Minister himself is aware of the danger in the system, at all levels, of becoming compartmentalized. He has even referred in his own remarks to that programme that we used to call the Robarts' plan, becoming somewhat compartmentalized. That he is prepared to move away from the old three-stream approach to one which will provide what, I suppose, might be called by some—a cafeteria approach—in the options and subjects that are available. It seems strange that we have come to the point where we talk about the Robarts programme as the old programme, but I suppose with the passage of time even that phrase would fit into the category.

The new provisions as expressed by the university presidents will also allow a second-year student of high standing in a community college to transfer to a first-year programme in university.

In the light of changed conditions in our society, I am not convinced that this reply goes far enough. I would be the last one to want to water down high academic standards, or make degrees available off the shelf, but for legitimate aspirants to academic standing, the climate is still too frosty for my liking.

Surely we now have to face the reality of a different kind of matriculation—the matriculation of endurance, perhaps, and certainly of maturity. This was recognized after World War II. The veterans who had the will to further their education, did not meet the kind of closed door that some of our graduates of the community colleges may well encounter still, unless public opinion asserts itself. Fortunately I think that it will. There is a difference between legitimate academic freedom and autonomy on the one hand and, perhaps, academic snobbery, or a hold over of that attitude, on the other.

We here are agents and we are spokesmen for the vast community of would-be learners; as they pay their taxes, to some extent they pay their fees. The balance of fees must, of course, still be paid individually and there must be individual ability, of course, before entrance qualifications can be recognized. But no one has the right to slam the door in the face of the honest student who may have come to admission standard through a late or unusual route, or through self-help along unconventional lines.

Matriculation is surely maturing, and most of all in reasoning power. We all come to it in different ways. There has to be some new way of measuring the ability of the student to transfer from the level that the community college can offer him, to the greater possibility of the university. There cannot be just one transfer level; there must be several, so that no one who can ultimately make a contribution to society is denied the opportunity of so doing.

I do not want to emphasize just the transference from community college to university. The same is true, I submit, of graduates from the ordinary grade 13 course, or newcomers to our country who had their education in another atmosphere entirely. The new departmental approach to examinations has left the student and his acceptance at university at the mercy of a subjective rating.

The old-fashioned final exam used to be a place where a failing grade could be recouped through extraordinary effort or a super application of a good intelligence that had been occupied with other matters during the year. I do not want to dwell on this, but I can think of situations where, after repeated warnings of failure by the teacher and the principal, and so on, a student was able to get good passing standing simply by the open door of the final examination, which really no longer exists in that form.

The new approach tends to force students into the conforming mould from which teacher approval is gained. Our efforts to establish an acceptable objective assessment of students' readiness and ability for post-secondary work must be increased. This method, or preferably series of methods, must open a door for mature students and those who have continued their education along less recognized lines.

Specifically, then, the elementary and secondary system must provide each student with the most objective personal rating as a basis for admission to post-secondary institutions. A broader approach to transfer and admission is needed, that would set out standard procedures, so that anyone may be tested, interviewed and rated, to allow students of any age with any background to be individually assessed. In this way all the doors to further education can be kept open, as I believe they must.

Mr. Chairman, you might not believe it, but both the Minister and myself have been endeavouring to keep opening remarks to a minimum, realizing that the more informal discussion of the estimates is the place where specific matters can be discussed. But I do feel that this is a time where I can agree with the Minister, when we talk about the superb schools we have in the province. Superb in that we no longer have the old institutions with the oiled floors, the creaking stairs, the incandescent lights, and the dedicated teachers.

We now find teachers with better professional training, perhaps on the average, than they have ever had. They have, I suppose, a very reasonable acceptance of their responsibility as teachers and as citizens. It is different from what it used to be, and for this I suppose we can say, "Hear, hear." Even the Minister and myself, and all the other members of the House who still feel that they can understand the young mind—that they are not like those moss-backs who are separated from the new generation—must eventually come to the point that, in fact, we are separated from the new generation.

The rate of change is faster even than politicians realize. All of us, as we grow old, are joining that old gang that we used to hear say, "where will it all end?"—"who is going to balance the budget?"—and this sort of thing. We find ourselves associating more than we used to with this kind of an attitude. It is something, I suppose, that we must beware of.

Certainly when Marshall McLuhan, who is evidently back in town, predicts that the student revolt is going to get down into the secondary level and predicts, facetiously no doubt, that the secondary schools will be in flames as will the Pentagon; I guess he has not really applied it to Queen's Park yet. He is giving a kind of a warning, a warning that the attitudes in the education system are changing perhaps more rapidly than any of us realize.

It is difficult to keep in touch with these attitudes, even around the breakfast table, as the Minister may perhaps appreciate, and it is our responsibility to see that the system is in fact up to date, and is in fact meeting the needs for the young people who are not going to move into our world, they are going to move into their own world which will be very different from ours.

It is a warning that is important—that the Minister and those members of this House who have special responsibilities in education must be careful that we do not grow old too soon, and smart too late. It is an easy thing to see the sun shining on the upper slopes of the education system. It is easy to overlook the third-rate and fifth-rate educational opportunities that are found in so many communities in this province.

We are delighted to be called upon in this House to vote huge sums of money to support a system that we trust is the best that money can buy, but the time has come when we must go on something more than trust. We must have assurances that are based on objective and independent examinations, we must see to it that the milieu—a word that the Minister himself used the other day—the milieu of education, as it extends out into the community from the school building itself is, in fact, meeting the needs of modern students for a modern world; not our world, but the world of tomorrow.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Chairman, it gives me very great pleasure to take part in this debate on the estimates of The Department of Education. One could not help but be impressed, and pleased with the comments which the Minister made both this afternoon and this evening. It is very good to see a progressive thrust being taken towards the ending of some of the more Neanderthal aspects of our educational system.

I wonder if I might comment for a moment on what the Minister said this afternoon, because it does bother me. It bothers me very greatly, because I think in the two documents which he presented to the House there is great hope and great expectation, but one cannot help but wonder at the method by which these expectations are going to come about.

The thing which bothers me is this. Along with all these many programmes—one can scarcely describe them all—but along with this, is the concept of decentralization, whereby The Department of Education will be—I think I am paraphrasing the remarks of the Minister—will be the research and planning agency, and also, of course, the agency for distributing funds. Whereas the local boards, the enlarged local boards, which the Minister has provided for in the recent legislation, will have, in essence, the main role for carrying out these programmes.

I think there is something basically dangerous about this concept, and I do want to discuss this for a moment. I am not sure how you can expect people at the local level to carry out the kind of exciting new revolutionary programmes which have been suggested in sections of this report when, indeed, they themselves are only being brought along now to accept some of the implications of the programmes The Department of Education has put into effect in the last five or ten years.

I do not see how you can plan at the centre and leave it to the local community to carry out those plans. Now you can use the carrot, you can use the grant structure, I realize that, but certainly in many many areas, this has not been the case. I am concerned that the planning is going to be entirely at the centre for one thing, because I do not think that the local community will carry out plans that they are not themselves a part of. I really worry about the division which the Minister has indicated is going to take place in the implementation of the plans and the planning that takes place beforehand.

I have a great deal of faith in local autonomy, and I am with the Minister on the fact that you cannot impose progress, you cannot force local authorities to bring in exciting new programmes, exciting new curricula and new administrative procedures and so on. You cannot impose them, but I suggest to him also that you cannot decentralize the power and then expect these local authorities to come up with the same answers which the department wishes.

In many of these areas I think there will have to be a degree of push or pressure, a degree of—well I think almost the use of the "stick" is going to be necessary in some cases to force local authorities to move in some

areas. In other areas I realize, and the Minister knows—I have suggested in the past—local authorities have been ahead of The Department of Education in going into new programmes and so on, and I am concerned about this trend.

For example you have got a number of commission reports coming down, in the next few months. The Hall committee report, I suspect, will be coming down very soon. The Keiller Mackay commission report will be coming down; the Minister has just announced that we are going to have another commission on the training of secondary school teachers, and the implications of all these reports, is that you cannot train secondary school teachers in the province, and then send them out into local jurisdictions which have no relationship in terms of their philosophy, in terms of their curricula, and of their whole milieu to the institution which created that teacher. I suspect, indeed, that much of what the Hall committee is going to say is already in this report. I suspect the Minister's speech is almost the Hall committee report. That is just a guess. I would suspect that a great deal of time has moved on.

At the time when the Hall committee was set up, the things which the Minister was saying this afternoon would have been regarded as extremely revolutionary, but, you know, the fullness of time—as the Minister says—the fullness of time has wrought these changes, and now these things do not appear quite as revolutionary and as unacceptable to the professional as perhaps it was some time time ago.

I want to leave that point in the Minister's mind—this problem of the decentralization of authority and control at a time when you are trying to encourage revolutionary change. At a time, indeed, when time itself demands revolutionary change, because the leader of the Opposition commented on the whole problem of the new generation and the generation gap, which is widening and is continuing to widen. The demands of a generation which in many cases can be seen perhaps most effectively at the centre, rather than on the local scene where it appears they may be undermining local authority and the ways that things have been done over the years.

Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes that I have, on the opening remarks on the Minister's estimates, I would like to do as the Minister did this afternoon. I was very pleased to see that we had discussed the whole question of philosophy rather than a piling up of all the activities of the department over the past year. And I wonder if I might this evening continue that same activity of the Minister, seeking to establish the philosophic basis on which we are working. And at times my remarks may seem rather philosophic, even esoteric, but I suggest that in the first session of this Legislature it is not amiss that we should talk a little about the philosophy with which we are going to judge all the estimates that come after. Perhaps it is important just to state the obvious, that the kind of education system that we create reveals, perhaps more than in any other area, what we believe about the individual, and what we believe about the individual's relationship to his society; what we really believe about society itself.

Obviously if we look upon the individual as an economic unit, we will reflect this in our teachings to the individual. If the individual is looked upon merely as a unit to be conditioned and pressured, whether it is to produce good citizens or to produce good consumers, once again this will be reflected in the kind of educational system that we will construct. If the educational system is starved of support, particularly in certain areas, it tells something about the priorities of that particular society, and indeed it is a very good way to measure the quality of that society.

In criticizing this department, I am aware of the fact that I am dealing with a department which is led by a very able Minister backed by a great many able and well-trained assistants. I think that the value of these estimates will not be, I am sure, either from the point of view of the Opposition, or the Minister, in finding great differences of opinion in terms of the progress. I think that what we may very well find is what the priorities are and where the first priority of the government is placed, and where is placed that of the Opposition members.

Also, I think that it is an opportunity to discover as to whether the estimates as they are set out in this House really carry out these priorities which the government itself has stated. Someone said that it was very easy to be critical of education. In fact, Edgar Friedenberg said: "I do not know why I am called a critic of the education system. Being a critic of the education system is like being a critic of cancer."

Well, I think that there are some aspects of that quote which bother me, because I think of a cancer as being largely destructive, and education as constructive. There is also

an interesting concept there because cancer in some ways is an uncontrolled, undisciplined, unchecked growth which in itself can be destructive. I would suggest that this is one of the major dangers of this department.

There was a time when I complained rather bitterly—as someone who, indeed, felt the full impact of the department in my position in life—that the department never seemed to move and it was like a great big huge dinosaur. If you build a big enough fire under the tail, then about ten years later, it might move a few inches. I think that this element of the department is gone. I think that it has a new image of being quite progressive and that it is moving. But I suggest to you that even this movement can be self destructive, unless that movement is somehow directed and unless there is a full realization of the inter-relationship between every decision that is made within the educational system.

You cannot play around with grade 13, without it having a very serious effect upon the university world. You cannot play around with grade 13 without it having very great implications in all the grades leading up to it, and I think that these are some of the areas where there has been, I suggest, a lack of sensitivity in the past.

Sometimes decisions are made too quickly without sufficient consultation with other people who are concerned and without the full recognition which this decision might have in modifying existing programmes or in creating the need for trained personnel who simply are not available. We have no right to demand perfection of an educational system. I do think, however, that we do have a right to demand relevance.

I want to suggest a few areas where at least the educational system should have complete relevance and I think that is what we will be doing as we probe these estimates. Now certainly one aim which the Minister of Education has indicated to the Opposition on many occasions is his belief that the educational system should provide equality of educational opportunity. In fact, I think that this is the major reason why he has placed Bill 44 to reorganize the entire school jurisdiction of the province of Ontario

What does this really mean? If it just means that there should be facilities and programmes that are available to every student, then I think that there is a very real difference of opinion. If, however, he means, Mr. Chairman, that this department is responsible for overcoming those handicaps and disadvantages on the part of young people so that they can fully receive those opportunities, then we are in agreement.

The great irony of the educational system in this jurisdiction and in nearly every other jurisdiction is that most of the public money spent on education ends up in the hands of those who are of the upper incomes. It is far more likely that a student from a home of professionals will graduate from high school, will graduate from university, will do graduate work, go to a medical school and may benefit to the extent of some $20,000 to $25,000 of public money, while on the other hand, a student from a deprived home, culturally, or economically, may very well quit at the end of grade 10 at the worst. I would suggest that undoubtedly the reorganized programme has to some extent lengthened that for at least two years to the end of grade 12. But at best, he will go on possibly into a four year programme and a college of applied arts and technology.

We are talking about equality of educational opportunity. I suggest to you a reorganization of our system. I am pleased to see that we are going to see a far greater degree of movement and flexibility and motion in the three-pronged reorganized programme. Perhaps these will disappear. They have already begun to in some experimental schools I know.

I am very glad to see that, because in many cases, what is happening is that those who are culturally or economically at a disadvantage, are inducted in a programme which places them out of the stream of receiving the greatest degree of educational opportunity for the ability which they have, for obvious economic reasons. I think that it would be unfortunate. I would hope to see that sociologists would be able to take a look at the student population of the province of Ontario in five or ten years, and I would regard this as a major victory for social justice in this country if we could find that at least a comparable percentage of students who are in university in a college of applied arts and technology and even those who are dropping out are from the full range of income levels.

I think that this would be a major step forward, to recognize that indeed, not only are the facilities being provided, but that every young person is going to the facility for which he has the ability and in which he can gain the skill he needs. In order to do this, the money must be placed at the bottom of the scale. We are working at the other end of the

scale. Our province of Ontario student aid programme, the student bursary – these are largely at the other end of the scale in their efforts to provide an opportunity for those who do not have the economic advantages of others who are in the system. But the point remains, that if the young person is not shored up in terms of motivation in the early years, then the game is up.

He never does go on to university and he may very well not go on to a college of applied arts and technology. That is what I mean by a recognition of the responsibility of this department to give grants to special classes, pre-school classes for those who are culturally deprived. Now the leader of the Opposition has called it the–

Mr. Nixon: Head start programme.

Mr. Pitman: –the head start programme. I think it is called the bootstrap programme in some parts of the United States.

Now in the United States, of course, there is a particular problem because they are virtually trying to stop the burning down of their cities through a problem which obviously has to be dealt with. But I suggest to you, in the name of justice – not simply in the name of stopping future chaos–this province has an opportunity now to move ahead in this particular area; to train special teachers for this kind of war. They may very well not be the kind of teachers that need the academic training which is proposed for those who are going into elementary and secondary schools.

I do not think we have begun to use the medium of television. Television goes into nearly every home in Ontario and if this could be a medium by which The Department of Education could provide opportunities within the home along with specialized services which would have to accompany that kind of an impetus, I think that this province would be making a tremendous step in terms of progress of education in this country.

I know that there are exciting things being done in the intercity schools and most of them, of course, are in the city in which this Legislature is to be found.

But, unfortunately, these are isolated cases. There are rurally deprived students too. I know that the Minister hopes that this new legislation may do something about this, but it will have to take more than this legislation. It means special grants, a special impetus. There are even suburban culturally deprived people as well. Well, I hope that this will be an area for a major initiative of this department.

But perhaps the worst gap of all is involved with emotionally-disturbed children. I remember reading just a short while ago, a comment by the trustee for the Toronto school board, William Ross, who said that the report which is presented to the Toronto school board stated that there were 1,100 children waiting to see a school psychologist as of January 31. And he indicated there may be 1,900 by the end of the school year.

Toronto school trustee, William Ross, said that there is no way the board of education could ever provide the services needed by children with learning and psychiatric problems.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the place that we can deal with emotionally-disturbed children first, is the place where they are all to be found eventually, where they can be identified, where the degree of emotional disturbance can be assessed, where at least preventive measures can be taken, where indeed it can be decided if the emotionally-disturbed child will do best in an ordinary school setting, or in a special classroom, of whether it may very well need a residential school setting in order to provide the equality of educational opportunity for that particular kind of child. Just as The Department of Education has shown its concern for retarded children, I am hoping that the department will not feel it necessary to wait until all the emotionally disturbed children are organized under committees or under the society for emotionally disturbed children or something of this sort; but indeed, the department will find it possible to move ahead on this in a much more obviously necessary way.

It seems to me that equality of educational opportunity is a major problem which the Minister faces. This revolves around the whole question of the larger units. There is every opportunity, I would suggest, for the larger unit to produce this kind of educational opportunity but I am wondering how the Minister is going to be able to provide that educational opportunity, that equality, in some of the areas of this province; particularly, areas in this province where the tax base simply will not allow it.

Now I realize that in the introduction of this bill and in the committee dealing with this bill, he has suggested that we can round the tax base over a larger area and provide stability of tax base. But the great problem is, Mr. Chairman, as you well know, the great problem is that in many areas the urban society itself is finding it difficult to provide

the kind of educational services it wishes and to talk of dissipating that base over a larger area is simply unrealistic.

I know the grant structure was raised this year in a minimum sort of way, but until there is a realistic recognition that we can no longer support education through taxation on property, we can never really solve the problems which we are going to face in this country and in this province.

I might just quote from an article by Mr. Harold Greer:

> No end to education cost rise—buried in the technical papers which accompanied the Ontario Budget this week are three pages of text and two tables of statistics which spell nothing but gloom for Ontario taxpayers. There is no escape in this lifetime they say from the ever-spiralling costs of education. The poor taxpayer who has been hoping that the load will become at least rapidly lighter as the economy grows and the birth rate declines can forget it. The budget projection show that, as far as the eye can see, education costs will far outstrip economic growth.
>
> In recent years, provincial spending for education of all levels has been increasing at an annual rate of about 25 per cent. With this budget it has now passed the one billion mark—$1,260 million to be exact or 41 per cent of all provincial expenditures. The projection shows that elementary school enrollment, which this year stands at 1,392,000 pupils, will continue to rise in absolute terms until 1971, after which very slight declines will take place. But that is not the area, of course, where the great expenses will be found in education.
>
> Today's annual operating costs per student in the province for example are, $482 for elementary schools, $1,027 for secondary schools, $1,800 for technological colleges and $2,970 for universities. They are expected to rise during the next eight years to $729 for elementary schools, $1,687 for secondary schools, $2,980 for technological colleges and $5,497 for universities. These are increases of 51 per cent, 64 per cent, 65 per cent and 85 per cent respectively. Combined with the enrollment this means the total operating cost of the elementary schools in 1975-1976 will be $1,040 million, an increase of 55 per cent against an enrollment increase of 2.4 per cent; of secondary schools $943 million, up 99 per cent against an enrollment increase of 21 per cent; of technological colleges $330 million, up 850 per cent against an enrollment increase of 467 per cent; and of universities $668 million, up 185 per cent against an enrollment increase of 54 per cent.

Those figures are pretty terrifying when one thinks of the taxation base on which education is being supported at least at the elementary and secondary levels and I think that perhaps these statistics, more than any other statistics that we have seen in this House, would establish the fact.

In some areas, the larger units will not be able to provide the kinds of programmes that are suggested in the Minister's speech and in his accompanying report. In some areas, where an urban area is looking after a region which up until now received 95 per cent of the cost of education, the larger unit, unless the province takes over an increasing amount and places that taxation on other sources, is going to be able to give the equality of educational opportunity. Perhaps, at one time, placing the education costs on an immobile population and agricultural society made some sense; but today it makes no sense whatsoever.

What I am afraid of, Mr. Chairman, is that there is going to be a backlash. The Premier was out speaking in some part of Ontario and he mentioned the psychological effect it would create to have these taxation bills arriving in each home so that the person could see just how much they are paying for education. Well, I am wondering if we may not very well be over-psychoanalyzing the Ontario taxpayer. I am wondering what he is going to think when he sees that it is his education costs which are undermining his economic viability as an individual in this society. When he sees these costs spiralling and sees no hope by which he can come out of it.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is one of the major dangers to the very projects the Minister has put forward. Most of the projects that he is suggesting in this report—I will not say that they are entirely experimental, I will not say that they are not repeated in many other areas—but I think that he has in some cases taken an example from what could be called a more progressive area, in a school with a more progressive principal or administrator. And I am sure he would not want us to generalize and indicate that the examples that he gave were to be found right across this province.

If that is what he wants to see right across this province, and unless this province is ready to take up to 80 per cent of the cost of education, and place that cost where it belongs—

in more progressive sources of taxation—we have no hope of having the kind of educational system which the Minister has placed before us in this speech.

I hope the Minister is spending a great deal of his time before the Treasury board, before the Cabinet, indicating the serious situation in which this government will find itself, and this Minister will find himself, unless there is some recognition of the obvious nature of this demand.

I was very interested in the Minister's comments which were found in the *Globe and Mail*, I am not sure of the date, in which he made a rather interesting comment, interesting observation: Ontario industry will have to start allocating money each year for the prime purpose of keeping Ontario-trained men and women in the province. And he goes on to point out that the greatest resource is talented creative people. He went on to ask: but could industry be encouraged to go into partnership with the government in education and research.

He did not spell it out, but he thought federal tax incentives might be the answer. A subject on which federal and provincial governments—all interested in productivity—should be able to reach agreement.

Well, there is one step forward, I think, and the Minister's thinking is indicated in that article. I would hope that we might well find other sources. Obviously, income tax is a far more sensible, a far more progressive way of collecting taxes for education than the one that we have at present.

Now, in terms of relevance, not only do I think that it is relevant to the Minister's aim of a society in which education is equally available, but also I think it has to be the kind of educational system which must be relevant to a more free and open society. I think one of the great fears of parents in this province, as the Minister has undoubtedly found in the last number of weeks, is that a great many people—and they are not just trustees, or former trustees, or soon to be former trustees, they are parents—fear that the enlarging jurisdictions may very well cut them off from some degree of being able to exert pressure and influence upon the education of their children.

The Minister has indicated that these local areas will have so much more opportunity to provide for the differences, for the regional differences, and so on, that in essence, it could mean a greater degree of influence by parents within a school area. But, I suggest, to you, that this has to be structured so that there must be local councils related to each individual school in these larger areas.

I know the Minister will tell me that I must read his speech to the home and school association. I suggest to you that home and school associations speeches are very excellent, and encouraging them to move ahead and giving them more money is all to the good, but, I suggest to you, that it has to be structured. I suggest to you that it must include parents, it must also include students, and I suggest, as well, that this local advisory council to each individual school should also include teachers. So often these are people who are forgotten when it comes to making suggestions.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Pitman: Well, I am not quite sure of the implications of the Minister's interjection, but I suggest to the Minister that it will be very, very necessary that we have this kind of opportunity in each individual school if we are going to be able to carry out these new programmes and make them relevant to that school, and to the kind of free and open society which we are talking about.

As well as that, I have suggested that we desperately need some dialogue, and a meaningful one, that will include students. Now, I was very interested that an organization, which I am sure the Minister would not only applaud, but I am sure that he would encourage, are the Friends of Zac Phimister, former Deputy Minister of this department. In the memorial for Mr. Zac Phimister, it has been suggested that they might very well consider providing some kind of conference for young people, to encourage young people to help in the administration of their own schools.

If I might just read a paragraph or two of this memorial. This is the Deputy Minister:

> He envisaged a degree of responsibility offered to, and accepted by, the young people in the schools. Though he himself was a part of the schools run by an authoritarian hierarchy, he had been profoundly impressed by instances seen in his travels, of schools virtually run by their students, with highly successful results. He encouraged this objective in his contacts with Canadian teachers, and made a speech to the Ontario secondary schools headmasters' council in 1966.
>
> I am confident that there are men in this room who could push this concept of student responsibility further and develop, over a period of years, a tradition of self government and participation in school life which will do much to ease the burden on the teachers and create a sense of responsi-

bility in the whole student body. It would have far-reaching effects on the attitude of students to schools, both while they are in attendance and after they leave.

I would hope that in future, as Mr. Barry Lowes suggests—to quote another educational authority—that students will have far more of a role than of simply choosing the colour of the crepe paper for the annual dance. They are going to be involved in basic decisions, along with parents, and along with their teachers, in what the kind of curriculum will be in that school, and the kind of administrative procedures in that school; that they will have some input instead of simply being the objects of the educational process and simply being put upon, so to speak, by every other sector in the educational spectrum.

Well, I realize the Minister will say that this is not his responsibility, and to a large extent it is not, but I would suggest that it is, through the bulletins that are under the direction of this Minister; the directives that are sent out; the teacher training; the principal's training courses which are still in the hands of the provincial government; the kind of philosophy which permeates each of the jurisdictions under his control.

Thirdly, I would suggest that this department must be relevant to a technological society.

Now we are, I think, in a society of which we have a great many depersonalizing forces. We see them all around us, on our television sets, in advertising, and I suggest that one of the major roles of an educational system will be that of trying to combat depersonalization. And I would only quote to him the comments of a man within his own department, Bascombe St. John:

> I sometimes think we ask our schools to do much too complex a job, that we should be seeking, with urgency, to simplify, integrate and co-ordinate the knowledge that we impart. Far too little thought is being given to subjective, or to the means of realizing it. If education is going to have a significant future, an answer to the problem of the individual in the mass society will have to be found. And there is not much time.

I see many of these programmes where this very end could come as a result, and I can only hope that the Minister will provide the kinds of grants and the kind of impetus needed.

I come back again to this decentralization, because I have seen, so very often, men who have made an impact from coming from the department and going into the local area. I know inspectors are a bad name, but I can remember very great men—George Gray, men like Robert Wallace, men like the man who will be sitting in front of the Minister very soon this evening. They have made a very great impact on education, by their influence from the centre going out into these areas, and I am very concerned that that influence not disappear.

To carry on to the relevance to this technological aid. It has many implications. I think it means lowered teacher-pupil ratios. It means using teaching machines not simply for the sake of saving money, but in order to provide individual instruction for individual needs. Educational TV is going to have to be brought in with the greatest care and sensitivity so that there will not be any effort to find ways of replacing teachers, or providing larger classes, or any of these depersonalizing aspects which educational TV can produce, and has produced. I have seen this at another level. A technological society means a changing society, and many of the things which the Minister has suggested would, I hope, provide for a kind of flexibility of mind.

I hope that the Hall committee, which I understand is dealing with the grades 1 to 6, at least in part, will come out with a curriculum which will make some kind of meaning to young people in the grades 1 to 6. So much of what is done in those early years, which are perhaps the most important years of a young person's educational life, are so completely meaningless. We teach them history before they have any sense of time, or any sense of causation or have any sense of human motivation, and we call it social studies. Yet we fail to teach them languages which most educational authorities would indicate could be taught at that age with some meaning and some effect and, indeed, with some enjoyment on the part of the students.

I suggest it is time to re-shape the whole curricula. Get rid of the old subject boxes and let us try dealing with information and with experience. Now, I am going to try not to use the name of Marshall McLuhan; these kids may never have heard of Marshall McLuhan, but they are of Marshall McLuhan, and they do see present experience, a continium; they do not divide your experience into little boxes as we do in schools. They have been to Expo and they can see what exciting ways that information can be a part of their experience. They watch their tele-

vision sets and they have seen the onrush of events in terms of knowledge acquisition.

And I suggest to the Minister, that this may be the case in a few classrooms, but in many classrooms this kind of experience is not there, and I would suggest that before that kind of experience can be theirs, there must be a massive retraining of teachers far beyond the kind of training which has been done in the sort of haphazard Saturday morning way by various organizations and various agencies, and even by the department itself.

I do not know how it can be done; by a rotation basis, by providing special grants or the local bodies to allow certain number of teachers to go out for retraining, but it must be done. We cannot put new wine in the old bottles which, in many cases, happen to be sitting at the front of classrooms across this province. And I think this is a major responsibility which I hope will remain in the hands of the department and the Minister's officials, because this is something which the local boards and local jurisdictions cannot look after.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding, I suggest there are a number of things which this department must do if it is going to be able to deal with the rise of expectancy which has come about as a result of the Minister's legislation in this Legislature, and also as a result of the speech and the documents which he brought before the chamber this afternoon and this evening. First, as I say, a major refinancing of education. Second, the taking over of the entire cost of educating groups such as the emotionally disturbed. Major efforts to reach culturally or economically deprived young people at an early age. A major overhaul of curriculum. Destroying subject-orientation and ignoring the tradition-bound and meaningless material which inhabits so much of the curriculum. A massive retraining of teachers by the department. More action on teacher training in the provincial universities. A more effective use of personnel.

I would suggest that one of the areas where the educational system has so much human wastage is in administering schools where, in many cases, you have people with graduate degrees phoning up mothers of children who are not present in school. And, I suggest, we need to completely pyramid our idea of educational personnel, with perhaps a principal and a whole team, which would include people who could look after certain aspects of education where fully-trained teachers are not necessary. A far greater use of teachers' assistants, and even parents in the educational system. I suggest, to you, that these are the only ways that we are going to be able to carry out the kind of hopes that have been suggested here this afternoon and this evening.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just to deal very briefly in reply to some of the observations made by the leader of the Opposition and the member for Peterborough, may I say at the outset—and I say this most sincerely—that I think their comments tonight, for the most part, were really very constructive and indicated an awareness not only of the complexities of the problems that we face collectively in the field of education, but also recognition that the solutions to the problems are not always readily or easily found.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that I appreciate this, as I say, for the most part, constructive approach to these estimates because, as the leader of the Opposition has pointed out, and I think with great validity, it is not just the sums of money involved which are, let us face it, staggering. It relates very basically, to the direction that really can, and should, be given to the total community. And I think this is becoming, increasingly, a responsibility of an educational system, whatever jurisdiction it may serve.

At the same time, I think it is necessary to point out two or three areas where I am not in complete agreement with some of the suggestions offered by the members opposite, and I am sure that these observations will be taken in the same spirit of a constructive nature that I think has been demonstrated, so far, in this discussion.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out, to the leader of the Opposition, that we as a department—and I think the total educational community, if one can use this term—is really keenly aware not only of the problem of the provision of physical plant and its cost, but the whole question of greater utilization. I think this is inherent really in the opening statement that was made, but I think at the same time, Mr. Chairman, we must be very realistic in our assessment of these problems and understand that once again the question of utilization or greater utilization is not easily determined.

It has been suggested to me on several occasions that perhaps we could use the physical plant 12 months a year; the students could go to school for prolonged periods of time, or you could even introduce a semester system at the secondary level. But the leader

of the Opposition I think is well aware of the implications, shall we say, of a semester system at the secondary level; of the impact it might have from an economic standpoint on, shall we say, the tourist industry, the use of the summer months so far as family holidays are concerned.

Of course, if you move into a semester operation and this is what we have found at Ryerson and at Guelph University, you also get into the question of the provision of additional staff. And when you provide additional staff for, shall we say, a semester type of operation, then you negate some of the savings you might experience by utilization of the physical plant for a longer period of time.

I think—and I like to think I am relatively objective—that there is a growing interest and desire on the part of the local school authorities to more fully utilize the school plant, and this is extending into the summer months through the use of summer courses to assist those students who have some difficulties in one or two subjects during the current academic year.

Mr. Nixon: Would the Minister know what proportion of boards provide summer school.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I cannot tell the hon. member, but I shall endeavour to get the information. We do not have statistics relating to this yet but we shall have when the divisional boards are created. I think it is fair to state that there are not enough areas doing it, but once again you get into the problem that some of the students who might wish to participate, get involved again in the traditional holiday situation. And some other students wish to work and sometimes have to put work ahead of a continuing educational programme. This is something we experience.

Mr. B. Newman: Are there extra grants to boards?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, there is no extra grant at this stage.

Mr. B. Newman: That is one of the reasons why the idea is not spreading.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I do not think so; at least my experience has been that it is not related to the cost or the question of grants. It really has been related in many areas to a question of interest. Once again, I do not want to be over-optimistic but I do not think there is any question that the provision of the larger units, particularly in the rural or less urbanized areas, will expedite the provision of summer courses for many of the students in those communities. It is really in the urban centres where they presently exist.

I was interested in the approach of the hon. leader of the Opposition when he was making a very strong presentation—and I must say to him, once again very sincerely, I really found those parts of his speech when he departed from the prescribed text were really more helpful than some of those that were prescribed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member wanted a copy of my speech at McMaster and it was anything but—

Mr. Sopha: The Minister would not give me one.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh I will; I have asked that one be provided for you.

Mr. Sopha: You have been holding it in front of me like a carrot in front of a rabbit for about three days.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, just one day. Mr. Chairman, I have to be fair with the hon. member for Sudbury. He asked for it yesterday, which was Monday; today is Tuesday, it has not been three days.

Mr. Sopha: It seems like three days.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not realize your anticipation was this great. I shall endeavour to expedite it for you.

Now getting back to the question of, shall we say, standardized plans, and I think on this occasion the leader of the Opposition referred to standardized modular plans—and I think perhaps he might check his notes, because this is really quite relevant.

If you will read *Hansard* carefully—because we debated this at some length—we are just as concerned as the members opposite in finding ways and means of reducing the cost of the physical school plant. Our studies in other jurisdictions, and I mentioned this, I think, in the last session, indicate that standardized plans *per se* do not hold out the answer, we feel, to reduction in construction costs. But what we do feel is there is a possibility—and the report of the Metro board is not finalized —the leader of the Opposition is referring to the first phase of the report which, as I pointed out, the department is helping to finance—there is a possibility that the modular approach—

Mr. Nixon: Choose the right word.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and we are as anxious as he is, Mr. Chairman, to see if this is a successful or practical way of bringing about some reduction with respect to the construction costs of physical plant. We just say—

and once again we are keeping this matter under constant review—that a set of so-called standard plans made available by The Department of Education certainly in this day and age of change in physical design, does not hold out the answer that we are seeking.

Mr. Nixon: That is precisely the point I made. Every time, Mr. Chairman, that this has been raised the Minister makes this point and of course it is absolutely true, but there is always the implication that anyone who has suggested this is rather—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, not at all. In fact I was delighted tonight with the leader of the Opposition's insertion of the word modular, which I do not think he used last session.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, always—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I am subject to correction—

Mr. Nixon: Well I know you will check the record, as you are always enjoining me.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well I will, I will have a look later on.

Mr. Nixon: Modular apparently is the word that makes it okay.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do want to touch on the question of finance and the suggestion by the leader of the Opposition, which I find not only intriguing but very contradictory to the present position of the federal government. And I do not want to interject—as the member for Sudbury is always loath to interject—any, shall we say, federal election campaigning suggestions at this present moment, but nonetheless I think it should be made abundantly clear that the ministers of education generally across Canada have been seeking—certainly had until the very definite change in policy took place at the federal level—had been seeking a continuation of federal financial involvement in education. I can provide for the leader of the Opposition specific resolutions passed by the committee of Ministers of the CEA.

Mr. Nixon: How much are you getting from them this year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Specifically, we are asking the federal government to continue, and to increase, their participation in the technical, vocational training agreement, which in their wisdom, they brought to an end as of March 31 just a year ago.

Mr. Nixon: We have the schools; there is no reason why you should dictate what their participation should be. How much are you getting from them this year, do you know?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We do not know yet.

Mr. Nixon: It does not appear in the estimates anywhere.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, we do not know because they are not giving anything directly to education any more; this is the part that is upsetting.

Mr. Nixon: In post-secondary education it comes right to you and you parcel it out as you see fit?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, this is not correct, Mr. Chairman. The arrangement is very simple. We provide to the federal authorities the cost of our post-secondary education and they deem this as the fiscal equivalent and transfer half of that cost to the provincial authorities. They are not directly involved in education any more. They have opted out.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, of course—now just a moment—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, they have abdicated their interest—

Mr. Nixon: Not at all, they give it right into your hands—$180 million.

Hon. Mr. Davis: A year ago, Mr. Chairman, they were making payments to the AUCC, to the universities and colleges of Canada—

Mr. Nixon: That is right, and they now give you the money so that you make the same payment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and because of the influence of the present Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) to satisfy certain constitutional situations, in his mind at least, the federal government has opted out of an interest in education. This is true.

Mr. Sopha: Such ingratitude.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Very indifferent.

Mr. Nixon: Very misleading—

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not misleading at all, it is factually correct.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly the money comes as a cheque to you. It may even be made out to "William G. Davis" for all we know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I find this very intriguing, and I really hope that the comments of the

leader of the Opposition here tonight find their way through to the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Manpower in particular.

Mr. Sopha: Are you sure you got the cheque from him?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would be delighted, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member could bring his influence to bear on the present Prime Minister and the Minister of Manpower.

Mr. Nixon: You are talking like the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) who made a similar statement.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it is highly relevant.

I do agree with the leader of the Opposition that we, of necessity over a period of years, require additional financing in the field of education and if he feels he can have some success in the next three weeks with the federal authorities, my blessings to him. Perhaps after June 25, those of us on this side of the House may have a little greater influence.

Mr. Chairman, dealing with two or three other matters, I think there is substantial merit, not necessarily in a uniform accounting procedure, but shall we say some uniform method of calculation with respect to the new divisional boards. I do not want to go into this at great length, but I think there is merit, not only from an accounting point of view, but quite frankly I think, in the whole question of definitions for data processing purposes. This is one—

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): How about the control?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think inherent in any grant structure that is developed on the basis of information, is that the grant structure relates to expenditures to assessment. And in this there is, shall we say, the flexibility of control that the hon. member is suggesting from the other side of the House. But I am saying that this suggestion has, I believe, some merit.

In dealing with the observations, Mr. Chairman, from the member for Peterborough, once again his observations were basically, shall we say, philosophical in nature. I found them really quite constructive and he really has demonstrated, as did the leader of the Opposition, many of the assets that we can look forward to with respect to Bill 44. But I cannot understand why the gentlemen opposite did not enthusiastically support the bill at the time it had second reading in this House.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the Minister has said this so many times that I really must ask him to desist. I think that this is one of the problems that has changed. As I remember it, Mr. Chairman, what we voted against was the procedure of the Minister taking that bill through second reading before it had been to the committee. Because of the procedures of this House, we had to vote for that particular motion in order to exhibit our concern.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I do not care what the members in that group do, our—

Mr. Pitman: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Minister said that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pitman: I hope the Speaker's committee will deal with this so we may have an opportunity to vote according to what we think during the bill-handling procedures. But in this particular case we were voting on procedure and not on the bill.

I think the leader of the Opposition and myself both indicated our agreement on larger jurisdictional units; we indicated some reservations and concern, and wished to take it before the committee to have the matter examined in some detail before the people it concerned. This is what we were dealing with, and I do wish, for the rest of this session, that the Minister will not say that the Opposition voted against his bill.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Why does the Minister try to create divisions where there is unity? I would think he would have appreciated the unity.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I say, I am really appreciative of the unity I see developing among us.

Mr. MacDonald: Do not spoil a good thing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I will not. If the member for Peterborough is now saying that he completely supports Bill 44—

Mr. MacDonald: Which he always said.

Mr. Pitman: We voted for it in committee.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am quite prepared to accept his enthusiastic endorsation and I shall say no more about it. The other point that he made—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): We could have shot the bill down in flames three times in committee.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is regrettable really that the member for Sudbury was not here earlier because once again I must refer to the remarks of the member for Peterborough where he suggested there should be involvement; this refers to his remarks, they were not mine. I agree with him. He suggested there should be an involvement of the community with the individual schools under the reorganization.

He even referred to the desirability of "home and school," and I suggested that really this was contrary to the point of view of the member for Sudbury East. I recall it well, he was completely opposed to the home and school being involved in any educational decisions. I think that my memory is accurate in this regard.

I understand his point of view, but I disagree with him as I say. It is interesting to note that this particular group does not have unanimity on that issue. I agree with the member for Peterborough, but getting back to a more serious discussion, the member for Peterborough mentioned his concern—perhaps when the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) has finished his discussion with the member for Peterborough, I can continue my dialogue with him, Mr. Chairman; I would not want to interfere with any conversation that the member for Peterborough is having with the member for Lakeshore because I am sure—

Mr. MacDonald: You can talk to yourself instead!

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I will wait. If I did talk to myself, it might be helpful to myself. I might get a very interesting reaction.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, what you call an educational process!

Hon. Mr. Davis: The concern that the member for Peterborough raised, which I think is valid, indicates to me his still somewhat traditional approach to these problems. I will not use the word traditional—it is his concern about the decentralization of the shall I say, traditional role of The Department of Education or a department of education.

I do not think that The Department of Education in Ontario is unique in that regard. I do not think that there is any conflict between the policy of decentralization and the desirability of the department to provide leadership in a genuine sense, in the programmes that are to be introduced and the experiments that are to be created and initiated at the local level.

The department in my view can and will still be involved. We will be involved through the provision of programme consultants to the local offices. I recognize the validity of the concern of the member for Peterborough. I think that this is something that through the evolutionary period, and I think that this is the only way you can describe it, we can, as a department, see that these problems do not arise.

Quite frankly, we recognize, as I said in committee and on second reading, that even under the reorganization there will be some areas of the province where the local board itself will not have the resources, because of economics and because of numbers, to do the job that we think should be done. I said on that occasion, and I repeated here again tonight, that we shall as a department provide the resource material and the personnel that are necessary to see that the type of situation that the member for Peterborough fears could not occur. It does not in fact become part of the problems during this reorganization period.

Mr. Chairman, I made a lot of notes here. Perhaps we can pick some of them up as we go through the consideration of the individual estimates. But once again I say most sincerely that I found the presentations for the most part very constructive indeed.

On vote 501:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I want to pursue the matter of the use of this gold. I wish to say in parentheses that this young man who had control of $2 billion for expenses, must be so busy looking after the money that he has not time to really see what is going on in the field of education, so it is our duty to inform him of some of the phenomena that we see in education in the province. It may also be that he does not use his time to its best economic advantage. That is for him to determine.

Mr. Nixon: That means wasting time.

Mr. Sopha: Well, if he is getting an honorary degree, I will leave that to University Affairs.

I do not want to become distracted from what I was going to say. I wanted to extend first the remarks of the Minister of Education—or the leader of the Opposition, pardon me—in respect to the use of the schools. One of the observations that I have made is that

in the local community there is little in the way of involvement of the schools and their boards with the community in general in any intimate way, or meaningful way.

The school boards and the regional bureaucracy of the Minister, rather give the impression that they operate on an island unto themselves, and the community, when it does come into contact with the school administration comes in contact on an arm's-length basis.

One of the illustrations of that can be seen in the use of the school plant by the community. I see no reason whatsoever, and I would welcome argument to the contrary, why a political party—which form the warp and woof of our democracy; we here have a great respect for political parties and we all belong to one or another — I see no reason why, when a political party approaches a school board to make use of the school facilities for a political meeting, that it should have to pay.

The party makes up a large proportion of the public, in addition to which, those who would come to a political meeting who do not belong to a party, are themselves part of the public who have paid for the creation of those school facilities. I treat this almost as arrogance, or perhaps dispassionate detachment on a high plane by the school board, when they look at the emissaries from the political parties and say that the rental of the auditorium for that political meeting will be $100. That is a very common figure. I recall a number of years ago speaking on behalf of my friend from Oxford (Mr. Innes), in Woodstock, and I can very well recall that we had 700 or 800 in that auditorium, and he told me that the rental was $100.

I wanted to say this for a long time, that these school boards should be told by the Minister or by his local people that that is a totally unjustified encroachment upon the rights and liberties of others and an unwarranted exercise of their power. When all is said and done, this school plant does not belong to the school boards; it is theirs on trust, and on trust for the benefit of the community. When this community makes a very reasonable request for the use of the facilities, then one would hope and think that the school board would be more than delighted to make them available.

In this regard I remind myself, since McLuhan has been mentioned here a couple of times tonight, that this year marks the 20th anniversary of my discovery of McLuhan. I am rather secretly proud of the fact that I discovered McLuhan before he became a watchword, or the in-thing. That discovery was made with his first volume, "The Mechanical Bride," published I believe 20 years ago this year. I recall that in that he made a great thing out of our fetish for cleanliness. It is very appropriate to mention that, because one observes in the caretaking configurations of the responsibilities of school boards that they make a great fetish out of the cleanliness, neatness, and tidiness of these Taj Mahals that we have erected in the communities at public expense. That itself is reflected in their reluctance in many cases to let the unwashed into the schools to make proper use of them because they might mess them up or in some way—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Is that what the teachers do?

Mr. Sopha: —or in some way detract from their pristine beauty.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What about the professors?

Mr. Sopha: I am putting that forward to you, Mr. Chairman, as a very genuine and sincere plea, that throughout this province there might hope to be a change in the attitude of school boards in respect of welcoming community involvement and community use of the school facilities which, after all, have been provided by all of the taxpaying citizens of the province.

The second matter I should like to raise, and I think this is the appropriate vote, is that one certainly must evolve an attitude of displeasure in witnessing the activities of the local bureaucracy surrounding the administration of schools, which has been created by this Minister and by this department in the local area. One cannot help but conclude that that bureaucracy on a regional basis is a very powerful and very authoritative institution in the administration of education in this province.

I have said before and it might bear repeating that it is a disillusioning thing about that bureaucracy to see and to realize that among those whom you might think were the most enlightened people, the most progressive people in their attitude, the most objective people, there is a political undertow in the carrying on of their task. In my own case, I observe, after many years of disillusionment, that if any function was going on, the local region of administration responsible to the Minister of Education, when holding any

kind of a clambake, a taffy pull or any other public function, would never fail to invite the member for Nickel Belt. He is always there—

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): You are always invited.

Mr. Sopha: —he is always there and his very, very handsome good looks are depicted across the pages of the paper—

Mr. Demers: You never answer your phone.

Mr. Sopha: Oh yes, at all educational functions. As consistently as they invite him to the taffy pull, just as consistently they fail to invite me and my friend from Sudbury East. We are never invited.

An hon member: It may be departmental policy.

Mr. Sopha: It may be, now—

Mr. Nixon: I suspect it is.

Mr. Sopha: —now I am told in the corridors, by members who support that government, that you almost have to have a machine-gun or a baseball bat to break through the entourage of the Minister of Education at any function at which he is present to get into the ranks of prominence at all.

An hon. member: Does he get his picture in the paper too?

Mr. Sopha: Always, always. At any public function it is unheard of, since he became Minister, that any local member is ever given the privilege of cutting the ribbon with scissors, or axe, or however they do it, as the case may be.

I certainly object to the fact that, on several occasions, this Minister has been in my community, opening schools. Well, is there a school in the province that is not opened without his presence?

Mr. Nixon: Most of them are named after him.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Yes.

Mr. Nixon: We have not had a new school at Brant.

Mr. Sopha: On several occasions he has been in my community. Not once, not on any single occasion, have his local people, his local lieutenant, ever had the courtesy to invite me to any of the functions.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) is not like that at all.

Mr. Sopha: Not once. The Minister of Reform Institutions is not like that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are always welcome.

Mr. Sopha: But in this area—

An hon. member: It is easy to get in.

Mr. Sopha: —but in this area of government functions, that ought to be objective and remote from partisan politics, one would expect that these people would be the very last to engage in such petty political philanderings as they do.

Another manifestation of it is this. At a commencement exercise just nobody is ever allowed to make the speech of the evening, except some official from The Department of Education.

Now these people working for the department, the local inspectors and what have you, they are the ones that are the centre of the programme in delivering the gigantic exercise in elocutionary circumlocution on the occasion of these young people receiving their diplomas and, invariably—

Mr. Nixon: The same speech.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, it is the same speech. Invariably, they never promote an original thought. They begin by quoting what Plato said five centuries before the birth of Christ and they end up by quoting what Karl Marx said a century and a half or a century and three-quarters ago. They never promote to the original thought—

Mr. Nixon: Up our way they quote the Minister.

Mr. Sopha: Oh yes. I would not doubt it.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, what is there about this department that it is such an inbred outfit? They erect these walls to keep all intruders and all outsiders out of it and let nobody break the fortress that they have created.

The Minister, in the ensuing year, would do well if he would adopt an attitude of impartiality and objectivity and change some of these petty political manifestations that have crept into this department.

But I want to deal with the third subject before I sit down. I want to say, very seriously—having given it a good deal of thought, that I seriously question this Minister and the Prime Minister of this province, year after year accepting these honorary degrees from the universities. I question that.

If the Ontario federation of agriculture

arrived outside with a prize steer for the Premier, we would certainly raise an eyebrow. If the Minister accepted a gift from any other pressure group, we would certainly open it to question. I treat this committee of presidents and these institutions, which are now deriving, what, three quarters of the money or 85 per cent of their moneys from the public purse; I question their offering of the blandishments to the Minister of Education on an annual basis.

The trouble is, of course, that in singing his praises year after year, he is going to start to believe it. He is going to start to believe that he is as great as they say. I say that against the background that the granting of the degree itself is a custom so sufficiently archaic and itself open to question on objective and intellectual grounds, that you would think that the Minister would be in the forefront to try to abolish this system.

Last Saturday afternoon I sat at Laurentian University and having heard the president of the institution engage in a tirade against politicians — a veritable tirade against politicians. He condemned the method of appointment of senators and then noticed no inconsistency whatsoever when he departed from speaking terms with common sense and the university began to confer honorary degrees. As they read the citations, let me tell you, those young people who got their degrees squirmed in embarrassment in their seats at this constitution of university functions.

All right, all right. You can have all the order you want, but I wanted to make these remarks at the earliest possible time. I say this, that the Minister, indulging in that every year, is little less than submitting to an indirect form of blandishment that is very close to bribery; it is very close to it on an intellectual basis. I quoted correctly and as I see it. Every year he goes somewhere, and he threatens them in dark fashion. He threatens them and never tells us specifically what is wrong with the system or what he would do to correct it.

Pardon?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): When are you going to get invited?

Mr. Sopha: No, I do not want one. I do not want to be a senator. I do not want to be a judge. I do not want to be an ambassador. I do not want an honorary degree. I just want to be myself. That is all.

No, I do not want to be a bachelor, I have given that up.

I cannot hope that there will be any progressive reform, but would say to the Minister, in extending the remarks of the leader of the Opposition, I would ask the Minister to work towards the end of letting the community make greater use of the school plant than has been the custom in the past.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, may I just very briefly reply to the suggestions from the member for Sudbury. I will not even get into the question of the universities at this stage, there will be other occasions. But I—

Mr. Sopha: You would not dare. You know that there is no answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are very valid answers, but I do not have an answer with respect to the lack of invitation he receives to school openings. I am only going by memory, and I am subject to correction, but if memory serves me correctly, I have only attended one school opening in the city of Sudbury—

Mr. Sopha: La Salle Secondary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member must recognize that the regional office does not extend invitations. The Minister of the department—we do not extend invitations. If the member for Sudbury was ignored, he was ignored by the Sudbury board of education—no one else. I think this is perhaps the area that he might pursue. Perhaps we should establish a rapport with the Sudbury board. The regional office has nothing whatsoever to do with extending invitations to school openings to officials, neither does The Department of Education in this province.

I would be delighted if the hon. member wishes me to send a letter to the chairman of the Sudbury board indicating that the member for Sudbury feels that he has been ignored by the local school authority, and make sure that he is invited to any future whatever-it-is that they are having. I would be quite prepared to ask the chairman of the board to take this under consideration. We have nothing to do with it, and I want to make this abundantly clear, and I really only recall one school opening that I did attend in Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Well, let us put the records straight. Your man Allan in Sudbury, for whom I have a good deal of respect, for his intellectual prowess and ability, moved his office from one part of my constituency to another part of my constituency. Sort of intra-mural change—if you get what I mean.

I pick up the paper and there is Allan and the member for Nickel Belt snipping the old ribbon, right on the front page. Oh yes, very photogenic. But it never dawned on him in the old entelechy that he was in my constituency—so he invites the foreigner in from Nickel Belt to cut the ribbon. So it is not the school board.

Mr. Pitman: He has quite a sense of humour.

Mr. Sopha: Now what are the orders to Allan? Are the orders from headquarters to play up the local Conservative member? Aye!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Play up the local Conservative member—this is it, is it not? They went up to the Lakehead. We read in the press that the member, the local member of Parliament, Douglas Fisher, who helped with the slam-bang opening of the school, and the local member of Parliament—he is sitting in the 94th row, way back below the salt, they did not even have the decency to ask him up to the platform.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 501?

Mr. Pitman: I want to refer to the question of whether the Minister has considered the possibility of replacing urban schools with some form of school apartment complex. This, I understand, has been used in other jurisdictions to cut down costs. When the parking lot is empty during the day, as people have gone to work, it can be used by the staff. Or the gymnasium and educational facilities which are free in the evening, late at night, can be used by the apartment dwellers. During the day, of course, the whole building is empty, as these apartment dwellers go off to their work. It seems to me that there is some economic viability in this suggestion. I am wondering whether the Minister's department has considered this? I really do not think this comes under this vote, it probably comes later under planning or under school building and so on, but we are on the topic, perhaps we might exhaust it now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am sure we could exhaust it, but I am not sure that we will. I think really it would come under vote 503. The possibility of having school facilities as a part of an apartment complex—there have not as yet, been any specific presentations made to the department by any school boards. But we know they have been considered, and that there is a certain amount of research and discussion going on in this area. As far as we are concerned as a department, we are quite prepared to investigate very carefully the possibility of this if it comes to us from one of the boards. There are some problems inherent in it, and yet it has worked reasonably well in some larger urban centres. They have actually put in a school facility right within a major apartment complex. Now it did create problems of—I do not say recreation is the right word—playground facilities, and so on. Nonetheless it did work, and has worked in some jurisdictions. I am not sure that we have reached that point here yet in our larger urban centres, but we are not rejecting the possibility of it.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two matters that I want to pursue in the first vote still dealing with the utilization of the schools and the grounds. I understand that it is in Lodon, Ontario, that there is a fairly extensive summer programme designed around the school building, the gymnasium, the library and the playground. There is some opposition to it because the local recreation council or commission feels that there is some duplication.

There is no doubt that the recreation people should be supervising and giving a lead to the aspects of the school programme in the summer months that would make use of the gym and the playground facilities, but it really is true that as you drive through the towns in the summertime, the school yard is usually fenced and not in use while the city parks are in use.

It may be a small matter, and yet in a good many of the cities these would be quite a significant addition to the recreation facilities. One thing I wanted to pursue further was the Minister's comments about federal participation in the payment for education here.

It is true that the withdrawal of direct support from the universities was accomplished with an agreement that they would pay half the ordinary costs of post-secondary education in the province and this must be payable by some kind of a cheque to somebody in the province which is then used to finance education.

There has always been a great greyness over this agreement, because the Minister has tried to convince the government of Canada that post-secondary education in Ontario includes grade 13, as well as a string of other institutions. He should now have surely reached an agreement of some sort so that he can predict what the federal contribution to education in the province would be.

It is true that the cheque is not earmarked for specific purposes other than for post-secondary, and the government of Canada recognizes the Minister's responsibility in apportioning these funds and does not send cheques to the individual institutions. But surely the Minister can tell us what the federal involvement would be in our education programme, in the broadest sense, and what the disposition of the argument has been in the past year, and as to our attempt, the Minister's attempt, Ontario's attempt to broaden the understanding of post-secondary education so that the payment is as big as possible.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to confuse this at all, and I shall try to remain non-partisan. But as I understand the philosophy of the federal government, they were seeking to find some formula for the transference of certain amounts of federal moneys to provincial jurisdictions. They have used as the basis for this formula for fiscal transfer one half the operating costs of post-secondary education within each jurisdiction.

I think this is one of the basic philosophies of the federal government that it is a form of fiscal transfer to be paid into the provincial jurisdiction and it is not earmarked. Of course, I have my own point of view, and I will not get into that tonight, because it is perhaps a shade provocative, but this is the philosophy and this is how the plan is working. The province of Ontario made rather strong representations to the federal authority with respect to the question of definition. We have had some success, but I think it is fair to state that we are still anxious to pursue further just what can be included in the definition of operating grants.

Mr. Nixon: What were the successes you achieved?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, we have been successful in including at this stage grade 13, because we feel this is the equivalent of post-secondary education in other provincial jurisdictions.

Mr. Nixon: They agreed?

Hon. Mr. Davis: And they have agreed. The question of including furniture, books, libraries—this in an area we were pursuing and, we think, with some validity based on operating costs rather than on capital costs. Here we have not achieved the same success. I shall endeavour, in that this is the first year of the fiscal transfer, to get before the end of the estimates—or perhaps it would be more appropriate really to do it in the discussions in The Department of University Affairs—a projected revenue from the federal government with respect to post-secondary education.

But I must point out this is a projected figure because, once again, they are requiring very detailed information from the provincial jurisdictions including audited statements from the universities as to their actual operating expenses. I am not sure—and I just say this very casually—that they should be so involved in the last dollar and cent, because it is very difficult to get these figures on a projected basis to allow for adequate planning as detailed perhaps as they wish it. But we are prepared to do it. But I cannot give the member any accurate figure because of the detail they require at this stage. It is an estimate.

Mr. Nixon: In general terms, then, the government of Canada will provide a transference of funds equivalent to half the costs of operating our entire post-secondary plant, including grade 13. And the Minister's accountants cannot give you a ball park figure as to how much that would be?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, we can come reasonably close and I will endeavour to get this during the estimates of The Department of University Affairs. I have that approximate figure.

Mr. Nixon: But it would include grade 13 and the community colleges which come under The Department of Education? Ryerson?

Hon. Mr. Davis: All post-secondary institutions—

Mr. Nixon: All teachers' colleges?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Teachers' colleges we are including because we believe these are post-secondary and, in fact, they are faculty of education situations in other jurisdictions, so we took the position that there is no problem, that they also be considered.

Where we have run into the difficulty, because it really should be under another vote, is in the area of manpower training and the question of qualification—the federal position is that a person should be out three years before they qualify. This has led to some complications with our existing programmes, but perhaps we could deal with that under another vote.

Mr. T. Reid: May I follow up on this item, Mr. Chairman?

I would like to have on the record the policy as stated by the federal government in 1966. I think it would help clarify the discussion now taking place. I think it is very germane to our discussions of the financing of primary and secondary school education in Ontario because, if the federal government makes increased grants available to manpower programmes, universities and other forms of post-secondary school education, this surely should release some provincial resources that would otherwise have been made necessary in the areas for secondary school education. The point is simply this: that the Prime Minister of Canada set out federal government policy on education at the federal-provincial meeting in Ottawa in the last week of October, 1966. This is a short quotation directly from that statement:

> The federal government recognizes that education is and must remain within the provincial jurisdiction.

However:

> Certain interpretations have been placed on the scope and meaning of the word education which in our view—

that is, the view of the federal government:

> —are not valid. Specifically, the federal government believes that the training and re-training of adults for participation in the labour force are well within the scope of federal jurisdiction. They are manifestations of the federal government's responsibility for national economic development.

A week later, the federal Minister without Portfolio, at that time John Turner, stated in an address entitled "A Second Canada, Education is Everybody's Business" — an address he made on November 2, 1966, in Toronto. He made the following general statement, which I interpret as a follow-up to the federal-provincial agreement in late October, 1966.

This is what John Turner said at that time. He reiterated his government's interpretation of the constitutional responsibility for education under The British North America Act. He stated that the word "education" means "the imparting of knowledge through a standard curriculum during the period of childhood, adolescence and youth." Given this definition, he added that the provincial authority over education does not—I would like to repeat, does not— preclude the federal government from operating within the following four fields:

1. Training and retraining related to skills and employment, since the provision of full opportunities to Canadians to acquire the tools and skills they need for earning a living is a national responsibility.

2. Research or the pushing back of the frontiers of knowledge, since research priorities are national in their implications and scope for the Canadian economy, the so-called brain drain, the health and welfare of Canadians and for the ability of Canada to compete in world trade.

3. Aid to individuals as distinct from aid to institutions, since the welfare of individuals is a federal responsibility.

4. Culture—and as the Minister knows, the line between education and culture is a fuzzy one—since culture can be a national problem in a national context.

I would like to state that—I know the Minister will correct me if he thinks my interpretation is wrong, but I think my interpretation is correct—that at least this was an attempt to clarify the constitutional issue, to draw lines between federal responsibility and provincial responsibility in a number of areas relating to education. Whether or not in the long run it will prove otherwise or not, and I am on record publicly as having some reservations about it, at least the attempt was made.

So surely we should be able to get from the Minister of Education a fairly clear statement of what, for example, the federal government grants to Ontario in these areas that I have mentioned, of education, manpower training, research and so forth. What the transfer of funds from the federal government directly to this government or directly to the universities themselves, would have been in the coming fiscal year under the old terms, that is, before October, 1966. In other words, I think it should be possible for the Minister's experts to do this type of calculation.

Second, I think it would be very instructive for the Minister if he would try to calculate again what the new fiscal transfer is now, because there was a *quid pro quo* in this. The federal government would get out of certain fields and make it up through an additional fiscal transfer, so that the provincial governments could continue to run its manpower training programmes.

I would like to know specifically—I know that the Minister might not be able to provide it tonight—whether he can give me and the Opposition some idea of whether this province of Ontario is ahead in terms of federal transfers, federal grants to all these areas I have mentioned, is ahead now or next year, com-

pared to the position we would have been in if the rules of the game had not been altered. And can the Minister make a clear statement on that and can the Minister give us some idea of the methods used to calculate these two figures? Then I think we would clear up once and for all whether or not the federal government is more derelict in its duty towards education in a broad sense today than it would have been if it had not tried this redefinition.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is very difficult because the—shall we say, the ground rules were changed, not only with respect to the involvement of the federal jurisdiction with provincial jurisdictions, but their own ground rules with respect to manpower training have also been altered. It is very difficult for me to give the hon. member any accurate figures as to what the position is today, compared to what it might have been if the existing programmes had continued.

We face a very difficult area where we could speculate because, under the former federal-provincial agreement, I think the provinces—and I think the other Ministers would share this point of view—had every reason to expect that there would be a continuation of capital support. Under the present fiscal transfer they are only including operating expenses; there is no credit given for capital expenditure. And the entire college of applied arts and technology programme, which was developed here in this jurisdiction, I think with every reason to anticipate some capital contribution from the federal government, is now being financed entirely by the provincial jurisdiction. And this applies as well to the other provinces.

This is why, Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to say what the position would have been if the existing arrangements had continued because we could not say two years ago what the capital requirements would be of the community college programme.

As I say, the ground rules with respect to The Department of Manpower and its own payments have also altered and the regulations of who can participate in the programme have changed, so it makes it very difficult. I can provide for the hon. member our estimate as to the total amount of the fiscal transfer we anticipate receiving for the 50 per cent of the operating costs of post-secondary institutions, but it is almost impossible to give him a figure that could compare the contribution this year with what we might have anticipated our contribution would have been under the former arrangements.

Mr. T. Reid: I am glad the Minister put it that way, for the following reason: He left the distinct impression in my ears, and I am sure those of other members of this House, that the federal government had somehow left the province in more of a lurch than the province would otherwise have been in. I will check *Hansard* on this, Mr. Chairman. I will refer the Minister to the specific section where he made the statement. He left the distinct impression in this House, to my hon. leader and to myself, that the federal government had somehow shirked its responsibility in this field from what it would have been otherwise.

In answer to my question when I asked him if he would present these figures—I did it purposely this way—he stood up and said that he could not possibly know. I ask the Minister this. Either he cannot calculate it, or he says the federal government is shirking its responsibility, or he says that the federal government is contributing just as much or more than it otherwise would. But if he stood up, and *Hansard* will bear me out on this, and said that these are impossible calculations to know, then he is shirking his responsibilities as Minister of Education in the province by putting the onus on the federal government without having the facts.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member is anxious to pursue this argument—and I would be delighted to do so—if he is prepared to accept certain, shall we say, conditions—one of them being that the federal government was prepared, as every provincial jurisdiction anticipated that they would be, to continue the existing federal-provincial agreement with respect to technical and vocational education—I have no hesitation in saying that this provincial jurisdiction, and I think that it would be true in the other jurisdictions, feels that without question it is receiving less than it would have received under the previous arrangements. Every secondary school that is composite in nature that was receiving $75, and latterly a decreased grant from the federal government for capital purposes, now has had this agreement terminated and there is no, shall we say, compensation for them.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot predict accurately in the year of 1968 what the total cost to the community college programme will be over, say, a 15-year period. I do not know, but I can give the hon. member some figures. I say without hesitation that if one could assume—and I think that one has to in order to get some sort of rough figure for the

member for Scarborough East—the former agreements would in fact continue or have continued on that basis. There have been no ceilings or limits imposed, as they did on the province of Ontario. There is no question that we are today receiving less than we might have anticipated under the previous agreements, but I cannot say how many dollars. It is very difficult to estimate.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister has already said that he will get some figures for us on this, I think that that would be quite helpful.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is no question of what we can anticipate from the federal government this year.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to pursue one other matter, but I would yield the floor willingly to the Premier if he has some contribution to make to the business of the House at this time.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Since this very interesting topic has been exhausted, I move that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, I would like to go to the order paper and deal with some of the second readings that are ready and the House in committee. Then, when this is completed, we will return to these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 107



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, June 5, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 5, 1968

Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 3925

Submission of briefs to the committee studying the Hydro report, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Stokes 3926

Assistance with restoration of the Cornwall lacrosse stick factory, question to Mr. Guindon, Mr. Kennedy 3927

Gertler report on the Niagara escarpment, questions to Mr. MacNaughton, Mr. Gisborn 3927

Cutbacks in spending due to the gross provincial debt, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Sargent 3928

Privacy of the individual in the development of central data banks, question to Mr. Welch, Mr. Sargent 3928

Glue-sniffing problem, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Nixon 3928

Investigation of charges regarding cause of sitdown strike of female prisoners at Don jail, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman 3930

Training Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading 3931

Department of Correctional Services Act, 1968, bill intituled, Mr. Grossman, second reading 3931

Pension Benefits Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 3932

Income Tax Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 3934

Financial Administration Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 3934

Department of Revenue, bill to establish, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 3934

Public Service Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 3941

Ontario human rights code, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 3941

Third readings 3941

Securities Act, 1966, bill to amend, reported 3942

Loan and Trust Corporations Act, bill to amend, reported 3943

Insurance Act, bill to amend, reported 3944

Corporations Act, bill to amend, reported 3945

Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, reported 3945

Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1964, bill to amend, reported 3948

Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, continued 3948

Recess, 6 o'clock 3969

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 1968

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon, in the east gallery, we have students from London Road-Durand Street public school, Sarnia; St. Andrews separate school, Etobicoke; and in the west gallery, from Calvin Memorial Christian school, St. Catharines. We welcome these young people this afternoon.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, last Friday, when we were dealing with Bill 130, I intended to refer it to the standing committee on labour, and apparently that was not done. I therefore move that the orders of the day for consideration in the committee of the whole of Bill 130, The Employment Standards Act, 1968, be discharged and that the bill be referred to the standing committee on labour tomorrow.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of bills.

THE CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the amendments contained in the bill fall generally into two categories; those which result from amendments to The Income Tax Act Canada, and those which result from the reorganization of The Treasury Department.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on a matter of personal privilege I wish to make a statement having to do with the headline and portions of a report on page B4 in today's "Report on Business" section of the *Globe and Mail* and a similar report which appeared on page 17 in today's two-star edition of the Toronto *Daily Star*.

The *Globe* headline stated: "Rowntree says firm's clients will not suffer." In the body of the report, Mr. Speaker, the following paragraph appeared and I quote:

> The firm's auditors, McDonald, Currie and Co., and commission auditors are conducting audits, but there is no evidence that public clients are likely to suffer.

The *Star* report stated:

> Leslie Rowntree, Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, replying to a question from Dr. Morton Shulman, NDP, High Park, said auditors have found no evidence that public clients are likely to suffer.

Mr. Speaker, no such thing was said by me. I have had no interviews with any reporters on the subject dealt with in the articles cited nor have I discussed the matter with anyone in or outside of this House since I made the statement in the House yesterday afternoon. I can only conclude that the statements attributed to me were somehow derived from the answer to a question as I gave it and which dealt with Ord Wallington and Company Limited, yesterday in the House. At one point, I said:

> The facts developed to that date were inconclusive insofar as demonstrating that the public clients were likely to suffer loss.

Because of the very mysterious nature of this misinterpretation, in that it could give false hope to concerned people, I wish, for the record, to restate the answer as given to the question posed to me by the hon. member for High Park and which I answered yesterday. Mr. Speaker, I now proceed to read into the record from the same document which I read from in answer to his question yesterday, and I begin:

> I am informed that as a result of the Ontario securities commission's auditors' interim report, the registration of Ord Wallington was suspended on April 16, 1968, pending the clarification of its financial position. Both the commission's auditors and the firm's auditors, McDonald, Currie and Company, have been proceeding

with independent audits. The facts developed to that date were inconclusive insofar as demonstrating that the public clients were likely to suffer loss.

At this hearing, Mr. Arthur B. Francis, CA, the registrant's former auditor, was called by the firm. Mr. Francis' business was acquired by McDonald, Currie and Company. Based on his evidence the commission's director concluded that the public interest and interest of the clients of the firm would not be served at that time by preventing the completion of the purchases and sales made for clients. The principals purported to stand ready to interject and/or inject further capital to ensure the public clients against loss and in fact subsequently did provide an additional $25,000 in working capital.

In light of these facts the director stated: "While the company will not be permitted to undertake any business during the period of suspension, it is permitted to complete the trades for which it has already contracted, and to make delivery of securities to its public clients, apart from officers, directors and shareholders of the company."

On May 3, after a trial balance as at April 30, 1968, had been taken off, it became apparent that notwithstanding the interjection of the additional $25,000 there had been no improvement. The commission took immediate steps to preserve the existing aspects for the benefit of clients, by issuing orders under section 26 of The Securities Act, 1966, freezing the assets of the registrant. Subsequently, one of the clients petitioned the company into bankruptcy under the federal bankruptcy Acts. A trustee has been appointed.

In light of the appointment of the trustee in bankruptcy, the commission does not have any power to require the delivery by the trustee of either securities or money. The commission, through its staff, has pursued every question put to it by or on behalf of the firm's public clients concerning the position of that client. The commission's investigation continues.

That is the end of the statement that I made yesterday.

There was a supplementary question posed to me by the hon. member for High Park, which I undertook to investigate with respect to its detail, and the information has been supplied to me by the hon. member, and I shall be answering that in due course.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, so that there should be no misunderstanding I would like to state that—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let the member state his point of privilege.

Mr. Shulman: So there should be no misunderstanding, I would just like to make it clear to the hon. Minister and everyone else in this House that I have not discussed this matter with anyone outside of this chamber.

Mr. Speaker: The leader of the Opposition has a question?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart).

Mr. Speaker: He is not in.

Another member had one yesterday for the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme), and he is not in. If the Ministers come in we will have these questions later.

There was also a question yesterday from the member for Thunder Bay of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Would he place it?

Mr. J. F. Stokes (Thunder Bay): To the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs: Will the Minister agree to an extension in time for submission of briefs from municipalities in northern Ontario to the committee set up to study the Hydro report? Is the Minister aware that only three weeks are left for this purpose, when ten weeks was promised when the report came out and the committee to study the report was appointed by the Minister only last week?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there is no change in the date originally set out on April 10 for submission of briefs from municipalities in the Lakehead area by June 28, 1968. Replies to letters I have received from different municipalities have reaffirmed this arrangement. I may say, I think there is some confusion insofar as the inter-municipal committee is concerned; the fact that it has just been set up has no bearing on the presentation of briefs. The purpose of the inter-municipal committee really is, as much as anything else, to look at the briefs that come in relating to Mr. Hardy's report, and the committee need not have been set up until after June 28. I am anxious to get on with this job, and we have set it up, and it will be ready to roll on June 28.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur has the floor with a question.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): I would just like to ask the hon. Minister what the rush is.

Mr. Speaker: The member is out of order, the question was originally not asked by him.

Mr. Knight: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett). However, I see he is not in his seat.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peel South has a question.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall), would the Minister without Portfolio who represents the riding of Stormont, inform the House if the government plans to take any action to assist with the restoration of the Cornwall lacrosse stick factory, as a result of its recent destruction by fire, and thereby alleviate what I am told may be a critical shortage of lacrosse sticks.

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Peel South, I would like to inform the House that the Cornwall lacrosse stick factory was destroyed by fire on Tuesday morning June 4. This factory manufactures 95 per cent of all lacrosse sticks used in Canada, and in foreign markets. As a result of this fire, some 90 employees, most of them Indians, are now without jobs.

As the member for the riding of Stormont, I immediately contacted the owner, Mr. Chisholm, and offered him all assistance possible. Yesterday, I had invited to my office Mr. Jim Nash, president of Ontario lacrosse association, to discuss the situation. We both recognize that there will be a serious shortage of lacrosse sticks unless some action is taken at once to rebuild the factory.

I have contacted the Minister of Trade and Development and I am glad to report that one of his officials, Mr. McCracken, is presently in Cornwall to see what assistance can be given to restore this all-important industry on Cornwall island.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Treasurer. When will the Gertler report on the Niagara escarpment be made available to the members and the general public?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I probably could, with some justification, take this question as notice because it did not reach me before leaving my office. However, I think I am sufficiently familiar with the situation to give an interim answer and then proceed on a notice basis to expand upon it if required.

The report is now in the hands of a subcommittee of the regional development branch of my department. It is expected that their evaluation process and subsequent recommendations to the government will be available by late summer or early fall. The decision, of course, as to the action that is taken at that time will be determined by the advice that is given to the Minister and then translated to the government. If the hon. member feels that I should elaborate on this in any greater detail, may I take it as notice for that purpose?

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question then would be, and I do not gather from the answer of the Minister that the question can be answered: Will the public or the members have a copy of the report before the action is taken on the report?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I think I would have to reserve any comment or decision on that until we have received the advice of the subcommittee of the branch of the department that is presently examining the report. I think that is quite appropriate under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, and will be dealt with in that manner.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the hon. Prime Minister.

Will the Premier advise what cutbacks the government is planning—do you have a question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: There was a question submitted to my office from the member for Grey-Bruce for the Prime Minister's office and it was 'phoned, as is the custom—would the member yield me the floor for a moment?

In order that the House may understand what happens to these questions—they are brought in any time up to 12 o'clock on the day—except Fridays, when they come in, we hope before 9—and they are telephoned to the secretary in charge of the office of the Minister on question. The Minister then has the

telephoned copy which is read back by the secretary to my secretary to work from.

Finding that some of the Ministers do not have the same questions as the members had, I have now instituted the procedure that a copy of the question as telephoned and initialed is placed on the Minister's desk on the day the question is to be asked, before the House opens. So that, if he has not had a copy of it in his office, he has a copy of it in front of him when the question is asked and he can at least take it as notice with some intelligent comment.

Subject to the aberrations of secretaries and pageboys this should work, because the member receives back through his caucus office immediately after 12 noon another carbon copy of the question, duly initialed and marked.

I would hope, therefore, that we would have no problem, in having the questions as submitted reach the Minister to whom they are directed and asked by the member in the terms they were submitted. The member will ask his question. If the Prime Minister has not received it, then at least he can take it as notice.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Premier advise what cutbacks the government is planning due to the gross provincial debt of $3.5 billion, which is an increase of more than $450 million from last year, exceeding income by $1.5 million per day.

What plans does the Premier have for the financing of these increasing deficits?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is really no problem with this question because it is precisely the same question the hon. member asked a week or so ago and my answer will have to be exactly the same.

The policy of the government in regard to deficits in financing and expenditures is set out in the Budget statement put before this House by the Provincial Treasurer on March 21. If the hon. member will read it, he will find the answer there.

Mr. Sargent: A question to the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Kenneth Cheng, director of the Ontario statistical centre, suggested a revision of the law in regard to privacy of the individual in the development of central data banks. Will the Minister guarantee the House that computerized information on individuals and businesses and personal dossiers will not be transferred to anyone without the permission of the individual, and that citizens will be given their records once a year to check their accuracy?

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this may have some reference to the activities conducted under The Department of the Treasury and the question has been referred to the Provincial Treasurer for reply.

Mr. Speaker: The Provincial Treasurer, I believe, had a copy of it and probably will take it as notice?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will have to take some of the substance of the hon. member's question as notice, although I can say that certain statutory provisions exist within the ambit of our taxation laws that do provide for secrecy.

It conforms, of course, to the statutory provisions at the federal level and, indeed, I think, associated with all tax statutes. The extent to which I will ask the hon. member's to allow me notice is to examine into the substance of this question and deal with it in greater detail on another occasion, if I may and if necessary.

Mr. Speaker: The leader of the Opposition may now place his question.

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Attorney General: Does the Attorney General now believe that glue-sniffing is taking on dangerous proportions in Ontario? And can we expect regulatory legislation at this session?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I would use the words "dangerous proportions." I do not believe this matter has reached that stage of use or effect. I would think perhaps we might say that the problem has given us considerable concern. It is serious to a degree, but I am certainly not prepared to say it is a dangerous problem in Ontario at this time.

No decision has been taken at this time as to legislation by the province and in that regard I would point out that a province has a very limited jurisdiction to control a situation of this kind. If it were to be regarded as a criminal offence to use it or to sell it, put it in the hands of a person, then it certainly falls within the criminal field and is federal legislation.

If it falls within the food and drug area, if it falls within the control area of drugs

or foods that could be put to a dangerous use, or might have a dangerous effect, then it is also in The Food and Drug Act area of the federal government. The only areas of jurisdiction where the province could deal with it would be perhaps in two ways—the first one marketing. Glue, in itself, is a common commodity. It is intended in an innocent, useful purpose and it would be extremely difficult, as I am sure hon. members will understand, to limit the marketing of a common commodity such as glue, butter or sugar, or whatever one might suggest. The other way we might get at it, would be to make it an offence to be found in an intoxicated or hallucinogenic condition as a result of it. This would be analogous to our liquor legislation. But again the analogy is not very good, because alcohol is a substance which has a special purpose. It is not a common commodity on the common marketplace for an innocent purpose such as glue.

So we have a very limited approach if we are to deal with this matter. I am concerned. We have discussed this with police chiefs and police bodies, particularly with the Toronto board of education, and with certain individuals who are also concerned. I think that we all have a responsibility here.

What I would like to point out is that glue sniffing in itself is simply just a particular evidence of a symptom which is a general situation, an attitude which is abroad at this time. To pass legislation, if we could, to control its use, or misuse, would perhaps only lead to the user's discovery of another substance such as gasoline, or nail polish, or vanilla extract, or something else that would be used to create another sensation.

I think that there is a great responsibility on parents—if I may say so, a primary responsibility—and certainly on teachers. I am sure that responsibility is accepted. Under present legislation in the criminal code, or some of our Acts relating to juvenile persons, we can bring to the court persons found in a damaged or dangerous, or intoxicated condition, and then charge them with an offence.

This is being done. That legislation has the effect of bringing home to persons who are indulging in glue sniffing, the danerous situation in which they personally may find themselves, and that they may be brought before the courts and dealt with. If I might, Mr. Speaker—I have before me a study made on solvent sniffing, and I would like to quote from it. It is called "solvent sniffing", and is a very complete study of the effects, the use, the prevalence and the legislative attempts which have been made in various states of the United States to control this matter. This is a study from last year which was published in volume 39 of *Pediatrics* in March, 1967.

Mr. Nixon: That might be of assistance, there are two provinces that have legislation on that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I was going to come to that. This study was done by the Illinois department of health and department of pediatrics, in conjunction with the University of Utah, college of medicine. The conclusions of this very extensive and thorough article are what I should like to quote, and it is in the last paragraph. This is what they arrived at one year ago:

> Legislation has been adopted or proposed in many cities and in several major states in an attempt to control the problem, but its effectiveness remains open to question.

Mr. Speaker, I can scarcely hear myself.

Mr. Speaker: It would appear that the microphone is probably not working well, and there is a considerable undercurrent of noise in the House. I do not know if the Minister's microphone is turned to pick up his voice properly or not, but let us try it again now, and perhaps the members will be more silent.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Continuing to quote:

> Statutes aimed at restricting distribution rather than abuse of solvents is made difficult by the ubiquitousness of substances which can produce such effects. Thus, while a particular product such as plastic cement may be the current favourite, legislation aimed at it alone is not only discriminatory, but may actually be harmful by forcing the use of alternate substances which are potentially more dangerous.
>
> Statutes aimed at abuse of the solvents, namely prohibition of inhalation, with the intent of intoxication, provide a mechanism whereby offenders can be apprehended, and hopefully subjected to treatment, and may have some deterrent value. However, if interpreted literally they could be difficult to enforce, and could technically be construed to prohibit alcohol, tobacco and caffeine, as well as glue.
>
> Individual and family treatment aimed at the underlying disorder offers the best

hope of effecting a permanent cure of the habitué.

In this country, we have in British Columbia and I believe in Alberta, legislation on this matter. In British Columbia, the legislation prohibits the use of marijuana and LSD—prohibits the giving of it to certain persons. The Alberta Act goes a little further, but neither one of them, as far as our studies go, seem to have been effective and do not deal with this problem in any way. All I would say further, in answer to the hon. member, is that there are many difficulties in our approach with legislation. We have concern and studies are going forward. As I say, certain court action is being taken which I think may have a very good deterrent effect.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the Attorney General: Would it not be possible simply to make it illegal to sell the products—and it could be an extensive list or a small list of products—to individuals under a certain age? Do we not have some sort of legislation about tobacco like that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have thought of this, Mr. Speaker, but if you are dealing with glue, here is a substance which you cannot really relate to tobacco. Glue is a commodity which is in common use for the ordinary simple purposes of construction of articles or fastening things together. Perhaps we could pass such legislation. I have grave doubts as to how effective you could make it. A package of glue comes with the model airplane or model boat in many cases. Is that to be an offence? Can we enforce such legislation?

All I can say to the hon. member is we are studying this problem, which presents many difficulties, and I hope we may come up with an answer. But it is certainly no simple matter. As I say, there is an underlying disorder—in the words of this article—of which glue sniffing is a symptom today, and if we put glue out of business, then it will probably be gasoline or extract tomorrow.

Mr. Nixon: Just one last question. The Minister is aware that the glue is not ordinary glue as he refers to it, but a toluene-base glue that seems to be popular.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, I am aware.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, on Monday last, the hon. member for High Park asked a question in two parts, which I took as notice. I would like to reply, now.

The first part of the question was: Has the Minister investigated charges by Matron Shirley H. regarding the cause of a sitdown strike of female prisoners at Don jail on May 19, 1968?

Second: Will the Minister reveal the results of that investigation to the House?

Mr. Speaker, I shall answer both parts of this question at the same time. I am advised that persons incarcerated in the Metropolitan Toronto jail receive three slices of bread with their meals. After they have eaten this allotment, they may return for additional bread if they so desire. This policy is followed at the jail in order to prevent wastage.

My information is that, on May 19, a very small group of inmates refused briefly to return to their cells because they wanted to be able to take unlimited supplies of bread in the first instance when the meal was served. They requested to speak to the assistant deputy governor. Subsequently, he spoke to them and they returned to their cells. This was the end of the so-called "sitdown strike," which lasted less than 15 minutes.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is not unreasonable to expect that an hon. member should refrain from taking up the time of this House with such an insignificant incident? Endowing a minor occurrence with the dignity of discussion in the Legislature of Ontario magnifies it out of all proportion and is an incentive to disruptive actions on the part of a few hard-core disgruntled prisoners, some of whom are to be found in every penal system in the world. The disruption that can result from such unfortunate publicity of minor incidents can only serve to damage the programmes and security of these institutions, thereby jeopardizing the safety of the public as well as those directly concerned.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to you that my question had to do with charges laid by the matron. The Minister has not answered my question. He has followed his usual practice and given us a sermon.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, the letters to which the hon. member referred, I have studied in detail, and the writer of these letters did not even mention a sitdown strike.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, that is not the question I asked. The question I asked, Mr. Speaker, was: Did the Minister investigate charges laid by a matron? I would like an answer to my question.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The question, Mr. Speaker, was: Has the Minister investigated charges by Matron Shirley H. regarding the cause of a sitdown strike of female prisoners in Don jail on May 19, 1968? I submit to you, sir—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And I submit to you, sir, that I answered that.

Mr. Speaker: If the member for High Park has any supplementary question, proper to the original question, I am sure he has the floor for it. Otherwise, the Minister has answered the question as he feels he should answer it, and that is his prerogative.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE TRAINING SCHOOLS ACT, 1965

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions) moves second reading of Bill 128, An Act to amend The Training Schools Act, 1965.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, is this the one that grants what might be called a ticket of leave, or is it the following one?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, Mr. Speaker, this is deleting from The Training Schools Act all those provisions which require municipalities to pay for the transportation of children, and so on, to training schools.

Mr. Speaker: If there is no further debate, is it the pleasure of the House that the second reading of Bill 128 carry?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT, 1968

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves second reading of Bill 129, The Department of Correctional Services Act, 1968.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park —I am sorry, the leader of the Opposition has prior right to the floor.

Mr. Nixon: Thanks, Mr. Speaker, I indicated when I rose for the previous bill, but I was in error, it was on this one that I wanted to make some brief remarks.

Certainly we approve of the change in name of the department, in that it would follow the philosophy of the department, emphasizing the correctional aspects of the Minister's responsibility. We have had a rather full discussion of the work of his department in the past few days. One comment that the Minister made I thought was of some particular importance. It might indicate that this bill contains a considerable breakthrough in a problem that has faced penal systems in many jurisdictions.

It has been raised in the House on many occasions—the special and unnatural problems that are faced by inmates of the Minister's institutions, and the fact that they are lacking the normal circumstances of family life. There have been suggestions made that we might at least study, if not copy, the attempts in, I believe, Louisiana and Mexico and some other jurisdictions, at making up for this unnatural circumstance which is bound to lead to increased difficulties in the institutions, particularly for those inmates who are serving some lengthy sentences.

The Minister indicated in an aside during his remarks that this bill might in fact contain at least a partial solution to this problem, and at the discretion of those in his department it would be possible to grant a leave of up to 15 days for specific purposes having to do with the harvesting of crops and other family circumstances. I gathered from the Minister's remarks that these family circumstances might be interpreted in a rather broader light than those which he had listed specifically, and it is in this connection that I believe there might be the breakthrough that I see possible in the bill as it is before us.

If that is so, I think that it would be a most commendable circumstance and that the Minister is giving himself and the officials in his department some considerable flexibility in meeting this continuing problem, if I make myself clear.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the principle of Bill

129 I should like to lend my support to the changes being made. Other jurisdictions use the term corrections—the state of Ohio refers to The Department of Mental Hygiene and Corrections; the state of Oregon, to the corrections division; the state of Wisconsin to its division of corrections.

One of the expressions that many of us heard in our youth, perhaps without understanding it fully at the time, was "give a dog a bad name and he will live up to it." The truth that is revealed in this saying has led to the changing of nomenclature in the field of penology. Young offenders seem to replace juvenile delinquents. Convicts, jailbirds and the like are now terms that are studiously avoided by most of those who are concerned with the rehabilitating of those who run afoul of the law, and for this reason I believe that The Department of Correctional Services is a great improvement over The Department of Reform Institutions.

At St. Leonard's house, in Windsor, there is accommodation for 18 guests; not ex-prisoners, not ex-convicts, not parolees or releasees—the word is guests. In fact the insignia of St. Leonard's house sets an admirable, if unattainable, standard for the treatment of those who seek its services. The motto on the St. Leonard's house insignia is, "Let all guests be received as Christ."

In all human relations, Mr. Speaker, and in all human communication, the choice of words is very important. The choice of words reflects immediately the attitude of the speaker—of any speaker, not Mr. Speaker—and hate literature can be identified very quickly by the choice of vocabulary that is used. I believe that this change in name will bring with it a greater emphasis on rehabilitation, and it is further obvious that the better the rehabilitation, the better the protection of the community. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I support the change of name and am happy that Ontario is catching up in this respect with other jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak in this debate before the Minister? The Minister, if he has any comments.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is too much comment called for by me. Both the hon. members have agreed with the principle of the bill. I agree wholeheartedly with everything they have said in support of the bill and I am glad that they are in agreement with it. I might just add that the comments of the leader of the Opposition have not gone unnoticed; that the references which he made to the certain situations which concern us all, are certainly involved in the ultimate programme of what is envisaged in this bill. However, let me assure the hon. members we will proceed with a great deal of caution, because the bill is breaking new ground. The specific references the hon. leader of the Opposition has mentioned, we think will present themselves in this new programme and perhaps in a more dignified fashion than in those other jurisdictions he referred to.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT, 1965

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) moves second reading of Bill 134, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I presume this bill is to try to protect a little more, the pension benefits that are earned by employees after a certain length of service and having reached a certain age. Regardless of what happens to the company, does this protect the benefits in case the company does cease to operate? Does any plan that is approved have to make provision that even though the company ceases to operate, this retirement benefit will become due and payable at the time that the man reaches normal retirement age? If so, I think this is a very fine bill to have as added protection.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I had contemplated—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the Minister allow me to see if there is any other member who wishes to engage in this debate? The member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I was just going to inquire about one thing, and possibly the Minister might be coming to this point in his explanation. The bill, in principle, apparently is to allow the commission to take over when it is of the opinion that the employer has discontinued or is in the process. I am wondering if the Minister in his explanation might enlighten the House as to how the commission expects to be aware of the fact, or the presumption, that the company is going to discontinue.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member wishing to speak to this bill? If not, the Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would like, Mr. Speaker, to make a statement that I hope in general terms would clarify the questions of the two hon. members who have addressed the House. Then I might, upon completion of the statement, deal with the question put by the hon. member for Kitchener in maybe more specific detail.

This bill contains two provisions which are intended to protect the employee's interest in deferred life annuities in special circumstances. The special circumstances are (a) when a pension plan is voluntarily wound up, and (b) when an employer commences to discontinue business prior to winding up a plan. Under the present Act there was no question that an employee who was employed with the employer at the time the plan was wound up was protected, but it was not clear whether or not the same protection was extended to former employees who qualified for a deferred annuity but who were no longer employed. The amendment is intended to clarify this situation, but there has been no change in the basic entitlement provision.

It has come to the attention of the commission that in some instances where an employer is in the process of discontinuing his business he may encourage his employees to leave prior to winding up the plan. In these circumstances such employees may be losing certain entitlements and indeed—and I am digressing from the statement that is before me—there have been one or more sporadic instances of this; just enough, incidentally, to trigger the amendment we are proposing here today. Fortunately, there have not been too many but there could be more. In order to protect these employees, the commission has the right to deem a pension plan wound up. It should be noted, however, that the employer has the right to appeal the decision of the commission.

This brings me then to the question raised by the hon. member for Kitchener. I agree with him, it is a very difficult thing to define; it will have to be a judgment decision. I must say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of the House, that we will have to rely on judgment decision because it is an area where there can be very little precision. But I think this legislation is required to empower the commission to anticipate these situations and move in and deem such an action as being either contemplated or taking place, to provide the protection that is required.

Against that, then, we have provided for the appeal provisions that, if the commission does anticipate a situation, that, upon examination or that can be supported by a position of the employer, in fact is not the case, the employer then has the right of appeal. I recognize, Mr. Speaker—and I raised this same question when the legislation was being drafted and considered—that it is far from precise, but I do not know how we can be precise and give the protection that is required.

I would like to make a comment about section 5. I could actually, at this point, go into an example, if the hon. members who have posed questions would be interested in a more specific example. I hope, however, that I have covered this situation satisfactorily enough.

While there has been no question raised with respect to section 5, I just would like to mention to the House that this has to do with portability. It has come to our attention that there is a conceivability that another province may enact legislation which is substantially similar to the legislation in Ontario, but which may differ in one or more particular aspects.

As an example, when the province of Saskatchewan enacted The Pension Benefits Act, they made provision in their Act to allow regulations to be made which would exempt females from the requirements of—45 being the age eligibility factor and ten years being the vesting period—they exempted females from this requirement. It would have been difficult for Ontario to enter then into any reciprocal agreement, or to designate Saskatchewan as being a province in which there was substantially similar legislation, unless we could recognize the difference and introduce a regulation which would allow us to administer pension plans for employees in Saskatchewan in line with the legislation in that province.

At this present moment there is no need for this, as Saskatchewan's Act and regulations are substantially different. However, any other province could enact legislation and this section would allow us to designate that province when there is a difference in the legislation and provide for continuing portability.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE INCOME TAX ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves second reading of Bill 136, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I just want really to get some information. It could be asked at another stage.

These, of course, are funds collected by the federal government, and they are then abated to us—I believe that is the word that is used. It has occurred to us on this side that the necessity of Bill 136 coming in year after year, is really a basis of agreement, rather than an enactment of this House. I wonder if the Minister could explain how he deals with the government of Canada in this regard and the necessity of the bill?

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other members who wish to engage in this debate? The Provincial Treasurer has the floor.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, this is the form required by the federal government, for giving notice to them of our own intention, with respect to personal income tax.

I think it would be obvious to the hon. leader of the Opposition and members of the House that they need and require time to prepare their tax return forms and schedules. If it was the intention of the provincial government to impose a personal income tax in excess of the abatement percentage, then notice would have to be given to the federal government, for administrative purposes. This is the means of giving them that notice.

I might say that at the last conference of finance Ministers, this matter was discussed with the federal Minister of Finance—indeed, it was advanced by Ontario that it is a rather restrictive method of giving notice, doing it in this manner at this time. It boxes us in to a very considerable extent if we elect to change our Act.

It was generally concurred in by, I think, the federal Deputy Minister at that time and some of his advisors that there could be another opportunity to give notice if any changes in this particular area of taxation were contemplated. I am given assurance now that they would entertain, say, two opportunities to give notice a year, rather than the one.

Mr. Nixon: The other one could be an order-in-council?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The means of giving notice, I might say, were not considered. The principle was concurred in. They agreed with us that it was too restrictive, in the light of circumstances that could change, and that we might elect to consider these things. But the means of doing it, other than by this rather restrictive method, were not considered.

I think the principle was accepted and I think we will have an opportunity to work it out when we confer with them, before too long, in terms of the renewal of our tax agreement. They saw some wisdom in the flexibility of this, so, hopefully, if we can develop a means of providing this notice that is not as restrictive and gives us another opportunity to give further notice, if circumstances make it necessary to change the position that we now propose in this bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves second reading of Bill 137, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves second reading of Bill 138, An Act to establish The Department of Revenue.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, these two bills separate the responsibilities of the Provincial Treasurer into two departments. I have a disinclination to favour the proliferation of government departments. The recommendations of the Smith committee on this aspect did not seem to have sufficient argument to set up a completely separate department, except for tidiness and ease of understanding the administration.

I would surely hope and expect that there would not be the necessity of a separate Minister at the provincial level to administer the new department that is created by Bill 138, and by its companion Bill 137. If there is any reason to think otherwise, we could perhaps make more extensive comment at that time. The reason for separating it into a separate department, except for neatness of

administration, is really difficult to understand.

It would tend, I suppose, to restrict the activities of the public servants that are presently in the staff of the Treasury. They would think of themselves as being restricted only to revenue, and it would take a Cabinet committee so that they would be in proper contact, at the top level at least, with their former colleagues in The Department of the Treasury. Perhaps I am setting up difficulties that will not occur, and yet it is not at all apparent why the greater good of the province is served by yet another department, in a Cabinet, in an administration that has grown over the years to its present large size.

I could stand to be corrected in this, but I believe that there are now 24 separate departments, which is as big, as far as the number of departments is concerned, as the government of Canada, and bigger than any other provincial administration. I do believe that there is an advantage in focusing responsibility in a smaller number of departments. The Provincial Treasurer may feel that his responsibilities have grown to the point where he no longer feels able to handle them, and yet my expectations would be that one Minister would continue with both responsibilities.

The Premier (Mr. Robarts) is not present to add his comments on that eventuality, but I would be very glad to hear the justification that the Provincial Treasurer has for the division of his job.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: I would just like to inquire of the Minister his reasons for the change from the present standard of The Department of the Treasury now to be The Department of Treasury and Economics, with the addition of this Department of Revenue. It would appear to me that the function of the Treasury board would be the major one to be retained by the Minister as Provincial Treasurer. I am wondering if he would explain the necessity for the establishment of a separate department with respect to provincial revenue, would he enlighten the House as to the retained functions of Treasury and his expectations of this as a separate department?

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering why the Minister is in such a hurry to introduce this change of organization prior to the white paper being prepared by the select committee on taxation? This has already been observed to be following a suggestion in the Smith committee, which as the hon. leader of the Opposition mentioned, is not very fully supported. I feel that there could be a little more care given in the decision of whether it is necessary to set up a separate department in this phase, which is so often followed by increased overhead. We already see some duplication—in fact, considerable duplication of effort—on the part of The Treasury Department in connection with The Succession Duty Act, and corporation tax work, where, particularly in connection with succession duties, we find work being duplicated that has already been done by the federal authorities, and resulting in considerable delay in release of estates. It seems to me that the whole matter of the study of this separate department, as recommended by the Smith report, should be held over until we get a report from the select committee on taxation.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, much of what has been said I would agree with, particularly in the queries that have been put to the Minister as to exactly what is in the government's mind. What puzzles me about this move is that it strikes me as being to some degree a parallel of the kind of thing that the government did in the instance of separating out The Department of Transport from The Department of Highways. You had a department whose main job was to build highways, so you separated out the routine detail, and you created a new department that was going to be given a real *raison d'être* in terms of doing planning of transportation, real research work. What has happened? The research work has disappeared from The Department of Transport. I am not objecting to that; it has come back into your department to a considerable extent, into the Treasury but what is left of The Department of Transport?

What are you doing in this case? You are separating out the routine aspects of raising revenue from the whole budgetary, research and economic aspects of the department. It seems to me that we are getting such proliferation here that we are going to end up with an unwieldy bureaucracy—an unnecessary number of departments. We have already suggested from this side of the House, in the instance of The Department of Transport, that if it is not going to be a really meaningful department, let research go where it really is going—to the new Department of the Treasury —and put Transport back as a branch of Highways. I am tempted to venture the prediction that this will be half a department at

best, dealing with routine matters such as the collecting of revenues.

I think that we reach a point, somewhere around 20, in terms of Cabinet Ministers, where you begin to get depreciating returns. When you have added two or three more departments I think that you are creating an unwieldy bureaucracy.

An hon. member: Too many chiefs.

Mr. MacDonald: There are a lot of chiefs that they want to put to work, and maybe that is the purpose. Maybe it is the same as with Indians. Every time we get a new programme it is to provide jobs for the whites, and not to serve the Indians. Maybe in this instance it is to provide jobs for the Tories and not to serve the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sarnia.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I would ask you, along with myself and my colleagues on this side of the House, to cast your mind back to about eight weeks ago. We were debating here the elevation of the motor vehicle fuel tax, and The Gasoline Tax Act. We spent probably eight hours of one day in this House putting to the hon. Minister the question of the regressiveness of these taxes and imploring him to take a more vigorous attitude in the more progressive tax field available to him. He said, and I believe rightly so, "You must bear with me, if you would, because we have the Smith report, but we have not had the opportunity of digesting it fully."

I did accept that premise at that time, as much as I was opposed to the regressiveness of those taxes. But to elaborate here for just a moment on what my hon. leader has said, one week after the government has established a select committee to investigate this very report, here we have it establishing a new department of the government.

It is almost incomprehensible to find that the Minister would take this position now. Surely to goodness it is incumbent upon him to listen to the brief and read the briefs and get the report of his select committee before he undertakes a step of this consequence—the establishment of a new department of government and all the consequences thereof.

I ask him to relate this, for example, in connection with transport. The hon. member for York South has mentioned The Department of Transport. What about the revenues through The Department of Transport? Are they to be channelled eventually through The Department of Revenue? One example, again of an undue proliferation of government, something that the leader of our party has taken issue with strenuously.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further debate before the Minister replies? The Provincial Treasurer has the floor.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Again, Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of yourself and the members of the House, I would like to put a statement on the record, and possibly comment on some of the questions and observations that have been raised.

The two bills before us provide for a fundamental change in the organization of this government, and my preliminary remarks will cover both pieces of legislation. I hope to provide the hon. members with the rationale behind the organization, or reorganization. Our objective is to provide for greater specialization and proficiency in our financial and economic operations, in recognition of the pressures resulting from a rising level of governmental involvement in our social and economic evolution. Our growing revenue requirements, particularly in the area of priority investments, intensified the need for application of a greater degree of scientific research and skill to our financial management and revenue administration.

I digress from this point at this particular moment, and I say this is not new. I have made these observations from very shortly following the time of my appointment to this present portfolio. It became apparent, very early in the responsibilities that were assigned to me a year ago November, that this was a great necessity. Indeed, shortly following that, statements were made which explained to the public, while the House was not in session, that the very substantial restructuring of the department had already been made as far back as December 15.

Mr Nixon: The Minister's predecessor had lots more problems.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I think I will regard that as beside the point for the moment.

The Budget statement and accompanying papers which I presented to the Legislature this spring—and, indeed, for the year previous—outlined the sobering problem ahead of us in meeting the prerequisites of this rapidly maturing jurisdiction. And I digress again to say that I think that we have placed before the members of this Legislature the budge-

tary, economic and matters facing the government in more detail, the supporting material, than has ever been done before. I do not say we are perfect yet, Mr. Speaker, but we are moving in this direction.

Two distinct areas of organization delineate themselves among the present operations in The Department of Treasury. One is required to ensure that the thrust of our fiscal activities contributes optimum benefits to our economy and maximum advantage to our people. The other is necessary to provide for fair and efficient administration of our revenue legislation. So sensitive and critical, in my opinion, are both of these functions that the government believes each merits singular and precise attention by a separate department of this administration.

Under the legislation before this House, The Department of Treasury and Economics will undertake the responsibility for recommending and implementing broad government policy on revenue and expenditure programmes. Its title retains the traditional designation for the financial heart of a government, and recognizes the importance of its role in the production and distribution of wealth and associated benefits in this province.

The Department of Revenue will concentrate on the equitable and proficient administration of taxation statutes, and other revenue legislation which may be assigned to it. This specialization acknowledges the right of the public to receive just treatment in the enforcement of laws required to finance the services this House deems necessary, and desirable. While I believe the reasons for the division of this responsibility are evident, I am pleased to cite specific recommendations and precedents on which the hon. members may make their own judgment.

I refer to the report of the Ontario committee on taxation, and I quote a portion of paragraph 7, of chapter 25, which sums up the concern of the committee for a change in organizational structure, and I quote:

> Among the possible structural alternatives, it is our considered opinion that a separate department in which the main revenue responsibilities are brought together offers the greatest advantages. Such a department would facilitate the consolidation of assessment collection and appeal procedures for all major revenues statutes. While consolidation might admittedly be possible within the structure of an existing department, a revenue department would emphasize by the very fact of its distinct departmental status responsibility for efficient and equitable administration of tax statutes.

In addition, separating tax policy formulation from tax administration would enhance, in the public eye, the importance the government attaches to revenue raising policy. It would enable The Treasury Department to concentrate its attention on broad questions on fiscal and economic policy. We note that, to all appearances, experience with both the federal Department of National Revenue and The Department of Revenue in the province of Quebec has been highly favourable.

This recommendation is similar to the conclusion reached by the Glassco commission after its comprehensive study of operations at the federal level. The hon. members of this House who have urged the government to follow this guideline in refining our provincial operations, I would hope would welcome this further development.

The concern expressed by the Smith committee for preservation of civil rights relating to taxation has been much more thoroughly explored by Mr. Justice McRuer. His report presented to this Legislature a few weeks ago, gives added weight to the recommendation of the Smith committee.

The Department of Treasury and Economics says the policy recommending arm of government must assume a vital role in four broad areas of immediate and urgent concern. Paramount is the reform of provincial tax structure to which the government is dedicated. Closely associated is the rationalization of the intergovernmental taxation arrangements, which I believe is critical to the realization of both national and provincial objectives.

The third challenge relates to the direction and restraint of government expenditures toward priority investment and economic viability.

Finally, the government wishes to accelerate the management and supervisory programmes which have been established to improve efficiency and effectiveness of its activities and administration.

The hon. members will be aware that the economic component of the government organization joined The Treasury Department late last year in the first move toward restructuring our financial administration. Our economists are working closely with the Treasury board secretariat to provide a unified organization dealing with an economic

financial and fiscal taxation policy and federal-provincial affairs.

This new structure will be linked intimately with the Cabinet committee on policy development, established by the Prime Minister earlier this year, by consolidating the Cabinet committee on economics and finance, and the Cabinet committee on regional development. This consolidation also recognizes the need to apply scientific control to the development of policies.

Perhaps I can best describe the organizational flow in relation to preparation of the annual Budget. The Cabinet committee on policy development will meet in advance of the budgetarial review process to recommend basic guidelines on expenditure and revenue programmes for the coming year. The resulting decision of Cabinet will be implemented by the Treasury board during its consideration of departmental estimates. The Department of Treasury and Economics will provide the supplementary staff for both the determination and implementation of government policy during this process. The statistical and analytical research required for the formulation and assessment of alternatives will be supplied to the policy committee of Cabinet by the economic component of the department.

Treasury board, in its surveillance of expenditure and managerial operations, will be assisted by the Treasury side of the department. The integration of these input and output procedures within the department will ensure a co-ordinated approach to the broader aspects of government activity.

This outline I hope will serve to relate the general relationship of the new Department of Treasury and Economics to governmental operations. Members will have an opportunity to review the more detailed organization when the estimates for the present Tresury department come before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope and trust that these remarks will place this legislation in perspective for the hon. members. I believe this development is both realistic and requisite in the refinement of our organization. It demonstrates this administration's concern for the financial challenge facing us and our determination to resolve it with effective use of scientific and technological resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to comment briefly on some of the questions that have been proposed by hon. members, may I—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order before the Minister goes on.

A number of times we have attempted to come to grips with the most efficient procedure in dealing with second readings. With respect, I think the Minister has violated what I thought was the appropriate approach—namely, if the Minister has a statement in addition to a statement that he may have made on first reading, that he give it first.

This is not precluding conclusion of the debate, but what you have done in effect, is to have explained your understanding of the operation of the bill at a time when we, in the Opposition, are cut off. We cannot even get up and ask a question.

I would think that if that statement had been made at the beginning of the second reading, then we could have taken it into account when we asked questions. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I have one question I want to throw in before the Minister replies.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I might say that at the beginning of the debate on the previous bills and on this one, the Minister endeavoured to get to his fee. But, not knowing what he had, and going on the agreement that the Minister would speak last, I gave the floor to the Opposition. So, in order that we have the matter properly dealt with today—yes, I am confirmed in what I was about to say by the advice of the Clerk of the House, who is most experienced in these matters.

What I was about to say was that we would still endeavour to abide by the previous agreement, but that I saw no objection to the leader of the Opposition—or the leader of the New Democratic Party or indeed, any member who had engaged in the debate—asking the Minister, in this instance, if he would clarify for the member any part of the remarks made by the Minister.

In other words, I would not like this to be a precedent so that we can continue the debates hereafter, but I think in this instance, it is quite in order.

So the member for York South has the floor and then, if any of the other members who had engaged in the debate, wish to ask a question it will be quite satisfactory.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not know whether I understand you or not, Mr. Speaker, but in my view—and I am not being argumentative—the statement the Minister just made was an appropriate statement to make at the

beginning of second reading. When we respond over here, we put questions and the Minister replies.

Mr. Nixon: Well, if I may speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The leader of the Opposition has the floor at the moment.

Mr. Nixon: It was on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, and it perhaps would be even more useful if the sort of statement that the Minister has made would be made on first reading, as part of the introduction of the bill. It would then be on the record for us to consider as we approach second reading and the consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I just simply wanted to observe that I have no quarrel with what is being proposed here today. I simply felt that I was keeping within the rules that had been prescribed by the chair. I have no objection to this at all. None at all.

Mr. MacDonald: No, no, the rules—as prescribed by the chair, and as discussed by the party leaders—are: The Minister makes a statement on first reading, if he wishes to make a further statement on second reading he does so. Otherwise, he says, "I have made my explanation of the bill in first reading."

The Minister, on this occasion, has come forward with further elaboration which—in my view, not being argumentative, but in my view—was appropriate for the beginning of the second reading. However, we have sorted it out. I hope that we are back on the track. The first thing I wanted to—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order please! May I just be sure that there is no misunderstanding. I think that the Minister did try to make that statement and I indicated that he should retain his seat, because I did not know the type of statement which he was making. I think it is a complete misunderstanding. The member for York South has the floor.

Mr. MacDonald: The question I wanted raised with the Minister, in attempting to get a picture of exactly what the government is going to do in separating out the revenue raising in this new department, is in reference to the special statutes that come under this department as set forth in section 4. It lists The Corporations Act, and so on—there are 13 of them.

I am interested in noting these, but what I am even more interested in is what remaining statutes or revenue raising activity, is left scattered with departments through the rest of the government. It would seem to me that the sole justification of this department is that it would clean up this untidy business of so many departments being involved in the collection of money for the government.

If it is all going to be centralized in The Department of Revenue, then at least I begin to get on your wavelength and I understand the rationale. But my specific question to the Minister is: Is The Department of Transport, for example, still being left with some collections, such as licence fees? Are other departments, like Social and Family Services, left with collecting revenues because it happens to be done in their offices? Whether it be the offices of the Minister of Social and Family Services, or The Department of Transport, does the money then go directly to The Department of Revenue rather than being circuited through that department?

This is the kind of thing I would like to get a clear picture of.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I realize that there may be some irregularities in this in terms of second reading. I attach enough importance to the legislation before the House, to ask you to permit a little dialogue in this respect. But I will not take these questions in order.

I think the hon. member for York South has put his finger on it. And I think what he suggests supports the reason for the division of the department. There are a number of things which I dealt with in very general terms. I will attempt to be more specific.

A select committee has been set up to pursue the recommendations of the Smith committee report—and the terms of reference provide for this—to examine the briefs that have already been submitted and to hear more presentations as they travel throughout the province, if requests are made in some formal manner.

However, I would remind the hon. member —and remind the House—that we started the process of this examination immediately upon publication of the Smith committee report and we have done exhaustive studies on it in an internal way. We have set up a central task force to examine these things. I am mixing my observations to the hon. member

for York South to some extent with comments for the hon. member for Sarnia.

I cannot for the life of me see that what has been proposed here to bring a representative group of the members into a study of this important thing, needs to either negate what we have done or to stop that process going on at the same time because they are two different kettles of fish, I suggest.

There is the administrative problem associated with these things and I think only the advisors to government can examine this. I do not think that becomes the function of the select committee, nor do the terms of reference prescribe it. I am not trying to generalize on this situation too much, but again, I go back to the observation of the hon. member for York South on that. I think the hon. member for York South has put his finger on the reasons for dividing this department.

Let us examine the 350 recommendations of Smith on the one hand, and some of the recommendations of Mr. Justice McRuer on the other. I do submit to the House that then the whole function of the revenue administrative side, as a collaborative and a supporting arm to the revenue policy-making side which will still be vested in the Provincial Treasurer will become a very important joint responsibility. I suggest that, if we are going to pursue this in the kind of detail required to reach the kind of conclusions that we all must reach—to accomplish the taxation reform that I have already stated to this House and that myself and the government are committed to, I suggest this is going to make it much more possible than it would otherwise have been.

Mr. MacDonald: What revenue collection is left with other departments?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am coming to the point of the revenues collected by other departments, and I suggest again if I may, that you have to start some place. I think this is a function that once these statutes or these bills are approved by this House and the functional aspects of the two departments get under way, then the examination of the very problems that the hon. member has made reference to—and appropriate reference to—can be dealt with in much more finite detail. This will enable us to reach earlier and more sensible conclusions than would otherwise be the case.

If we are going to continue in this province to mix revenue policy and administration all the time, I say to the House, you are going to find it very difficult to pursue this thing in terms of the speed, the essential speed that is required. I am not trying to gild a situation, here, Mr. Speaker. I feel very strongly about this. I feel very strongly about it or obviously I would not have proposed the legislation to the House.

I would like that to be accepted as fair. Now I do not know whether I have answered the hon. member's question in sufficient detail. We can come back to this when we examine the estimates. But, generally, we felt it would be better to pursue the matter by the more definitive situation. I say that with all sincerity to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the hon. members.

Reference was made, I think, by the hon. member for Kitchener, to the functions of Treasury board. I think he will find, if he examines the amendments to The Financial Administration Act, that the role and the functions of Treasury board have indeed probably been strengthened in the amendments that are proposed in that respect.

I think I have touched, if I may so, in sufficiently general terms to the question raised by the hon. member for Sarnia as to why this is being done in advance of the white paper and the work of the select committee. I have at least stated to you, sir, and to the House, the reasons that prompted us to proceed with this legislation. As far as research is concerned, pretty well the total economic research of the government is now centred in the research branch of the The Department of Treasury and as a result of the change implemented late last year when it was transferred to The Treasury Department.

The only remaining aspect of research that is left with certain departments—and I think quite appropriately—is applied research; research as it has an application to the department itself—broad, general economic research now is all concentrated under the chief economist, who is also presently the Deputy Provincial Treasurer, Economics and Finance.

I think it only remains then for me to make a comment on the observation of the hon. member for Sarnia again about our discussion during the passage of the tax legislation through the House a few short weeks ago—reference to the regressiveness of taxes; wait for select committee report again. I can only assure him again, in very general terms without being precise, that these are the very things that prompted this more finite split of the functions of The Treasury Department.

To get into further detail on that, Mr. Speaker, at this time, I think we might get a little bit beyond the discussion of the principle of the legislation so, for detailed purposes, I would propose to be available for discussion of this when we get down to the examination of it in House in committee, if you like, or under the estimates of the Treasury.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, one matter that you might permit me to question the Minister on. Does he believe that the divided jurisdiction will require the services of two Ministers?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would have to say to that, Mr. Speaker, that, in the fullness of time, the government will, in its great wisdom, make that decision and make its views known to this assembly.

Mr. Speaker: Has either of the other two members, who engaged originally in this debate, a question of the Minister at this time? The motion is for second reading of Bill 138. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves second reading of Bill 139, An Act to amend The Public Service Act, 1961-1962.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the Minister would give some further explanation to this amendment to The Public Service Act than is in the explanatory note.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak? The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The explanation, Mr. Speaker, would be that one of the proposed amendments in this bill clarifies the responsibilities of the civil service commission regarding salary recommendations, and it is complementary to a companion section in The Financial Administration Act, and bears reference to that amendment which provides that persons appointed to the official side of the joint council shall be responsible to Treasury board. It clarifies that.

The joint council is a forum made up of representatives of management on the one hand, and staff on the other. I would rather not pursue, in detail, the reasons that make this necessary, but I can assure the House, it needs some clarification, and that is the purpose of this amendment. The civil service commission, in support of this, will continue to make recommendations concerning salary ranges in each classification, unless the salary range is subject to negotiation under the provisions of section 19(a) and 19(b) of the Act. There are certain elements of The Public Service Act where matters of negotiation are not included. In all the other classifications, the civil service association of Ontario acts as their bargaining agent and has representatives on the staff side of joint council for that purpose; even pursued to such an extent that if negotiation fails, the process of arbitration follows. I think the hon. member is quite familiar with that.

This is for the purpose of clarifying the legislation in both Acts—The Financial Administration Act and The Public Service Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE, 1961-1962

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour) moves second reading of Bill 133, An Act to amend the Ontario human rights code, 1961-1962.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Oshawa.

Mr. Pilkey: Just a simple question. This is just incorporating this as part of The Employment Standards Act, is that correct? I gather that from the explanation—

Mr. Speaker: The member will complete his question and then if other members have questions, they will ask them and the Minister will answer them in turn, I would hope. Is there any other member with a question, or who wishes to engage in this debate? The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Bales: The hon. member is quite correct. The provision is included in The Employment Standards Act and is expanded there.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 112, An Act to establish the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

Bill 122, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Bill 123, An Act to amend The Medical Act.

Clerk of the House: The 8th order; committee of the whole House, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

THE SECURITIES ACT, 1966

House in committee on Bill 50, An Act to amend The Securities Act, 1966.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. Minister would indicate to the House as to why he feels the extra member is necessary, and why it is increased from four to five members?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Because we want to make provision, and be able to have a proper balance of representation on the securities commission itself.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. Lawlor: With respect to subsection 2 of the section, the reference, in the side notes, says that it eliminates certain powers, and goes over to item 2 of section 5 which, in return, refers over to section 21, subsection 4 of the existing legislation which, insofar as I can see, is exactly in the same terms as the new section being set out here, the repealed item 2. Since section 21 is incorporated in the existing item 2, why is it felt necessary to repeal item 2 and substitute what is already there?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I would almost like that question in writing. It is a technical matter, and this is the form in which the amendment was provided by the legislative counsel, and we in the department accept their advice.

Section 4 agreed to.

On section 5:

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): In connection with section 5, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the matter of ability to postpone hearings. It seems to be that somewhere —maybe I have the wrong part of the Act here—but somewhere, they can take action without a hearing, and could indefinitely postpone it in 15-day periods without giving—

Mr. Lawlor: Section 6.

Mr. Deacon: Have I got the wrong section?

Section 5 agreed to.

On section 6:

Mr. Deacon: Section 6 is the matter. I would like to see some limitation put on the number of periods of postponement of hearings. Has the Minister any comments on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, the matter was at the legal bills committee for discussion. I am not prepared to recommend an amendment as suggested.

Sections 6 to 12, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 13:

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, in connection with section 13, there is no provision in here for appeal in case someone who is trying to get a prospectus approved is stopped by the director and feels it is being arbitrarily prohibited. It seems to me there should be some basis of appeal to the commission or higher authority in case of the director arbitrarily refusing to issue a receipt for a prospectus. I think provision should be put in here for that.

Mr. Lawlor: Section 12; the member missed the boat.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: If we are reading from the same document—

Mr. Deacon: I am getting my numbers mixed up, I guess, from the old printing.

Sections 13 to 23, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 24:

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, under section 24, will it provide for mechanization of the matter of salesmen's licences and their termination, so that the department can notify salesmen in future when their licences have expired?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is our ultimate intention, but at present I think the rules provide for certain information and certain documentation, which requires this amendment to enable us to get into the sales forms and that sort of thing. But on the broad point which it appears the hon. member is

speaking about, it is our intention to carry this process right into the area he mentions.

Section 24 agreed to.

Sections 25 to 44, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 50 reported.

THE LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill 59, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Deacon: Section 2, sir. Mr. Chairman, I think it is objectionable in section 2, subsection 1, to have this provision about proof that there exists a public necessity for a trust or loan company or for an additional trust or loan company. I think this type of clause is conducive to practices which are not in keeping with private enterprise and the desire to keep service good by competition. It is very difficult for any body or board, or any group coming in, to prove there is a public necessity for a trust company. I think the onus should be on the other parties, and the wording of the clause should be changed so that it is up to existing trust companies to prove that there is no need for an additional company, and the onus is upon those who are now providing service to prove that there is no room for anyone else or any need for anyone else.

Mr. Lawlor: The last of the free enterprisers.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The question here has to do with securing the initial approval leading to letters patent for the corporation of a loan or trust company, which insofar as Ontario is concerned, occupies the prime seat and place in the category of institutions which may truly be described as financial institutions. The historical base has been in this area of establishing proof of some need, and it is in this area that we have extended the basic capital requirements to $1 million. It is part of the policy of this government that this position should not be changed. I do not know what the future will hold; maybe the future will bring about a change in the total climate. I am trying to answer, but the hon. member is not listening.

Mr. Deacon: I am sorry, Mr. Chaiman, the pageboy just spoke to me. I am interested in your comments.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I am not limiting the right of change in the future, but I am saying that in today's economic plans, it is not the policy of the government to change—other than is so stated here—the conditions of incorporation.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, it seems to be quite sensible to require adequate capital requirements and have provision for inspection to ensure that proper reserves are being maintained, but that does not in my view change this basic philosophy: Where someone wants to set up a business, and believes as a result of a study that it is worthwhile for him and others to risk their moneys in such an enterprise, why should they be prohibited by means of having to prove to some body, the public necessity for it, when we are not dealing with a monopoly or a public utility type of operation. There is no duplication of wires or pipe or something like that involved here; it is a matter of additional services to the public, and it seems to me so very important that we do not pursue further than we already have—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, the member must know, from the months past, there can be no greater concern to the members of this Legislature or the government than any financial institution that has to do with public funds, in the sense that loan and trust companies do. I do not think they are comparable to industry whatever, and this was surely established a year ago in the spring of 1967 in this very Legislature, by the members of the official Opposition party as well.

Mr. Chairman: Sections please.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I do not quite understand. I was not in the House a year ago, and I am not familiar with the reference.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This matter was settled in the House a year ago.

Mr. Deacon: In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is saying that they do not want to change this philosophy of approach that a company must prove public convenience or public need for the establishment of these companies. This is despite the fact that similar institutions, financial institutions which take public funds, do not have to prove this need. Investment companies and

other corporations that are accepting public funds for investment are subject to proper scrutiny, surprise audits and things like that to ensure they have financial capability and backing sufficient to look after the public funds. Surely the same thing should be true in trust and loan companies.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. Lawlor: With respect to subsections 2 and 3 of this section; it raised, on a second reading, the question of using as a base for the 20 per cent aggregate that they must maintain and retain at all times for payments out, a number of forms of security which are liquidable set forth in the 1966 amendment to the Act. These two subsections are designed to extend the range of the aggregate holdings of the company so available, and I suggest to the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that the credit from a chartered bank of Canada is a highly tenuous—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I have already explained that this is to be covered by regulation. The matter was not raised in committee, the legals bills committee, but I gave an undertaking to the House, I believe, on the occasion of second reading that the condition would be a written irrevocable credit for a loan from a chartered bank of no less a period than three years.

Sections 3 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 59 reported.

THE INSURANCE ACT

House in committee on Bill 60, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. Deacon: I am not so sure whether this comes under section 2 or section 3. There should be some provision in here for advising the superintendent of insurance when there is cancellation of any driver's insurance. It would be put in this Act here, and I suggest that this is not now covered by the Act. I think that the wording of this section could be changed to provide for that.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We are speaking now about section 2 which has to do with—section 2 or 3 are both probably what the hon. member is making reference to.

Section 2 has to do with the wording—the present wording—of the loss of a licence on an *ipso facto* basis. This was all debated in second reading, by the way, and that type of situation from a legal point of view, and a point of view of equity, leaves no provision for legitimate or bona fide error or at least an honest error. That is why section 2 of the Act is in. I do not think there can be any difficulty there.

Section 3 goes on to the area of increasing the amount of the deposit, is that right? Did you have something under section 3? Sometimes I find it rather confusing, Mr. Chairman, when the current pattern of showing amendments is to give the amendment and then to repeat the old section as it is now going to read in the future.

Sections 2 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 5:

Mr. Lawlor: On second reading I raised the point about the postponement of this—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This is second reading.

Mr. Lawlor: —on the postponement of the compensation without clauses under part 4, which is a rather elaborate section added into the bill a couple of years ago, in The Insurance Act, and which provides enormous benefits. It is a crying need throughout the North American continent, and no less here.

The Minister's reply, as indicated in the note, is that it was to bring uniformity in legislation across the country. I question that, first of all—the need for that uniformity. I thought the Minister was perhaps a little offhand at that time in his reply, and I press him a little harder today. First of all, why do you feel you actually need uniformity? Why cannot you give leadership in this matter in this country? If you do insist that the uniformity is in order, then have you any idea, can you give us any anticipated date whereby the various provinces might have set a deadline or a goal date of some kind in which this legislation will come into being?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I have no further information to offer the House other than that which I gave in some detail and not in any offhand manner on second reading. As a matter of fact this subject raises a matter of principle.

Mr. Chairman: Section 5?

Section 5 agreed to.

Sections 6 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 60 reported.

THE CORPORATIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill 107, An Act to amend The Corporations Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 107 reported.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

House in committee on Bill 120, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on section 3: The first section is a very long one there. Just before the bill is reported, there has been some thought expressed that the provision of the Act in general or the bill in general, that will transfer title to property to the school boards without any compensation might in some specific areas have a somewhat unfair result.

Surely public funds over the years have been involved in the establishment of these schools for retarded children and so the transference of the title without any discussion would be quite in order.

Is the Minister aware of any circumstances where large private donation and capital involvement of a type other than the charitable funds would be involved in any of the schools whose title would be transferred without compensation?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I would not be in a position to account for the large number of schools involved. I am sure that there may be one or two instances of this. I think that the bulk of them of course have been receiving the 50 per cent grant from the province. A number of the schools have been additionally financed through funds made available through municipal or county councils, and I would think that perhaps the majority, whatever balance is left, through public subscription.

Now, whether there are individual situations, where individuals *per se* make substantial donations to the association of the school purposes, I really cannot say, Mr. Chairman. I can only say that this question for the transference to the school administration was discussed with the Ontario association for the retarded. This question was explored and they are in agreement; but this is really the only equitable way, or profitable way, to bring this about.

Mr. Nixon: No doubt anyone who did make a substantial contribution was very interested in the work of the education of the retarded children, and accepts the principle of the bill most enthusiastically.

One other comment that I had wanted to make, and a question to ask, was that the responsibility of the department, in its largest sense—the Minister expressed it again, I believe, yesterday—is for the education of all children.

In the past there has been the proviso that the children be educable—if that is the proper use of the word. The Minister is no doubt aware that there have been borderline cases where it has been difficult to determine whether the young person, because of mental retardation, in fact came under the jurisdiction of the local board of education, or some other jurisdiction. With this bill it means that there will be a larger proportion of the young people in the province who would come under the jurisdiction of the local school board, because they will now have the facilities for the training of the mentally retarded.

Of course, this simply moves the boundary line a little further from its original position. There will still be those people who perhaps cannot even be educable in the sense that they would benefit from attendance at these schools. Is the Minister aware of any problem involving children who are suffering from certain mental difficulties that would still put them outside the jurisdiction of the department?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, who can say? You have to get into the question of determining all of the children who may, or may not, fall under this category.

If the hon. member looks at the definition section, he will see that the definition is broader than it has been in the past. I think that the only point that could be made is that, with the progress that has been made in the last eight to ten years with the retarded

children, we should always keep a very flexible approach to this question of definition. As programmes improve, or techniques become more sophisticated, perhaps the definition can be altered so that we can incorporate more children into the programme.

It is a very complex area and, from our standpoint, we are interested in having as many children in the programme who can benefit from it, and this is what the definition is really saying.

Mr. Nixon: On the other end of the Minister's jurisdiction there is his involvement in the Ontario hospital schools, and I suppose that this would give the spectrum that would cover the individuals that I have in mind. There was some considerable concern expressed in the standing committee having to do with the integration of this type of education with the regular school system, and the possibility that the facilities would, in fact, be in the same schools.

The problems arising from that are pretty obvious and I know that the Minister's people, or advisors, are very sensitive to the regulations that would cover this. I wonder if the problem has been raised in the discussion that the Minister has undertaken before the introduction of bills?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this problem had been discussed. Actually it is not a recent discussion; it has been deliberated in many other jurisdictions and I think that it is fair to state that there is a divided school of thought on this. There are those who quite sincerely feel that the student should be in a separate physical facility and there are those who feel that, over a period of time, they should be integrated into the same physical plan.

I think that we have reached a point here in Ontario, because of the policies that have existed, where at least from the beginning stages the bulk of these children will continue their educational programme in the existing physical plant. I think that the question of whether or not, over a period of years, they should become integrated physically with the regular school environment is something that must, of course, be studied. I really am not in the position here, Mr. Chairman, to say what the specific thinking is. Because, as I say, my view of it is that there is still no concensus for unanimity for what really is the best approach. I think that this is something that will evolve over a period of time.

I recall some of the discussions. In the United Kingdom, for instance, they are moving towards an integration of these facilities with the regular school programme. Yet the experience in some other areas would indicate that, perhaps, we are not moving necessarily in that direction.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I cannot say at this point. We have to start from the existing situation, which is in a separate physical plant, in most instances. Whether they should be integrated and so on is something that I would not like to prejudge at this point.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could probe the Minister's mind in one or two areas, in regard to the implication of this bill?

As the Minister knows, all sides of the House are in favour of this legislation and, of course, the association has indicated its interest in seeing it passed. I am wondering, though, if there have been discussions between the Minister and the association—and, of course, the people in his own department—in relation to the implication of placing the needs of retarded children into the full spectrum in such a way that they will now have to, in a sense, establish their right to these funds within the local setting.

Up until now, I think there has been a growing awareness of the problem of mental retardation and I think that they have not been finding it difficult to find funds from local sources. Then, of course, they have been helped by the increasingly generous grants which have been coming from The Department of Education.

What I am just a little concerned about is that now the mentally retarded associations will have to, in a sense, vie with all the other priorities at the local level. I am wondering if, in view of the discussion that we had last night, in relation to the whole business of decentralization, and the placing of the impetus and the pressure at the local scene rather than at the centre, just what the role of the department will be in relation to ensuring that mentally retarded children will receive a decent break and will be at the top of the priority list. What help will the department be to local boards? I imagine it will be giving some guideline, at least, to curriculum of personnel, some guidelines in relation to the developing pro-

gramme—in a way which it has not been so far.

I am wondering, as well, whether the grant system will, in a sense, be the carrot to the local board to do all that it can for mental retardation. I think these are the kinds of aspects which demand some kind of assurance from the Minister.

I notice, for example, and I am wondering why, the Minister organized the committee which will be reporting to the local divisional board, with six members. Three will be from the board and three will be from the association. If the association is smart, what they will do is elect one of the appointees from the board as chairman so that they will always be able to out-vote the representatives from the board, but I am not sure that this will always happen.

I am wondering why this number of six members has been chosen—three and three from each side, rather than perhaps giving the associations an upper hand at the committee level where, indeed, they will be able to move to the board level with fair assurance that their views are going to receive a great deal of acceptance at that level.

I would like comments on the financing, the role of the department in the programme and the guidelines which are going to be set out, and the organization of the committee and its relationship to that board.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just trying to deal briefly with all the items raised by the member for Peterborough I think if the member recalls the statement that I made on introduction at first reading of this bill, I indicated that with respect to the programme itself there is no question now that these schools will be coming under the administration of the divisional boards, and that we can improve not only the scope of the programme but obviously we can move into the area of teacher qualification to a greater extent than in the past. These are really the two prime ingredients as I see it within any programme. If we can look after those, I feel that we can make some genuine improvement in the total programme.

With respect to finance, I am not in a position, Mr. Chairman, to indicate exactly what the position will be. There is no question that the retarded programme will receive special consideration, but what the rate of grant will be or the proportion of grant, I cannot say until the grant regulations are available for 1969. Obviously, this type of programme will come under the field of special education where the grants are already substantially higher than the normal rate of grant. There is no question that this can be controlled by the grant structure in this province.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Minister one specific question. I am sure it will evoke an answer.

I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, with the retarded child aged three and four, and I would like to ask the Minister whether the present legislation would allow a four-year-old, for example, to participate in one of these special classes? If the answer is "no" to that, perhaps the Minister could let me know what happens in this province to a three- or four-year-old retarded child?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the legislation does not deal specifically with the age level of the child as far as admission is concerned. The policy, and I am subject to correction here, would permit admission of a child at four and a half or five, but I am not sure. It depends too on the birth date of the child, and once again, here is an area where I think we must retain some flexibility and assess after it has been in operation within the school system for a year or so. I would be quite prepared to explore this further with the hon. member after we have had some experience with the programme.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on a point of clarification. Could the Minister, and I realize this is somewhat outside his particular area, tell me what educational programme is available to a three-year-old or a child under the age of four and a half in this province? Are there private groups that look after these? Do these groups receive grants from the provincial government? Will these groups, if any, have a cutback in their grant because of this legislation? What is the situation for a three- or four-year-old retarded child?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, if the child is not, shall we say, in one of the Ontario Hospital environments or schools, as I recall it, there is no specific provision now under our legislation for payment of grants. I do not believe the local authorities are administering programmes for children under five or four and a half. There will be no reduction if there are private programmes going on now, because these have not been receiving any departmental support—at least not through The Department of Education.

Whether they have through The Department of Social and Family Services, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I do not know.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 120 reported.

THE ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES CAPITAL AID CORPORATION ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill 127, An Act to amend The Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1964.

On section 1:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if financing at Ryerson has been carried out by direct grants instead of having access to the university capital aid corporation in the past?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has just replied that Ryerson is being added to the Ontario universities capital aid corporation for purposes of financing. This is the Provincial Treasurer's—

Mr. Nixon: Yes, that is right. Really I was directing my question to the Minister of Education although it should more properly have gone to the Provincial Treasurer. But the development of Ryerson up until now has been carried on just by direct grants from The Department of Education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes. Right.

Mr. Nixon: Is the institution still considered to be associated with the department, and in any way different from a community college?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I guess it gets down to a discussion of what one means by different. It has its own board of governors, and the board of governors is serving a comparable purpose to the boards of governors of the community colleges. But it is set up under its own Act, whereas in the colleges the appointments are made by the council of regents, and the name and so on is designated by the Lieutenant-Governor in council. The concept is really similar from the standpoint of, shall we say, function of the board of governors. But they are not exactly the same because Ryerson is set up, as the hon. member I am sure recalls, by a special Act of this Legislature, whereas the colleges are set up under the amendment to The Department of Education Act.

Mr. Nixon: My point really is that if we are going to undertake a fairly large investment in capital plant for the community colleges —and the Minister just last night was commenting on our unexpected and heavy responsibility in this regard—and if he is prepared to give Ryerson access to the universities capital aid corporation, why not the community colleges as well? Would that not be a more convenient way? If the capital aid approach is useful for capital expansion for the post-secondary level, why not include the community colleges?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I believe we made this amendment last year. If I recall correctly, we are financing them.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 127 reported.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain bills without amendments and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain bills without amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 24th order; House in committee of supply, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
(Continued)

On vote 501:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to bring to the attention of the Minister, the unusual situation that took place in my community during the last elections for the board of education. We had an individual running for the separate school board who was a public school supporter and was elected—was put in office by acclamation, actually. Yet by the same token an individual who is a separate school supporter is barred from running for the public school board. Does the Minister plan on introducing legislation so that the representation for both boards—separate school and public school—would be on the same basis?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, under Bill 44, as I recall the provisions of the bill, separate school ratepayers will be able to be elected to the board of education. They will be elected representatives and can, in fact, become chairmen of the boards of education under the amendments to Bill 44.

Mr. B. Newman: Even in municipalities that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: This principle will also apply in the designated cities.

Mr. B. Newman: In other words, a separate school supporter could run for either separate school or public school board?

Hon. Mr. Davis: He can run for the board of education, and of course he can vote on matters that relate to the secondary school panel, but he will also be eligible to serve as chairman of the board.

Mr. B. Newman: This, then, eliminates the problem that was existent in North Bay and the city of Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would think it would, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. B. Newman: All right, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Might I ask the Minister when I should make remarks concerning "head start" type of programmes? Would the best place to do that, Mr. Chairman, be under the vote 516, on the elementary school grant?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would think the hon. member could do it under votes 507 or 516. I think either spot would be appropriate. I think vote 507 would also be quite in order from my standpoint—that is the programme branch where we discuss matters of curriculum and so on. I think either place.

Mr. T. Reid: In that case, Mr. Chairman, my undertanding is that we will discuss this type of programme under vote 507.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, last night we were discussing the federal involvement in the financing of education, and while we may pursue that on some other occasion, I did want to ask the Minister if he does not feel that the council of Ministers of Education might not be well served if the council included a representative of the government of Canada, and as something other than an observer, who could be present in the discussions that must take place at this particular council? I said, last night, that I would predict that the government of Canada would have to accept some responsibility for the equalization of opportunity with regard to education, and I would say further, when this change does come about, it will have no impact on Ontario other than that our federal taxes might change to reflect the fiscal transfers that would be made by the government of Canada under those circumstances. I would agree that these transfers are presently inadequate.

I think that Ontario, however, is not in a position to benefit largely by a federal programme of equality of opportunity. While I am not prepared to agree with the Minister's assessment that our system is the best in the world in so many regards, I am prepared to say that a federal representative on the council of Ministers might very well assess what equality of opportunity might entail. There seemed to be many areas in which the government of Canada might involve themselves in the theory of the council of Ministers of Education. The government of Canada was moving tentatively—as a matter of fact, I believe there was at least one private bill before the Parliament of Canada with regard to a federal office of education which would have some co-ordinating function, as well as just administering the very small education responsibilities that the federal government has.

I sensed, at the time, that the provincial Ministers moved rather swiftly and definitely to organize themselves to the exclusion of the government of Canada. I may be wrong in this. Nevertheless, they are not included in the council of Ministers, other than that they might be invited to observe, or to give some specific information.

I feel that if the quality of educational opportunity across Canada is going to become meaningful, and if this council of Ministers is going to do the best possible job, then there should be a full-fleged federal representative that can sit around the table and take part in the discussions, with responsibility of the government of Canada resting on his shoulders.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with this item briefly, I think one must understand the background, or the concept, of the council of Ministers. It was formed to give some leadership and direction to educational problems as they relate to national situations, but also, of course, to co-operate to exchange information and ideas, and work together more closely than has been the case in the past.

It is also understood, Mr. Chairman, that no member of the council, or no participating province, is bound by the decision of the council of Ministers. I mean that this is something that must be left up to the individual provincial jurisdictions, and I think, Mr. Chairman, at the present moment at least, there would be one, perhaps two or three provinces that would not be enthusiastic about this—and perhaps at this stage there is no need—for a permanent representative from the federal government on the council of Ministers.

From my standpoint, and I am speaking entirely as the Minister from this province, I have never hesitated, nor do I hesitate now, to discuss any matter that could be helpful to the educational programme of this jurisdiction with any federal agency that would have some interest in this regard. I would point out, Mr. Chairman, and I do not want to get back to last evening's discussion, because perhaps it was headed into an area that was not really too constructive, except to say that I regret the member for Scarborough East is not with us. I am sure he will be back, but really, I was not arguing with him as much as I was agreeing with his leader. Agreeing with his leader, that as I see the question of finance in the field of education over a period of years, we will need an increasing amount of support or assistance from the federal government. I was really tending to agree with the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister's comments take me back to other circumstances and I find them—I do not like them, I should say. But if we are really concerned about the involvement of the federal government, I think that the council of Ministers might work at it a bit more. And I know that the Minister of Education for Quebec would, perhaps, express a different view, but that does not mean that we cannot put ourselves on the record as favouring the inclusion of the government of Canada, and it might very well come about sooner than the Minister thinks. But if we are going to have federal funds in the form of fiscal transfers not earmarked for education, but at least designated in their amounts related to some programme which would bring about equality of opportunity a little nearer to reality, then I think this council of Ministers would have to act in co-operation with the government of Canada, and not sort of as a separate group that would present a brief to the government of what would amount, really, to demands, and sometimes to recriminations for extended support, or even continued support.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue this question of the role of the council of Ministers, but I would like to do so, leaving out the suggestions, that have been made, that the federal government become involved in this matter. I think that one of the most unfortunate things that has happened to education in this country has been the "in and out" aspect of the federal government in the whole area of education. I would say that one of the most damaging steps that took place in education in Canada, took place a couple of years ago when the federal government backed out of the programmes which had been carried on previously, and which looked as though they would give great hope, both to the universities and to those who were concerned with manpower training and retraining of individuals. I think this was unfortunate, and perhaps we will come to talk about this in greater detail. More than unfortunate, I think. It was disastrous for the educational policies of many of the provinces. And, as far as I can understand, the present Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) has been adamant on this point, that he is not interested in federal programmes which would in any way deal with the federal role in education.

Now, I think that this is a role—

Mr. Nixon: He is interested to the extent of $175 million.

Mr. Pitman: That is a pretty minimal concern, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, and I hope we are not going to get into money once again, but I can tell you that one only has to speak to the people in the universities and one only has to talk about manpower training, to find out to just what an extent this was a disastrous step taken by the federal government in this country.

Mr. T. Reid: There are unused department of manpower grants in Ottawa.

Mr. Pitman: I am going to deal with this matter, Mr. Chairman, with relation to the Minister in his role in the council of Ministers.

It has been quite apparent that the Minister of Education of Ontario has been, in a sense, pushing this matter. The very fact that it is such a large grant in these estimates, the very fact that an office is being established in Toronto—even if it is only on a temporary basis—the fact that Ontario appears to be the major thrusting agent, I think gives the Minister an opportunity to do something really quite exciting with this particular agency.

I am suggesting that the one area where we, in Canada, lag sadly behind is the area of educational research. I realize we will come to the Ontario institute for studies in education, and we will undoubtedly deal with this matter in the Ontario setting, but I would like to deal with this on the national setting. In the United States, as the Minister well knows, because of the defence priorities and because of the Russian sputnik, there was a tremendous surge of educational research that took place four or five years ago. As a result of this, the United States government at the federal level—and I am suggesting this could be done through the council of Ministers at the interprovincial level—established the educational research information centre in Washington. The advantage of this was, of course, that anyone in the United States would find out what research was going on in any area of the educational world. They could find how far this research had gone and what implications that research had to the education system within each individual jurisdiction. Then, of course, right across the country, research and development centres could be developed in co-operation with this educational research information centre.

Of course, I would suggest to the Minister that this is a matter which very well might be placed within the universities right across the country. I think we are moving now to placing teacher education in each of the universities in the Ontario jurisdiction. I think teacher education has been associated with universities in many of the other provincial jurisdictions.

I would suggest that there might very well be a viable place for a research and development centre which would do basic research and relate the more pure research of the central agency of your information centre, and begin to place it into actual performance in the various regions of Canada. And beyond that possibility, within the larger educational units which the Minister has placed before this Legislature, you might find a place to put a regional educational laboratory because it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the greatest problem is getting research into the laboratory of the classrooms.

Really, the only laboratory that makes sense is the classroom and the individual teacher trying to deal with the day-to-day problems of his or her class and trying to find out the implications of the research that is being done in these other more esoteric areas. I think there is a pattern here which might very well have some viability in this nation of ours. I put it to the Minister that it is perhaps not enough to just simply exchange information. This council of Ministers can be one of the most exciting developments if we can use this as an area to produce educational research. In Canada, a comparatively small proportion of our educational dollars are placed into research. And we have so many problems, we still do not know what young people can learn best at various ages.

We still do not know what subjects really make sense to young people and there are a great many other areas, so many areas in guidance, so many in the sciences that we do not know very much about yet so far as education is concerned. We know so little about adult education and various means by which you teach adults, teaching methods and teaching facilities and subject matter.

I suggest to the Minister that this is the kind of a project which the council of Ministers could very well take over and provide perhaps an exciting era in the area of educational research in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Minister this? It appears to me that in this vote 501 the amount has risen by 31.6 per cent in this past year. I am wondering if the Minister could explain the reason for this tremendous rise in the activities of that office?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, obviously one of the significant items is the amount for the council of Ministers of Education.

Mr. Pitman: Were there any other reasons for this?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, the amount for the programme's cultural exchange will, I believe, be some $35,000 higher, and then just the general increase. But the major item, of course, is the amount for the council of Ministers.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could also ask the Minister—this perhaps is related to the

council of Ministers—whether The Department of Education has decided whether it will support the testing service which was devised to go right across the country? I realize there is a tremendous jump expected by the province of Ontario—I think ten times that which was previously requested in another year—and whether the Minister has decided yet whether he intends to support this or whether we will carry on with the Ontario institute for studies in education in their testing programme?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There has been no decision on this matter yet, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pitman: Is there any deadline for that decision, when it has to be made in order to plan the tests which will be carried on in the schools across the country?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is a deadline, obviously, with respect to the federal programme. We have the provincial programme in any event. I cannot tell the hon. member when this deadline may be, but as far as we are concerned, we will be resolving it some time in the very near future. It will be done prior to their commitments having to be met.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask also about the programmes of cultural exchange. Included in this, would there be the teachers from France, who are being brought over here to take part in the educational programme, or would they come under some other vote?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, it all depends. There are, shall we say, two areas here. The teachers who are coming over and will be employed by individual boards of education will be paid by the boards. We have also set aside funds for students and teachers who may be here participating in some departmental or general programme. But actually the bulk of the teachers, as I understand it, will be employed by the individual boards of education.

Mr. Nixon: Also on this vote, I do not believe there is any place in the education estimates where there are funds set aside for the centennial museum.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the moneys appropriated for the centennial science centre, I believe, are all in the estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information.

Mr. Nixon: I would ask the Minister if he is still serving on the board of the centre?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is.

Mr. Nixon: I would also like to ask if the staff of the department are involved in the preparations for the opening of the museum? I do not mean the formal opening, but the opening as far as getting the displays in shape and even the part that will be available next year for public use. Is this entirely separated and under the full jurisdiction of the centennial centre board or are the Minister's advisors involved in it as well?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, from the educational or academic point of view, Mr. Penny, of The Department of Education, has been acting as the liaison officer between the educational department—particularly curriculum—and the board. We have an advisory educational committee to assist in the development of this aspect of the institution and Mr. Penny is the liaison officer between the centre and the department.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Chairman, my question to the Minister has to do with the usage of schools after school hours. I would like to know if he has a report yet or is there something coming up reasonably soon on the research being done on the Duke of York pilot project of the after-four programme and the lunch programme for the children of parents who work?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. member did not have an opportunity—and perhaps she was just as fortunate—to listen to all the remarks yesterday. The Duke of York programme is, to a degree, unique here in the city of Toronto. But the information is available to the city of Toronto board of education, as it will be to the others. There are other school boards doing similar types of programmes. I would refer to the ENOC programme in the city of Hamilton. The inner-city schools are involving parents in the evening. I really cannot tell the hon. member that the programme at the Duke of York school will, by itself or of itself, become the programme, in the city of Toornto.

This is something that the city of Toronto board must determine. We know of the programme, and we are quite enthusiastic about it. Whether it has application in other areas, quite frankly, we do not know at this point.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if my understanding is correct that it is being researched by the department?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we have a report. I do not know that it would be fair to say that we are researching it as a department, but we are obtaining a report on it and of course so is the Toronto board.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Fine. Could I ask if the Minister would comment on his view on lay supervision for lunchtime periods in public school, and after four?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not hear the question.

Mrs. M. Renwick: On lay-person supervision for lunchtime periods in public school.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman: I really expressed this point of view on several occasions and I have said this to the teachers' federation and perhaps there is not unanimity in this regard. In areas where we are short of qualified staff, I think that there is a role for, shall we say, teachers' assistants or what have you involving lay personnel for certain tasks within the school system. This is my own personal point of view, and of course it is being done in many areas. As I say, some of the professional teachers may differ with this point of view.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister if he is familiar with the film "To Touch a Child" and the experiments in Flint, Michigan?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I did not hear--I heard Flint, Michigan—

Mrs. M. Renwick: I just asked the Minister if he was familiar with the Flint, Michigan, programme and the film "To Touch a Child," which very carefully covers this after-four period of school.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that I am familiar with the film, "To Touch a Child." I am familiar with some of the programmes in Flint, Michigan, but I am not sure that they relate to the point that the hon member is making.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I go, Mr. Chairman, to the field of day nurseries. I would like to ask how many junior kindergartens there are iin the Metro area. Since this is going into pre-school education, I would like to ask the Minister if he would care to pass comment on his deparment's taking over pre-school education completely in the province, removing it from The Department of Social and Family Services, since it is not necessarily of custodial care.

Hon. Mr Davis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is aware, I know, that The Day Nurseries Act is under the jurisdiction of The Department of Social and Family Services, and I think that this is where it is being administered. I am not prepared to comment on just what the future may hold for this aspect of the programme. I am really not in a position to do so.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Could I ask for an answer to my question as to how many junior kindergartens, taking in the four-year-olds or three- and a few months classes that we have in Ontario for the metropolitan area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, our information does not show this. I will endeavour to find out from the Toronto board of education the number of pre-kindergarten classes that they have and get this information for the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I am not sure whether this will come up under this vote, Mr. Chairman. I would like to know why in Ontario, a separate school ratepayer can pay his taxes toward the separate school or the public school, but on the other hand, a non-Catholic who might want to send his student to a separate school cannot pay his taxes and enrol his student in a separate school.

It seems to me to be a bit unjust, and this is particularly so in the case of mixed marriages in Ontario, where if the father is a non-Catholic, there is extreme hardship in getting the taxes diverted to the separate school system. I think that it should be very flexible, and that people should be able to pay wherever they want. This would not harm anyone and I think that it would relieve a lot of the difficulties faced by people in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, as I understand the law, unless he is a Roman Catholic, he cannot be a separate school supporter, and this is the law. I know that the hon. member does not necessarily agree with this position, but this is the law.

Mr. Martel: I know that this is the law, but I want to know why it cannot be changed. There is tremendous hardship if

the husband is a non-Catholic and they want to send their children to a separate school. There is tremendous hardship involved. They have to sign the house over to the wife and a whole lot of rigmarole. Why should a man not just be entitled to pay his taxes wherever he wants?

I was just waiting, hoping that the Minister would speak on this. One more issue, then—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He was hoping you might announce some change of policy.

Mr. Martel: I would like to know, through the Chairman to the Minister, apparently there was a curriculum development committee set up in the Sudbury area just recently. Is that not right?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would have to check this. We have a large number of curriculum development committees and I would not be surprised if there was one in the Sudbury area, but I would have to check this for the hon. member.

Mr. Martel: I would like to pursue this, just a bit. I would like to know who was recommended for this committee, who made the recommendations, who received the appointments, what his qualifications were, who was turned down, the qualifications of the individual turned down, and why he was turned down.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, with great respect, I will have to determine whether there was some other application, or the question of qualification, maybe. The hon. member is pre-supposing, in some parts of his question, the answers to the first part of his question. I think that if the hon. member would like to prepare for me a specific question in writing, I shall endeavour to get an answer for him.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to return to the original problem that I brought up with the Minister at the commencement of these discussions, and that was concerning a public school supporter being elected to a separate school board. Can a separate school supporter be elected to a public school board, and at the same time deal with problems relating to the elementary schools?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, a separate school ratepayer will be elected to the new divisional board of education and will determine, or be part of the policy-making group relating to the traditional secondary school area. As was explained in the House and in the education committee, they will not be dealing with decisions relating specifically to the public school area.

Mr. B. Newman: But the public school supporter can have that authority as far as the separate schools are concerned? So there is discrimination there in relation to the responsibilities of a separate school supporter and the public school supporter.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I quite understand the hon. member's question. I hope that I have answered the position as it will be after Bill 44, and that is that a separate school ratepayer can be elected, and in fact will be elected to a divisional board, and can even become chairman of the board. I gather that the hon. member is referring—and he would have to give me some specific information—to a situation in Windsor, where I gather a public school supporter has been elected to the separate school board. Is the hon. member suggesting that this is not legal or—

Mr. B. Newman: No, I am simply suggesting that if a public school supporter has the opportunity and right to be elected to a separate school board, then the separate school supporter should have that same right to be elected to a public school board. He does not have that same right. No, he cannot act on elementary school problems.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But he has the right to be elected—

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, why not equalize both, though? Why not make it so that both have exactly the same opportunity? Why not amend the Act so that The Public Schools Act will read exactly the same as The Separate Schools Act, or vice versa?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman: I do not want to limit the debate in any way, but there will be amendments to The Separate Schools Act and perhaps this would be an appropriate time to discuss this matter rather than during the estimates. I have no further comment to make until we deal with The Separate Schools amendment Act.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that you are still discriminating against the separate school supporter by not giving him the same opportunity as the public school supporter.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Chairman, in connection with the question from

the member for Sudbury East. I understood the retort of the Minister to be, "That is the law", in connection with separate and public school opportunity and availability. I would like to direct a question to the Minister, Mr. Chairman. Do you feel that the law should be changed?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think when the hon. member has been a member of this House longer, he will find that I am and always have been quite prepared to look at any situation where the law should be changed. You will find several amendments coming forward even yet. At this particular session I am not prepared to say offhand at this particular moment whether that particular law should be changed.

Mr. Martel: Is this discrimination?

Mr. Bullbrook: You are not prepared to take a position in connection with this. Is that it?

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, this has been a problem that has been going on for years. How long do we wait before we get action from the Minister? This is nothing new at all. Mr. Klien from North Bay has been asking for this change for year after year, or for many years, and there still has been no action. It was at least seven years ago, and more than likely your department heard of it, if I heard of it.

Mr. Martel: Sir, I would like to pursue this one step further. In northern Ontario there is one town that only has a separate school, and the business people in this community, some of them, are non-Catholic. Where do their taxes go—their school taxes? They cannot pay it to the separate school; where does the business tax go?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wonder if the hon. member could tell me the municipality, then I might be able to find out for him?

Mr. Martel: It is in northwestern Ontario. It is just business tax from tourist industry.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know, but if you could give me the name of the municipality I shall endeavour to find out for you just where it does go.

Mr. Martel: I will submit the material to the Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 501. The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could just get a bit of information? I notice that under the main office there is an estimate for conferences, and I was wondering if the Minister might have on hand what conferences would take place under the main office and for what purposes?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there have been, over the years, several conferences sponsored by the department and I anticipate there will be two or three conferences in this coming year, relating to various aspects of education. The bulk of them will come under here, although there are, as you will see—for instance under vote 503, the schools' business administration branch—there are workshop seminars that are related there.

But the conferences that the department has had in the past years, and will have in the next year, will come under this vote.

I cannot say at this particular moment just what topics will be covered in these. I would think three or four conferences; the hon. member will be informed of these as they develop.

We plan one sometime after the CEA meetings, which will take up a good portion of the early part of September. I will let the members know, just as soon as the topics have been determined, as to what we will discuss at these various gatherings.

Mr. Pitman: These are organized by the main office of the department and not in connection with other groups outside?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, that is right. I think, quite frankly, we will be allocating a portion of the sums to seminars that will be held in the fall, with respect to Bill 44. We are going to be doing this, as the hon. member knows, in conjunction with the Ontario school trustees' council, and the other trustee groups and federations, and I think we would use a portion of these funds for those—conference might not be the right word, it might be seminars, or what have you.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 501. The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: We are getting into the wider use of the schools—the greater use of the schools and school facilities. I would like to ask the Minister if he is considering having recreation departments in communities as a branch of boards of education? Seeing that recreation is leisure-time education, in my estimation the recreation authorities

should come under the direct control of the board of education in a community.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would say, certainly, that there must be much closer co-operation—I said this, I guess, really in my preliminary statement—there must be much closer co-operation between the educational and recreational authorities, and much greater use of the school facility.

I do not reject at all the suggestion made by the hon. member. I would have to give it some thought as to whether the educational authority would be the best one to administer the recreational programmes. Certainly I agree there has to be the closest relationship. I would like to give this matter some study, because to me it has the basis of a very good idea. But I really would not want to say it should be, without a study of it.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the Minister then if he could have the members of his staff give it some study, so that when we come into the House next year, we will have a decision as to whether recreations should be a function of a municipal council, or the function of the board of education?

Vote 501 agreed to.

On vote 502:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the departmental business administration branch must, I suppose, provide the leadership for the local boards in setting out their procedures. I mentioned in my remarks last night that we really ought to be moving towards some imposition—no, it does not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the departmental business administration branch really relates to the internal administration of the department. I think the matter that the hon. member perhaps would like to raise would be under the school business administration branch.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, would this be the appropriate vote to discuss private business colleges and their relationship to the department?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I do not think it would be, Mr. Chairman; let us see if we cannot find an appropriate vote. Perhaps under vote 507—it seems to be a vote where we cover a multitude of situations.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 502. The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, under The Public Schools Act, in section 8, it defines public school visitors. I wonder if the Minister has considered adding school trustees to the list of people eligible to enter public schools? School trustees at the present moment are not allowed to enter without permission from the principal.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I might say that there has been some suggestion that we should delete the entire section with respect to school visitors, rather than add people to it.

Mr. Deans: Well, if I could follow it up. Does the Minister not feel that it might be in the best interests of administering the school systems if school trustees were to be allowed to enter schools at any time, in order to keep a check on what is going on with the spending of taxpayers' money, without having to have prior approval?

It is something like a notice of motion in the House. You have got to tell the Minister what you are going to ask him before you ask it. The same thing is true of school trustees. They have got to inform them that they are coming before they come, and I think they should be able to go in at any time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I guess one would have to define what we mean by—and you might ask some of your teaching colleagues—by being able to go into the school.

Does this mean that the trustee goes into each individual classroom to observe the lessons, or to look at the physical school plant, or really what is the intention of the visit? This is why there has been no amendment made, because there have been some very valid suggestions that we just take out the question of school visitors.

I think the practical approach the trustees take is that they have been visiting the schools. We have really not had any representation, to any great extent, from the trustee organizations that they be in fact legislated the right to enter the school.

Mr. Deans: I have had this matter raised with me. A trustee wanting to visit, or having to visit, two or three schools in order to check up on conditions that were reported to this particular trustee by parents.

It seems rather foolish that the trustee should have to phone ahead and make an appointment with the principal of the school, in order to let this person be able to enter the school to see if the complaints are justified

or otherwise. You can imagine the length of time it takes.

The school trustee's position is one that is done in his spare time, more or less, and it is very difficult. This person may have to take time off work to go and view the conditions in the school, and they would like to be able to go when they are able, rather than when the principal sees fit to let them come in.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 502.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, on this question, I really think the Minister's answer, originally, was just a little bit facetious, to say that maybe we should stop those that are now eligible to enter without so-called permission. I would not care. I think it might be a good idea to remove the right of MPPs, and MPs, and judges to enter at their will, but I do not think anybody abuses it. But we have had occasion, and it might depend on who the school trustees are, what political party they represent. And let us not kid ourselves. As the hon. member for Wentworth has said we have had reason to question this section where a lone NDP school trustee has been given a hard time because she answered reports from parents of children as to conditions and facilities, and other things; and she went into the school, and was chastised by the chairman of the board and by the board of education administrators.

I do not think that any persons that have the integrity to stand for school board, and they are elected as trustees, are going to abuse their rights; and I do not think they would walk into a classroom just to observe the operation of the classroom without clearing it with the principal, and getting the okay from the particular teacher.

But in all sense of fairness, and recognizing an elected person's rights, the school trustee is elected to be a school trustee.

If you want to remove the sections that give the MPP the right, it would suit me, because I always contact them and get permission, and give the reasons why I would like to visit them. But, just to say that maybe we should stop anyone from having the right, is not going to help the matter at all, and I think that consideration should be given to school trustees, elected in their particular areas, to having that right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just to correct the impression, I was not at all being facetious. We have had representations to delete the section with reference to visitors. These representations have been made for the last two or three years, and the hon. member will notice that I have not introduced legislation to delete the right of those enumerated in that section to attend the schools.

Mr. Chairman: With regard to visits.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sorry.

Mr. Chairman: The member for—

An hon. member: Some of us maybe should—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister to supply to the members of the Legislature, a list of Ontario scholars, annually, so that we have the same opportunity to inform ourselves of them, as some members in this House have been in the past?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I will give this matter some thought, and the hon. member might raise it again in the estimates of The Department of University Affairs, where this really would be the appropriate place to consider this.

You see, we are in the position now, where the Ontario scholars really will be those recommended by the individual schools. It will be quite a different procedure and situation from what has been the case in the past. I would have to give this some thought as to whether, in fact, it could be done practically.

Mr. Nixon: Are you going to continue to write?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I just have one point of comment on the matter of visiting. I hope that you do not delete this entire section. I think that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Your colleague said go ahead.

Mr. Deans: Well, he can say what he likes. I am speaking for me.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right.

Mr. Deans: This is one advantage of having a voice of your own, you can speak for yourself.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Better get together over there.

Mr. Deans: I hope they do not delete this. I hope that they change it to include these people, but I do suggest that you might delete subsection 2. I do not think that either the school trustees or anyone else, a judge or a clergyman or anyone else, should be able to go into a school and give such advice to the teachers and pupils, and others present, as they deem expedient. I do not think that we need that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I hate to think of some of the advice.

Vote 502 agreed to.

On vote 503:

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one or two remarks upon school administration. I think that this may be one of the most important areas that we may be speaking about on these estimates.

I think that we are standing at the crossroads in terms of how we wish to administer our schools and, as I intimated last night, I think there is a tremendous amount of human wastage, in the way we administer our schools. I suggest to you, sir, that as well we are not reflecting the kind of free and open society which, I am sure, the Minister would wish to reflect. And if I might take two or three specific areas.

First, I would suggest that in setting up the boards of education, I think it is unfortunate, perhaps, that there was not one or two places left on each board for teachers. I think this has been suggested as a means of dealing with the situation. I think the Ontario secondary school teachers federation suggested that there should be, perhaps, two places on every board of education for teachers, to provide, in an advisory capacity, another dimension in educational policy.

Mr. McCaffrey, the president of that body, said that educational policies of enormous significance should not rest in the hands of one man. I am sure that the Minister would not wish to be recognized as the one man. There are other ways by which this could be done, and I know that The Schools Administration Act will be coming before this House for a certain amount of discussion. I do not want to precede that Act, but I am also aware of the fact, that there are people in the Minister's department who are undoubtedly working on the Act at the present time.

So, I do hope that the Minister will consider very seriously, the possible role of the teachers' advisory committee, in relationship to the divisional jurisdictions that he is creating at the present time, as well as those unaffected.

I am not sure that that is the answer either, but I think that what we should be doing is finding a consultative process. It might very well be that a consultative committee in each school with definite representation of teachers and parents, as well as students and administration, is the answer. But, I do suggest to the Minister, that at the time when he is making such a revolutionary change in the administration of schools across this province, that this is the time when this new breath of fresh air should come into the kind of influences and the kind of openness which we wish to find in the administrative procedures in our schools.

So, I do put this to the Minister as hard as I can, and at this particular point in this Legislature, that this is something which he must be particularly concerned about. As well as that, I do bring to the Minister's attention, another matter which undoubtedly will come up under The Schools Administration Act. And one which I hope will be resolved, because I think it is also an important aspect of the work of these boards. And that is, of course, that there should be one person in charge of the educational policy of each divisional board. I know the Minister has been around this track already in the committee and I am sure he is going to go around it again and again—but I was very interested to read, just lately, a paper prepared by a district high school board, and if I might just read one or two sentences from this, in the literature: The Rejection of Dual Responsibility and Dual Control is Uniform.

> Violation of the unity of command principle is one of the most common and one of the most frustrating problems appearing in organizational structures. The problem is, of course, not in the theory but in the practice where the lack of unity and purpose, and lack of clarity and delegating and using authority is very common. As a result, the persistent misuse of talents, buck passing and confusion produce a nightmare of bureaucracy and empire building.

And he goes on to point out how unacceptable it is for a teacher. It could even be, as he suggests, the possible reason for civil disobedience—if such a procedure was

brought in as a result of the changing jurisdictions that the Minister has brought before the House.

So, those are two things that, I suggest, we must clarify, and make definite, and make provision for—the role of teachers in an advisory capacity, but in an effective advisory capacity. We must make sure that there is a unity of command in the administration of these school boards. I bring a third point to the Minister's attention on this estimate, that now is the time, also, to deal with the problem of what we call student power, but which I prefer to call student responsibility.

I think the Minister is aware. We do not have to go into chapter and verse of the new feelings among young people, that they should have a share in responsibility for what is going on in the schools, not just for the periphery but for the actual important matters of curriculum and administration of the schools. Not the full responsibility but a part to play. And I do suggest to the Minister, that at a time when there is an opportunity for vast change, this is the time—before there is any solidification of any continuing kind of role, either for students or teachers or within the administration set up—this is the time to move to provide for this kind of an impetus in our educational system.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, my comments are directed chiefly on the need for, in my view, the imposition of standard business procedures, in the business practices of the newly constituted boards. I believe this can be done in a very reasonable way. I believe the department is moving out of the imposition of its views in curriculum and programme matters, and occupying a situation where it is a resource facility for the local board. The large bulk of funds going toward the financing of education—in grand total more than $2 billion this year, under the Minister's direction —would justify, I believe, a very searching look at the way the business procedures of the various boards will be carried on.

In another vote, we are providing for elaborate and expensive computer facilities, and expansion, really, of those facilities that are already established; and I think it could be a reality that the boards—the 100 boards—as they are established, could be compared on a regular basis, using computer facilities.

I would like to hear the Minister's comments on that matter again. And also, if I might refer to a point raised by the member for Peterborough about the unified demand in the local board situation. My own strong feelings are that there must not be a duality in the representation of the administration to the board, and I further feel that there should be a single person with academic extraction being the chief officer representing the business, the implementation of board policy. This is my own view, and one that I know we can argue about when the amendments, that the Minister promised, come before the committee, and before this House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, I am very curious to know what the hon. member means by "academic extraction".

Mr. Nixon: He is not a primarily a businessman, but an academic.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I see. I agree with the hon. member on the question of the desirability of improved administrative practices, and I think this does provide us with the opportunity. We have already sent some preliminary material from the branch to the various ISOC committees, not laying down any hard rules at this point.

Mr. Nixon: I would not be afraid to lay down some hard rules.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, because we want to do some further analysis ourselves, with laying out some general areas. We think this makes sense at this point, and will be further refined during the discussions with the ISOC committees in the fall. We are also having some other studies made that I think will be helpful to us and I am in complete agreement. I think we can bring about a rationalization of the administration and, of course, it does relate to the provision of computer facilities both within our centre and the regional approach that I think we can take.

This is obviously one of the advantages that will flow from the hundred board structure rather than the difficulties we were facing with the concept of regionalization of computers for 1,500 or 1,600 boards. It was really a very difficult task. We can now see real daylight in this regard. We are getting along in the area of definitions.

Our people related to data processing have been in consultation with some of the larger boards, and I think we can work out a system whereby, as the hon. member says, we can —certainly on a far more regular basis—be in a position to know exactly what is happening from an administrative point of view. Also, we will be able to get some insight into the educational programme that is going on within the various school districts.

Mr. Nixon: A point of curiosity. Are the classrooms still provided with the standard registers with all the little lines?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there are still records of attendance. I cannot honestly say whether they are exactly the same as the ones used by the hon. member when he was—

Mr. Nixon: I will venture a guess that they are.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I could not say, because I have not seen the register as of that date, and as of today's date. I will try to dig one out.

Mr. Nixon: Just a comment about this. We are talking about efficiency. I think we are talking about using modern facilities, including the computer that is at the Minister's disposal and that so many boards have been installing. And we can expect the remaining boards to have these facilities almost immediately. I always remember the rigidity with which the department required the attendance figures. Of course, it is necessary that they be accurate and precise, because the grant system as it has been operating from that time until this, was based directly on pupil attendance—days' attendance.

But I understand that the old method of drawing one line in a little square for each student each day is still required and that, if the teacher does not do it in the classroom —as I understand many of them still do— then someone is hired down in the office to do it. It just seems ridiculous that we cannot use more modern techniques to account for the presence of students for attendance purposes and for grant purposes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I share the hon. member's point of view. I think we can, Mr. Chairman, make some very real progress with a more sophisticated approach to the question of attendance and enrolment.

Actually we are altering the registers because we are moving to enrolment rather than to attendance for grant purposes. Of course, there may be some relevancy to having attendance figures for other purposes. I do not know. But I quite agree. I think there must be, and will be, better ways developed. The teachers—as was the hon. member's experience—had to devote perhaps too much of their professional capacities to bookkeeping.

Mr. Nixon: Well, leading on that, just one other point. The Minister has indicated that the grants are going to be based on enrolment rather than attendance.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are now.

Mr. Nixon: And therefore you can pay the grant on the basis of the present year's enrolment and not last year's attendance.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it is the average enrolment. It does not—

Mr. Nixon: For the present year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, for the average enrolment for the past year.

Mr. Nixon: This is a point that of course has always given some difficulty. You base the grant on last year's requirements as far as the number of students involved, rather than the requirements for the present year. You are always a year behind time. And where your grant may perhaps accommodate for this, there is always the feeling amongst boards that are rapidly requiring their school attendance, that the department is not doing its fair share under these circumstances.

Going back to those computers. There is no reason why you cannot have an up-to-date indication of what the enrolment is. You talk about the grants being based on average enrolment. I think you can do better than basing it on last year's average enrolment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we estimated enrolment, and I quite agree with the development of the divisional boards, I think we can look forward to the day when we can move to the current situation. This is, from my standpoint, highly desirable.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the Minister—exactly what are the functions of the consultative committees in the territorial district?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, these were groups organized to work on the question of larger units in the northern part of the province, because they did not come under—I guess it was Bill 54. This was a provision made for the payment and organization of consultative committees in the northern part of the province, to develop programmes for larger units of administration.

Mr. MacDonald: Specifically, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister: Does this have any relationship at all to education for Indians?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it does not.

Mr. MacDonald: Just in the administration? Fine, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if there is not a kind of affliction involved with Indians in this matter because I understand that, in some cases, some of the smaller boards in the north, because they were small, because they were dealing with perhaps a few schools, did try to provide for a place on the local board for representatives of an Indian community. Very often Indians thereby had a representative of their own on a local board.

I am wondering if the creation of the larger units in the north will make it very unlikely that an Indian representative will be able to sit on one of these boards to look after the interests—and influence the board—on the peculiar position and problems of the Indians in dealing with the educational system of this province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that Bill 44 will alter that at all. Most of these—in fact the majority of them—are in areas that will not be affected by the larger units of administration.

Mr. Pitman: In other words, these Indian people will be ably represented on selected or non-elected boards as in the past.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Since the provision for facilities is quite an expense to communities, and it leads them sometimes to develop fairly large-sized schools, has the Minister's department reached a decision as to the maximum size of a facility or a minimum size of a facility for maximum efficiency, both on the elementary level and the secondary level? Should we be having schools with 2,400 students or is 1,000 students sufficiently large enough? Or should our schools be like some of the schools in the United States where there are as many as 4,000 students attending? Should we be busing into the elementary schools in municipalities and constructing fewer schools but larger in size?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is a difficult area to explore. I do not think you can have any rigid rule with respect to physical plant or the size of the unit. One can look forward to perhaps certain administrative efficiency or cost efficiency and you get into the problem of the educational effect of a larger unit.

I have representations from the member's own profession fairly regularly that there is some danger in getting the high school units or the secondary units too large. With respect to the composite schools, or the comprehensive programme, a minimum of 1,000 students —with exceptions where the geographic nature of the area just will not sustain it.

We feel this is a basic figure where there is the optimum or most economical running of various shops and technical facilities within that type of accommodation. And, Mr. Chairman, merely for me to predict what should be or even to state what should be optimum or maximum or minimum sizes with the changes that are taking place in programme, the obvious changes that will be taking place even in design—really I cannot be of much help to the hon. member in this regard.

I think these are things that we will have to determine as best we can as the educational programme develops and changes. I just cannot say that 2,000 is an optimum number. It may be optimum from an efficiency standpoint. There may be some educators who would say this is really too large for an educational environment at a secondary level and that these are the balancing factors. I really cannot say to the hon. member. We can tell you what the minimum should be with respect to the secondary programme. I would not be prepared to say what maximums might be reached.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, as I cross the border and visit the city of Detroit I do get disturbed when I see schools handling as many as approximately 4,000 students. Being in the profession myself, I would dread the thought of having to get back into a classroom of a school where you would have approximately 4,000 students. Having taught in one with as many as 2,300 students, I know discipline was a much more difficult problem than it is in the school that handles 1,100 or 1,200.

But referring to the elementary level, Mr. Chairman, has the Minister arrived at some maximums and minimums as far as size of plant are concerned? Or number of teachers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, once again we get into decisions that must be related to the geographic needs of positions of the community. We like to look at, say, a 12-room school at the elementary level as being a

minimum—but obviously you cannot always have a 12-room school.

Mr. B. Newman: What is the ideal school?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who knows what is the ideal? We look at this as being a minimum if it can be achieved—but it cannot in many areas of the province. To say what the maximum would be is once again difficult because you get into the concept of having grades 1 to 7 in one school facility and grades 8 and 9 in another. To come down and say rigidly that we should have X number of students in all elementary schools and Y number of students in the secondary—does not take into account the changes we can foresee in the educational programme or the economic and geographic situations within the divisional board areas. I think, Mr. Chairman, we have to retain a high degree of flexibility.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I notice that under vote 508 we do have school planning and building research and school plan approvals. I do not want to get into what we have already discussed, but I do have a question at least as to the future of these two important areas of the school business administration branch.

In the decentralization plan, I am wondering to what extent the school planning and building research and the school plant approvals sections will tend to do less. If, indeed, there will be decentralization, is the Minister assuming that local boards will have more freedom to decide on the size of the gymnasiums they want to have and the size of the various areas of the school?

Is the department going to leave it to local authorities to decide, for example, what kind of facility can best accommodate the kind of educational programme they want? Because I do not think we can separate them—the educational programme and the facility. I do not think you can leave the facilities at the centre and say we are going to approve of certain-sized rooms and certain kinds of rooms and not others. If the local community decides, taking in hand the power the Minister has given them, that a certain kind of educational programme is necessary, that we need movable walls, deskless rooms, if we need three gymnasiums or one gymnasium, if we are going to have team teaching then we need different sizes of rooms, if we are going to use television in a certain way—then it means a tremendous flexibility will be necessary in the way in which schools can be designed and the grants and approvals which will take place.

I am wondering, in view of the announcement of the Minister just what will be the role of these two sections of the department in view of that philosophy expounded last night?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. member would like—I am not recommending that he does this—to look at the amended capital grant regulations that were made available roughly a year ago. He will find that we are moving to a unit accommodation factor rather than just straight classrooms and much of what he is suggesting is now available to the boards.

Mr. Pitman: Much, but certainly not all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Right. We see a further decentralization, but at the same time this will continue to act as a resource centre, an area where we can co-ordinate the various activities that are going on in the whole area of school design at the central authority. I think this is still a function that must be part of the department's responsibility.

But much of the flexibility in what the hon. member says is really now available, not to the full extent, but far more than it was in the past. I can think of two or three schools that are in the process right now that the member would find quite intriguing.

Mr. Pitman: Is there any difficuty though in getting the grants in these kinds of experiments?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, the grants are related to a unit accommodation factor, in other words—

Mr. Pitman: Well, what about rooms that are—for example, if a jurisdiction decided they needed rooms for different purposes, not so much a matter of space and unit accommodation but a totally different purpose, say a gymnasium. In other words, they might want to have a programme of a great deal of utilization, auditoriums, gymnasiums, more peripheral kinds of areas which perhaps the department has not given quite the degree of recognition to as it does to these classroom sizes?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, it is a question of the degree of financial support.

Mr. Pitman: It is the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not quite the same thing because we have not discouraged some boards who wish to go beyond what the regulations of the department would allow

for—say a third gymnasium when our regulations only permit two. Some boards have done so. I think perhaps it is a shade early to predetermine what this evolutionary process will bring about. I just recognize, as the hon. member does, the desirability of developing in the approach to physical plants all the new technology and the new concepts that are obviously becoming available. And we will give the local authorities as much leadership and at the same time allow them as much responsibility as will make sense.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, the Minister invites opinions so I feel I should not let this opportunity pass without saying that, in my opinion, when you get past the thousand pupils in a school, you are doing many of the pupils harm. They become mere ciphers, mere cogs in a machine, and many of them lose their individuality—almost, one might say, their identity. From an educational standpoint if not from an economic one, I say that smaller schools should be in vogue.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I was reading with much interest a publication of the Scarborough board of education, which outlines the study of the programme that has been operated by the metropolitan school board entitled, "A Study of Educational Facilities", and I am very impressed with what has been achieved by this particular study according to this article. It indicates that it was a $1 million study and when I mentioned this yesterday the Minister was quick to chime in and say that some of that had come from the department, which is good.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have one of the first copies of the report. Do you want the full report, I have it upstairs, it is very good?

Mr. Nixon: The interesting part is that a large share of it was paid by an American research outfit that gets its funds from the Ford foundation. Really the Ford foundation has been doing as much for educational research in the province and in Canada as any arm of government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They sold a lot of automobiles.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but the foundation is considerably divorced from the automobile salesroom now and I know the Minister is aware of that. I think it is worthwhile, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister realize that one-third of the project was financed by educational facilities and laboratories of New York, a non-profit organization within the Ford foundation, and substantial grants we have been told have been received from The Department of Education, although the amount is not indicated in the balance borne by the Metro school board. But the basis of their research was very much along the line that has already been described here as one of the necessities. That is the emphasis on flexibility and the ability of the organizers of the school system to change the arrangement of rooms to meet changing requirements on very short notice.

The studies of educational facilities organization has undertaken the responsibility to provide 25 schools for occupancy in 1970 and 1971. In other words, it is not a group of experts sitting around a table batting ideas back and forth. This, I sometimes think, is the chief activity of those who are financed under vote 503, which has been in the estimates for many years without the developments that we might have expected, along the lines that have been achieved since 1965 under the auspices of the Metro school board.

I want to quote briefly from this publication, as follows, and I quote:

> Muriel A. Clark, chairman of the Scarborough board of education and a member of the SEF advisory committee, said discussions are being held with industries all across Canada. Ten master systems are the key to the tendering basis, said Mrs. Clark. These are structure, atmosphere, lighting, ceiling, interior space division, vertical skin, plumbing, electric, electronic, case works, roofing and interior finishing. By mass producing these items, Mrs. Clark says, it is hoped that a much superior, more efficient and adaptable school building with long-term value can be produced for less cost.

What an admirable goal these people have set for themselves, and how unfortunate that the Minister and his advisors were not able to accept a clear-cut goal like that some ten years ago, and do some of the work that the Toronto school board, the Metro board, with the co-operation of organizations listed in this pamphlet, have been able to achieve. It appears that they are actually going to achieve something.

I quote further from this publication: Scarborough's board chairman believes the nucleus of personnel from the technical arm of SEF will be retained after the study is completed.

One of their jobs will likely be to study the possibility of schools in apartment buildings. Now this has been referred to by the Minister and others in this House, as one of the possibilities for the future. Yet they go on to say that they are undertaking research into the building of apartments on school lands, with the school established at the lower level, and tremendous revenues, particularly in the high utilization area of the cities, would accrue to the leasing of the other facilities.

I feel that the imaginative approach here is going to be beneficial to all of Ontario, and to other jurisdictions beyond this, but I cannot help but feel, Mr. Chairman, that the department has been lax in meeting its responsibilities for the last few years. I do not want to repeat what I have already said, and yet this feeling comes through very definitely, when Metro Toronto, by gathering support from a number of sources, by talking to industrial experts, has been able to divide the construction of schools into the kind of tendering that is going to give flexibility and efficiency at low cost.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get too involved in this. It really bears out a point. I will come to it. I will assure you that the department has not been completely oblivious to some of these problems, but it bears out the point I was making earlier, and in the preliminary statement.

One reason we believe in this philosophy of decentralization and initiative and creative activity on the part of the board, is that we do not operate schools. We are not in that position, except with the schools for the deaf, the schools for the blind; we do not operate schools in that sense. We could not, without building up a bureaucracy which, I think, the hon. leader of the Opposition would then tend to question.

Mr. Nixon: You have a $228,000 bureaucracy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right, but we do not have the personnel who are involved in the day-to-day operation of the school system—who can conduct the type of research and experimental programme that is being done by the Metro board.

I think one should point out that there is a Minister's committee on school design, initiated by The Department of Education, that was very directly involved in the initiation of that particular project. That goes back into the history of it a couple of years, and I think it clearly indicates that the department perhaps has some responsibility, or should be given some credit for the initiative that was taken.

Mr. Nixon: All the credit that is due.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Nixon: From eight years ago! Look at the money that would have been saved; most of your—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there are some studies that are taking place today, and have taken place in the last two years, or three years—some are going on in the state of California, I believe in Macdonnal Industries and so on—with utilization of computers and actually designing physical school plant.

This could not have been done ten years ago. The technology was not sufficiently progressed to do some of these things ten years ago.

Mr. Nixon: What Toronto is doing could have been done 20 years ago.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I question that the results of that report—and I have read it rather carefully—could in fact have been done 20 years ago. I would not want to argue with my hon. friend, but I would ask him to read the report in total. If he still thinks it could have been done 20 years ago, I would be delighted to discuss it with him. I really do not think it could.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 503. The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: On this matter of school design, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just ask the Minister—I noticed tonight in a recent publication of The Ontario Department of Education, I think it is called "Dimensions," by Bascom St. John.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I agree. Yes, that is right.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Bascom St. John wrote an article on the mini-school—one of the concepts of Paul Goodman, in the United States. I am just wondering if this is a flyer being put out by The Department of Education to get general reaction, or whether this is just allowing Bascom St. John to have the freedom to write on whatever subject he wants in that particular publication.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether this is the appropriate vote for a question or answer in this regard.

I think what he said indicates very clearly that, as far as we are concerned, as a department and those of you who listen to our senior officials on occasion will recognize, we give scope and encouragement for creative educational thought.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable discussion here this afternoon in relation to the unification of school boards, and so I thought that perhaps I might also be permitted to say a few things about that.

I would like to call the Minister's attention, once again, to the rather considerable representation which has been made to him in writing, and through myself, from the representative of rural school boards and rural municipal councils who feel that they will not have sufficient representation under the formula of representation which is now proposed by the department. I would just like to emphasize it once again, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister.

In this connection, I think it would be pertinent to add that with all of this marrying that is going on up at the Lakehead these days, that is proposed for the Lakehead, the people are starting to wonder whether they are in front of a great big government whisk broom or something.

Mr. Nixon: Shotgun!

Mr. Knight: I will not use the term "shotgun," I will leave that up to some of my colleagues in the north.

But it does not seem to me, if you stop and seriously analyze what is happening here, that the people do not seem to have too much to say in these matters. They want more time to consider these things, and when they say, "well, all right, that is what you are proposing—now here is what we would like to add; this is how we would like this thing altered," they do not seem to get very good reaction.

I do not like to take a poke at the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) while he is not here, but this matter is all related—this business of amalgamation. I hasten to state that I am very much in favour of the amalgamation that is proposed by the government. I commend it for taking the initiative and finally getting something done.

Certainly, as a news editor, I have had a lot to say over the past nine years and, I would hope, have had a lot to do in helping to change, to elevate, the attitude of people in the Lakehead area toward this necessity.

But at this point I must honestly support these people from the rural areas of the Lakehead, who I think, will have about three voices on the new board of some 18 members representing about 22 townships, and it just does not seem to be adequate to me.

They do feel that they are relinquishing something here, something of their authority and control over their children. They are not balking against that I do not think, they just want to make sure that they have a loud enough voice on that board. So I would like to urge the Minister to acquiesce to their request and perhaps he could tell me whether he has made some decision on this request at this point one way or the other?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I really think we are back into a discussion of Bill 44, and perhaps the hon. member did not have the opportunity. I quite honestly do not know whether he is on the education committee where it was discussed. I think the bill, as it was finally approved with enthusiasm by the education committee a few days ago, will be—

Mr. Pitman: Do not start that again.

Hon. Mr. Davis: One must retain a sense of humour on occasion. The bill that was passed as satisfactory by the education committee the other day will be substantially considered by the committee of the whole House when it is called sometime in the fairly near future.

Vote 503 agreed to.

On vote 504:

Mr. Nixon: I notice that the maintenance requirements here have expanded by a factor of five. Are you renting more facilities or what would account for that increase?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, these funds relate to a transfer of the regional data processing centre that is being developed from the Ontario institute for studies in education into the education data centre.

Mr. Nixon: You mean they were purchased by the institute in former years, and you are—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, they were physically, I would say and the financing of the regional data processing centre was part of the budget of the Ontario institute. This has now been taken out and made part of the education data centre for the department. That accounts for the large increase.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: I understand that one of the major roles of the education data centre will be to provide data for the new divisional boards, and I am wondering whether this will cut down in the future the cost in terms of the fact that you will not have as many boards to service as you have at present?

There is something like a 60 per cent increase, explained by the Minister, I realize, in this reorganization and this change of allocation from the OISE to here. But is there any hope that this might begin to come down?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that this vote itself can be expected to reduce over a period of years because, while we will be dealing with it, it will ease our task and expedite information. We will still be dealing with the same number or, shall I say, an increasing number of students, so that if the data centre is relating information to the level of achievement of X number of students at certain grades, we are still talking about the same thousands of students. Even though we are talking about a substantially reduced number of boards, we are talking about the same number of schools, so that the input into the hardware must relate to the numbers of factors involved. This will not reduce itself because of the reduction of the units of administration.

Should we get into questions of information as it relates to a total board jurisdiction, obviously there will be a reduction both in the input and the cost factor. But I think this will be relatively slight compared to the type of information that must be accumulated on a total provincial basis.

Mr. Pitman: How much of this data is available to public authorities, either to members of the House or to universities or to bodies such as that?

I am interested. I will not try to throw a curve. I am thinking in terms of what the Minister just mentioned in his reply—the success rate of students in all the schools across Ontario. Data of this sort will be particularly interesting to a university which is concerned with admission requirements, with the kind of marks and the kind standing being given at all the schools across the province and with the disappearance of the grade 13 examinations. I am just wondering whether the entire proceeds of this data centre will be available to, say, the university.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would think, Mr. Chairman—and I am speaking without giving it very much consideration—that the total statistical information, the bulk of it, will be available for public consumption.

I would question—if it gets down to individual students or their marks, or their rate of progress—whether this should not be kept confidential, certainly with the individual school, whether one would release this for public information, or whether really it is of any interest on a total public basis. But as far as total figures for the entire province on these areas, we anticipate the vast majority of them will be for public information.

Mr. T. Reid: Would the Minister make available, some time in the next six months or so, a paper which will lay out the ground rules regarding the information which he has stored on his computer—the criteria and such matters as that? What types of material will he make available to the universities; what types of material will he let no one have, including other government departments—like the police, under The Attorney General's Department?

In other words I think that the time has come for a very clear statement on the use of this very personal data about student behaviour—perhaps even his background, if you are using information for student aid. This type of thing. I think the time has come now for this government, and particularly the Minister of Education, to come out with a very clear statement on what is going to remain confidential to his own department from other government departments, particularly The Attorney General's Department, and what is going to be made available to universities, colleges of applied arts and technology and perhaps to business men who might write and say: "Please give me the dope on Jones."

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if I might just say something before the Minister answers. I want to stress the comments made by my hon. colleague as being extremely important. The Minister is aware of the fact that one of my advisors attended, what was that, the interprovincial school information system conference that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Minister's information systems committee.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, that was what it was. And we had quite a chat when he returned as to the tremendous potential of the data processing and the availability of information most extensive in detail to anyone who knew how to extract it from the computer. And the point raised by my colleague is such an important one, because over the years of students' attendance in public systems, the information that would be catalogued in the computer, would make the most elaborate Gestapo dossier look like just backyard gossip. And all of that information would be there for proper use. But the responsibility that those people who safeguard the information have would be very large indeed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I gather, Mr. Chairman, from the leader of the Opposition's remarks, that he does support the point of view that there certainly is a substantial amount of information that should be treated on a confidential basis. I am not sure that I can agree with the member for Scarborough East that within six months I would be in a position to define what should and should not be. I think this may be a shade premature, but I would hope that given say four or five months' experience with the new divisional boards after January 1, we will be in a position to at least give much information or definition of the various areas. I would be quite prepared to do so—I think it is quite important. But certainly whatever we say six or eight months from now could change in a year's time as other areas of information perhaps are available to us. I would endeavour to do this, but I may not be able to do this in six months.

Mr. T. Reid: I understand that, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to make two further observations.

One, I think the Minister of Education of this province has the responsibility to instruct the school boards of the province about the types of information they can record about individual students. I am talking about liberties in our society; the liberties of the individual; the rights of individuals in our society. And I just say this, for I feel very strongly about this. The Minister of Education of this province must spell out specifically what the Hamilton school board for example is allowed to collect and what it is not allowed to collect.

And second, I think he must be aware that if there are regional computers, storage centres such as I believe there are in Hamilton, that he has a direct responsiblity—enough of this resource centre guff. You have got—the Minister has got—a direct responsibility to make sure that the information on those memory brains is secure. If he has not got that, then probably the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) has.

And third, in his own computer, he must know who has got access to the information, so that no one in the department can walk in who is not authorized to do so and get that information out of the computer.

I am concerned, the leader of the Opposition is concerned, about the individual liberty of a young teenager in our society. This directly threatens their individual liberties.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There are no arguments.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 504. The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the Minister can tell us if all of the new school divisions will be economically in a position to put in fairly sophisticated computer facilities, or will many of them have a direct linkage to the departmental?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman: I cannot say what the technical procedures will be. Whether they will have a direct linkage to the department or whether we will have, as the member for Scarborough East suggested, two or three regional or five or six regional terminals. I do not know about this point. But there are a number of the new divisional boards that will not have, in my view, the economic, or even the student resource, that would justify a single installation for that board itself. There will be a number of them.

Mr. Pitman: I have a short question. I assume that even though this has been changed, as far as the estimates are concerned, the hardware is still really at IOSE, and you are using the computers that are there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there is a sharing of hardware, really. Geographically, a good portion of it is now on Cumberland Street, which is behind the physical location of the Ontario institute, and there is a sharing at this point of some of the hardware. But I gather that the demands for time may be such, over a period of years, that there may be completely separate installations; I do not know. I think that this is the way that it will develop.

In other words, our education data centre will, I think, be more of a resource and

information gathering type of installation, whereas the institute will more directly be related to the area of research.

Vote 504 agreed to.

On vote 505:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I think that it was last year that we had some discussion of the liberation of the Minister's bureaucracy. He assured me at taht time that he was not going to take on any more supervisory staff, because I had gathered in the years gone by that the number of new appointments had been astonishingly large.

With a somewhat different emphasis on the role of the department, the responsibilities for many of these jobs are going to be given over to the county boards, and he now is able to predict that the numbers in his department will decrease in the next few years. His predictions come, of course, just one step behind the changes in the departmental policy which make these things possible.

I believe that, under this vote, he might give us some specific information as to the changes in the staff that are under the direction of the department itself, and what he predicts, in the next year or two, as the responsibilities in the county divisions, or the divisions of jurisdiction will increase, and a good many of the people who are now employed by the department will find employment with the county boards.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, in that the member did raise this with me a year ago, even without the change taking place under Bill 44, we have had a reduction in September, 1967, of ten positions in the inspection area. I thought this would be very good news to the hon. member, and I just wanted this information for him. We anticipated—

Mr. Nixon: You have not got the statistics on how that branch has changed in the last three years?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes. Let us go back to April, 1964, 304 positions. April, 1965, 327; April 1, 1966, 343; April 1, 1967, 343; September, 1967, 333. We have started the downward track.

Mr. Nixon: Can you extrapolate that and make some predictions?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I was just going to get to that next part. I just recalled this question from last year, and I just wanted to have this because I know you would be still interested.

Mr. Chairman, we think that the majority of the supervisory personnel—that is the term that we would all understand—our former departmental inspectors, a number of our area superintendents will become the employees of the new divisional boards.

I cannot predict at this stage, Mr. Chairman, just what the total percentage of these people will be and who will obtain employment with the new divisional boards. I can only say at this stage that it will be a substantial majority.

Mr. Nixon: What is the total complement of those under the jurisdiction of the department?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The total complement for 1968 and 1969—and this includes everyone—is 3,141. It is a drop from 3,891 last year.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask the Minister one or two questions about this group of people who are being phased out of the role that they have previously held in the department?

You say that most of them will most likely become employees of the new school jurisdictions. What I am really wondering is what assurance these people really have that hey will have jobs in the new jurisdiction? In some jurisdictions, do they not find it almost impossible to get jobs, in view of the fact that they have to remain within the department structure acting in advisory capacities to the new boards, and the interim committees?

In other words, is there every indication that the people who have given this kind of loyalty to the department and to the Minister and who have, indeed, very deeply influenced the life of education in this province, will have employment at the level and salary and status that they have previously held with the department?

Many of these, I think, came into the department from roles outside, in other jurisdictions, expecting to spend their lives as a member of the Minister's team, so to speak. This very real change in the philosophy of the department and its very real redirection has a very unfortunate effect in the careers of some of these people. I am wondering what the department is doing to see that sheer simple justice will be adhered to in regard to those who have been employees

of this department over the last number of years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is one of the very difficult problems of being a Minister, in that you get to know a number of your staff reasonably well, and you cannot help but admire them and respect the contribution that they have made. This does not make some of the decisions any easier for any Minister.

I do want to—and it will not take us much past 6 o'clock—to take this opportunity, because I did not in the preliminary remarks, and I really think that I should pay very genuine tribute to these people who have worked so well and for a number of years for the department. I am sure that the members opposite would join me in expressing these wishes to these individuals.

I can only say that it has been an area of some concern and regret for myself and for the senior officials of the department, but these are the decisions that have to be made. I should also point out that we have had some very constructive discussions with our former inspectors on several occasions. They have been not only helpful, but very constructive, and completely in support of what we were doing. I think that we were right in this decision, Mr. Chairman.

We have said to any present employee of the department in this category that they shall remain with the department in some useful capacity, at a level of salary no less than they presently earn, if, for some reason, they do not find employment with one of the new divisional boards.

It being 6 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 108



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, June 5, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 5, 1968

Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, continued 3973
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 4008

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
(Continued)

On vote 505:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): As I understand it, the Minister said this afternoon that they were cutting back ten members of his staff who had been under the impression they have apparently a life-long job. At the same time, I understand that the department is also making further appointments for various inspection jobs.

Could it not be possible to involve these ten who are being removed from a job into one of these appointments without appointing somebody new who has already got a position, possibly as a teacher somewhere?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I follow the hon. member. As I indicated to the leader of the Opposition, we have ten fewer positions in the area of supervision this year than we did last year and I anticipated that a majority of those who are presently in this area of responsibility in the department will become employees of the new boards. There have been some additional staff taken on with respect to, shall we say, programme consultants.

There have also been a limited number in the area of the separate school system and, once again, it will depend, Mr. Chairman, on whether we move into larger units of administration for the separate school system. Because if we do then, I would think once again the majority of the people involved in separate school inspection will move into the larger units of administration as well.

Mr. Martel: But I am just wondering; there are people who are going to be out of a job now, as a result of this move whether—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Chairman, as I thought I explained to your colleague, the member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman), a decision was made. But while we anticipate, as I say, the majority of our supervisory personnel moving to positions of responsibility with the new divisional boards, we have made it clear that for those who do not obtain employment or perhaps do not wish to go, there will be positions available for them in The Department of Education.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, the Minister was referring to the fact that some of his supervisory staff will be moving into the jurisdiction of a county board. I think it is a progressive approach—that we get away from the older attitudes of the inspectors—and while the Minister's department will no longer have people by that name, or even with that function, by the time the next estimates come around, it may very well be that some of the county systems or some of the school divisions will be emphasizing this aspect more than they ever have before.

I wonder if the Minister's communication with the boards has been to the extent that even the supervisory staff that they will be taking on should have a function that is a little broader than just the inspectorate function, and that they are there as resource people, very much as the Minister sees the function of the department on a broader scale?

We have talked on many occasions for the need to emphasize the professional status of teachers and, in my view, it is very difficult for an individual teacher to take this seriously when his operation is under the immediate sort of oversight that the old fashioned approach to inspection has. And if he is going to have someone in the back of the room commenting on his day-to-day activities, I do not think we can expect him to take the responsibilities for course development and freedom in the curriculum and its application that we would normally like to see go on with a more progressive approach.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we know traditions die hard but we anticipate that the

divisional boards, as some of the larger boards have now done, will adopt the philosophy that we have introduced into the department.

The traditional concept of inspection is disappearing and these individuals will act as resource people to assist the teachers, not to inspect them in that sense of the word. We really feel that this will become the philosophy of the divisional boards as they become established. And certainly, we will, as a department, make every effort to see that this becomes the approach.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 505. The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Chairman, I am anxious to find out from the Minister what will happen in the areas, particularly in the north, where they have been excluded from a recognized board of education, or unit, that will come under a board of education particularly, in places like Macdiarmid which is within close proximity to a recognized school unit but is excluded from it. Now how will it be supervised with regard to The Department of Education? It will not come under the board. Will it be under the direct supervision of The Department of Education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We shall, for a number of areas in the province which, because of the fact they are not part of a larger unit or even in some instances where the unit itself is not what the educators today term viable, still have a number of personnel who will act as resource programme consultants. We shall still have these personnel available to this kind of board.

Vote 505 agreed to.

On vote 506:

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, on vote 506, I would like to remind the Minister of the exchange we had some time ago about the distribution and methods of publishing some of the publications of the department. I think I asked specifically about the speech by Dr. Clegg, and the Minister replied that this was produced by the department. I gathered it was run off by the government press and so forth.

My question at that time was: Was the Minister considering the possibility of having this type of publication run off by a commercial publisher who would sell the book to make a profit? This would have two additional advantages. One, I think, the circulation might be wider. Secondly, the cost to the government might be less.

I was wondering if the Minister had any additional comments?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I have no additional comments at this point but I did make a note of the hon. member's suggestion and we are exploring it. I think it depends really on the type of publication that we would be making available, as to just how widespread an interest might be created. But the idea we thought really merited further consideration and we are doing so. But I have nothing more specific here this evening.

I should point out that we will get into a discussion of this and there are certain sums indicated in another estimate with respect to the Hall committee report. I am very hopeful that this will receive large distribution and perhaps could be marketed for general consumption on a slight repayment basis. Anyway, as far as the investment for the publication of that report is concerned, I am not sure yet.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 506. The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, some time ago I made a few remarks regarding the reading of the magazine *Dimensions* and I indicated at that time that although much of the material that the department sends out is excellent material, the greatest majority of it is not read and I think it is simply because the teachers do not have time to read it.

I am just wondering of the advisability of con'inuing to produce this material unless there is time for teachers to read it. I was wondering if the Minister would consider a survey of some sort whereby we would determine whether or not this material was actually being used or whether it was a waste of money? I think the material itself is good but as I said, I do not think much of it is being read, having been in school for quite some time, and it might be a waste of money because of no opportunity to read the material.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not really sure that a survey would, in itself, be an answer to this.

My own reaction is that perhaps I do not talk to as many teachers as the hon. member, but I do chat with a number over the course of a year and the response I have received, at least, is that the information coming from the department is read—I do not say by the

majority—but by a substantial number of them.

Mr. Martel: I just cite an example: In consulting with 25 odd teachers during the Easter week, there was only one who even knew what *Dimensions was*. Now there is other material that comes from the department. It is excellent but I am just citing this example.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member was talking to some of his colleagues at Easter with respect to the publication of *Dimensions,* one reason they may not have had a chance to see it is that, I would think at that point perhaps, there had only been one or two publications of *Dimensions* up to that time. Perhaps three at the most, I would think.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 506. The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: I think I asked the Minister how his annual report is progressing?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the annual report is in the hands of the printer. It has once again—and I think the hon. member will see this when it is available—been altered. I have to say this is obviously going to be substantially altered again next year.

We have endeavoured to make it not only more readable, but we have removed some of what we felt was irrelevant statistical information. But nonetheless we have added more statistics that we hope will be helpful to the hon. members.

It is just almost impossible to compile it from the returns of the boards in the length of time that is available. I think that we must face the fact that next year, there will be further difficulty. Hopefully the year after that, by the reduction of the number of boards, we should be in a position to have the report available at an earlier date.

Mr. Nixon: I like the innovation this year that the Minister has separated, from his opening remarks, a general survey of the work of the department. I think that this is really designed to be bound in as one unit and probably reprinted in a little more elaborate fashion, and sent out to a fairly large mailing list across the province.

I am always impressed really when I talk to my friends on municipal councils and other forms and responsibility, that sitting right on the mantelpiece, there is an autographed copy of the opening statement that the Minister makes year by year, bound much more elaborately than the one that is available to us here. But I would suggest that if the annual report is going to improve its function, it should be available for the discussion of the estimates.

I know the Minister's sentiments in this. He agrees to some extent and he is often critical perhaps that we do not make more use of his report than we do. But one of the most important uses of the report is to let the members of the Legislature know what has gone on in the previous year before we are asked to vote these sums for the year following.

I can sympathize with the problems of putting together the report in the form that it has taken in the last few years. It contains all sorts of irrelevant material that is loaded into that rather heavy volume. I would like to see the Minister undertake the sort of report that formed the supplement to his opening remarks.

He could get it prepared in fairly good time, as I am sure that this one was, and make it available to the members of the Legislature before the estimates are brought before it.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask in subsection 5 of vote 560, films and television, about the inclusion of an expenditure for the reproduction of the movie "A Place to Stand."

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that there is anything in this vote for reproduction—is this the right term—of that film. I would have to say this though, it is certainly worth reproducing.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to ask if I might Mr. Chairman, if in addition to "A Place to Stand," the Minister of Education might get a camera crew and put the camera atop the GO train as it goes from the Guildwood station to Union Station and photograph that place to stand along the tracks in Ontario.

Vote 506 agreed to.

On vote 507.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I notice that in this estimate there is $65,000 set aside for the radio broadcast. These would be the school broadcasts, I take it, that are heard over the many stations across the province. Is that true?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the hon. member is on the wrong vote.

Mr. Pitman: I am sorry, that is for television I see. This is just promotional

television? It has nothing to do with curriculum or programmes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it does not have anything to do with it. There is one film that was produced with respect to community colleges and perhaps some of the hon. members have seen it. We may be doing two or three more like it. This was some six or eight months ago. This does not relate to the regular radio broadcasts in the school system.

Mr. T. Reid: I understand that this is the proper time to bring in this discussion of Head start type of programmes, so I would like to take the opportunity of doing this. This is something that I have been concerned with for a number of years. I have read with interest some of the Minister's statements in this area, and I would like to question him in detail on it.

I would like at this time, however, to give the reasons why we feel that The Department of Education, under the leadership of the Minister, should become very actively involved in what might be called pre-primary programmes for the culturally deprived children in Ontario.

We think this is a function of his department and as I should outline, there is certain advantages to it. I would like to then present my remarks on: "Why Ontario needs a Head start programme under the direction of the Minister of Education as opposed to the direction of the various boards of education.

I think one should start by saying that we must begin at the beginning in education; this is the place to start.

Primary, and particularly pre-primary school education is the area in which a greater departmental concern and new programmes, as well as an upward shift in expenditures, could have the greatest long-run individual, social, economic and political return.

On the one hand, there is the question of preparing individuals for the world of work and of maximizing their contribution to economic growth in this era of a permanent scientific and technological revolution—popularly called "the age of automation". For this goal, an additional $1 million—a greater concern, a new programme by the Minister—but an additional $1 million invested today in pre-primary school education could reduce by at least several million dollars the expenditures which will be necessary to train and retrain many of today's four- and five-year olds 15 years from now for the radically changed world of work of 1983.

If, in other words, the approach to preparing individuals for the world of work had a deeper and longer run perspective in decision-making than it has at present in the Minister's department, Ontario would have a much more rational and efficient allocation of funds today.

On the other hand, there is the belief that it is good for an individual, however gifted, to be able to develop and use the gifts with which he was born. And, related to this, is the belief that social and economic barriers which stand between a child and the development of his inherited creative, intellectual and physical gifts ought to be eliminated.

For this goal, an additional 1 million spent today in pre-primary school education, particularly Head start programmes, could reduce by several million dollars the amount that would be spent on programmes to counteract alienated teenagers ten years from now in 1978.

The conclusion about these two goals is that there is no valid dichotomy between training individuals to be productive factors of production and their education as unique human beings with unique gifts at the pre-primary and primary school level.

Turning my remarks to the question of what I call manpower wastage in Ontario, I would like to say this. And I would be quite willing to provide the Minister with footnotes for the statistics.

In Ontario today a great deal of the intelligence, creativity and other inherited abilities of a vast number of people is being wasted. At least one of every four non-farm Ontario families lives on an annual income of $4,000 or less and more than one of every two farm families lives on $2,500 or less. At the very most, 20 of every 100 children of such families in the age group of 19 to 24 are attending a regular day-time school or university. Now if only 20 of every 100 of these children were born with the ability to pursue such education, then the argument that there is massive wastage of the talents of Canadians in Ontario would lose much of its validity.

But such is not the case. Since it is likely that more than 50 of every 100 young people, 19 to 25, whose parents have annual incomes of $7,000 or more are still pursuing full-time school or university studies, then one-half of the young people whose parents have incomes of $4,000 or less can be judged as

having been born with the capacity and the capabilities of pursuing such education. In my opinion there may be more "born bright-but-poor" young people not involved in formal education, informal study in this province than there are actually studying. This participation gap is evidence of a massive wastage of manpower resources in Ontario.

The federal government's Department of Labour noted in a case study in Ontario in the 1950's that:

> It is quite clear that children from middle class and professional homes enjoy a higher survival rate in the educational system than would be predicted from an examination of patterns according to which intelligence is distributed among students. Such findings merely underline the wastage that is occurring among the bright students who drop out of school not because of lack of intelligence or academic potential, but for economic, psychological and social reasons.

In 1962, the central advisory committee on education in the Atlantic provinces made this conclusion and then compared it to the state in Ontario. They concluded that:

> There is no doubt that in all four provinces many students who should go to higher education fail to do so, and there is serious loss of student potential—about half of the students in those four provinces who could be reasonably classed as of university calibre do not proceed to either university, to teacher training or to nursing.

And then the study notes that:

> It is clear that the wastage is at least as serious and probably more serious in Ontario than it is in the Atlantic region.

The evidence noted above is based primarily on studies done in the 1950s and on the DBS census of 1961. However, in 1965-66, the Canadian union of students did a sample survey of Canadian undergraduate students which verified the conclusions of earlier studies that university students are "by and large not representative of the Canadian class structure but rather bear the characteristics of the middle and upper classes of Canadian society".

The study gives as an example the following: The study concluded that only 35 per cent of Canadian university students were from blue collar or working class families compared to 64.1 per cent of employed Canadians who held jobs that could be classified as such.

And those statistics relate to Ontario, with a slightly smaller gap, but the gap is still there, and it is a very large gap. Now, Mr. Chairman, many people and some people, including I believe some members, perhaps, of The Department of Education find nothing startling in these comparisons. They claim that children born into the lower socio-economic strata in Ontario—for example, low-paid manual workers—are biologically inferior in their inherited abilities, particularly in their thinking powers, to children born to parents who are at the other end of the socio-economic spectrum—for example, high-paid corporation directors.

Theirs is an hereditary assumption which may have some validity in a half-dozen isolated rural areas in Canada in which a great deal of family intermarriage has taken place over generations, but it is nonsense when applied to a province such as Ontario.

There is little evidence to support the claim that the range and distribution of intelligence of a group of children born to parents who have not gone beyond grade 8 and who bring home annual incomes of $4,000 or less is any different from the range and distribution of inherited capacity of a group of children born to parents with university education who bring home annual incomes of $7,000 or more.

The number of children born with the capability for higher education is the same, regardless of the social, educational and economic background of their parents. And this, Mr. Chairman, I submit, is the only possible premise to adopt in the formulation of public policy. It is unequivocally the operating principle of the United States war on poverty as proposed by President Johnson in his message preceding The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

At that time, Mr. Chairman, the president noted:

> The young man or woman who grows up without a decent education—in a hostile and squalid environment—that young man or woman is often trapped in a life of poverty. He does not have the skills demanded by a complex society.
>
> He does not know how to acquire those skills. He faces a mounting sense of despair which drains initiative and ambition and energy. The war on poverty, including their Head start programme, is a struggle to give people a chance.

Mr. Chairman, I would like next to turn to the reasons for some of this wastage. There

are many reasons for the present wastage of human potential in Ontario. The concern in my remarks is concerned with the poverty environment argument only. It is now a platitude to say that it is the home environment which stimulates a child to develop the gifts with which he is born and stimulates his desire for learning and knowledge.

There are tremendous differences between the home environment and attitudes of a poverty home and a well-to-do home, besides the definitional difference of annual incomes.

Thelma McCormack, a York University sociologist, comments as follows:

> The poverty syndrome is produced not by economic deprivation but by a pattern of social relations symbolized and maintained by income differences. Being poor means being powerless, being treated in a variety of contexts throughout one's life. The old left called these people the "lumpenproletariat" to suggest that they were not just poorer than most but outcasts.
>
> The probability is high that their children will be outcasts too. Everything conspires against them. With few exceptions their fate is sealed before they ever walk across the threshold of schools which would have failed them in any event.

One essential aspect of the poverty syndrome Mr. Chairman, is that poverty homes produce too many children without adequate words at the age of four and five. Such children have not had the opportunity or the encouragement to pick up the basic skills of comunication and understanding of language that is largely a prerequisite for success in senior kindergarten and grade 1.

All later learning will be influenced by this lack of basic learning—having names for things is essential in the learning process. The average child from such a background will have difficulty and constant frustration from the demand of a typical primary school programme. He cannot cope with the change and expectations about what he should achieve and is baffled and feels inadequate.

No wonder the desire grows to escape from the virtual imprisonment which school comes to represent as he experiences failure year after year. Instead of eight or ten years of primary school curing the basic linguistic handicap of such a child, he has either left school for good or if he lasts through secondary school is likely reading at a level approximately three and one half years below the expected grade 9 level.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Who wrote that?

Mr. T. Reid: I will refer you to three articles which I wrote myself.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): That will put you in your place.

Mr. T. Reid: Because he literally cannot read the secondary school arts and sciences textbooks of grade 9, it is likely that he will shift into the stream, labelled in this province as "science, technology and trades", "business and commerce" and "occupational".

In too many cases, the choice is simply to get out of the tough reading courses of the university-geared arts and science programmes. A great many gifted children from poverty homes end up in courses below the level of their actual intelligence because they appear to lack the ability. Most do not get into the academic stream leading to university and many other kinds of post-secondary school education.

Most provincial Departments of Education in Canada have recently re-organized the secondary school curriculum. In Ontario the revision instituted in the early 1960's, the so-called Robarts plan, is resulting, and will likely continue to result—unless there are policy changes—in an extraordinary perversion of intent. Although it was clearly not planned as such, it is turning out to be "class" legislation in the sense that it encourages children from lower income homes to say out of the five-year stream leading to university and reserves places in that stream for the sons and daughters of the well-to-do.

This is happening because the re-organization of the secondary school curriculum was not backed up by a barrage of other educational measures designed for the very young, disadvantaged and poor children and their parents. The re-organization is accentuating rather than diminishing the enormous gap between those who can and do read and communicate intelligently – between those who can and do communicate in the language of the school—and those to whom the printed word and the standard techniques of communication in the school setting mean very, very little.

Mr. Chairman, several provincial departments of education have also expanded non-university institutions of higher education, particularly the junior college. Excellent examples of these are the community colleges established in British Columbia and Alberta.

A somewhat different trend has taken place in this province. Ontario recently established the colleges of applied arts and technology, which are merely a logical extension of the secondary school re-organization plan.

The CAATs in Ontario will, unless substantial policy changes are made by the Minister by the 1970's in effect seal the fate of the culturally disadvantaged pupil who survives four years of secondary school in watered-down streams, particularly in the stream labelled "four years arts and science." The principle of "separate but equal education" is now institutionalized in post-secondary school education in Ontario: Instead of the colour of one's skin being the distinguishing characteristic, poor or well-to-do family background becomes, in general, the *de facto* entrance labels. The two plans together in this province, progressively close the door to re-entry to the top level of academic education after grade 8 to those many teenagers who are placed at an absolute and at a competitive disadvantage because of the accident of birth.

This brings me to the priority in education today in Ontario and it must be in the area of primary and pre-primary school level. Many educators and learning experts accept the validity of the following two statements: The first one is contained in a report by the Toronto board of education.

> Our present knowledge of the development of learning abilities indicates that the pre-school years are the most important years of learning in the child's life. A tremendous amount of learning takes place during these years: and this learning is the foundation for all further learning.

A further statement by Jerome Bruner supports this concept:

> It is not surprising in the light of this that early opportunities for development have loomed so large in our recent understanding of human mental growth. The importance of early experience is only dimly sensed today. The evidence from animal studies indicates that virtually irreversible deficits can be produced in mammals by depriving them of opportunities that challenge their nascent capacities.

A child born into a slum has its intelligence deteriorate absolutely. It is on the basis of this premise, as applied to humans, that the advocates of pre-primary school education for children born into the "poverty syndrome" largely rest their case. For example, the Head start programme in the United States rests:

> On the assumption that an organized programme of enrichment, preceding kindergarten or first grade schooling, will have an important positive effect on the educational and social development of children living in conditions of poverty.

Well, Mr. Chairman, let us ask the question, what is being done in this province and let us see how we stack up against the rest of Canada. Here are some hard statistics.

Quite often the statistics are not available for Ontario, only available for Canada. I do not apologize for it at all but I would suggest that the Minister should look into it so we could have better statistics with which to make our criticisms of the department.

In Canada, the number of five-year-olds increased by 50 per cent between 1951 and 1964—from 301,000 to 454,000. The number of five-year-olds in school is estimated to have increased over the period by almost 200 per cent—from 92,000 to 271,000. This means that the percentage of five-year-olds in school almost doubled—from 31 per cent in 1951 to 60 per cent in 1964. These results are praiseworthy and in Ontario these results are very good, too, when we look at that cold hard fact.

A deeper look, however, reveals some interesting facts.

1. The Dominion bureau of statistics states that in 1964, 19 per cent of all the five-year-olds in British Columbia attended public and private elementary schools compared to 96 per cent in Nova Scotia. I believe, in this province, depending which statistics one uses, that Ontario, while not at the 96 per cent level, is at about the 75 per cent level.

2. In the Ontario public school system in 1964, only three of every 100 pupils in rural townships were in kindergarten compared to over 12 of every 100 pupils in cities.

3. In the city of Toronto, which has one of the most extensive systems of junior kindergarten classes in Canada, the following statement was a major conclusion of a study in 1965 by the research division of the board of education: Junior kindergarten—which can be classified in the category of the Head start programme—is most available in areas characterized by low socio-economic and educational levels of the parents.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the selection of the areas in which the junior kindergartens would be established was done on the basis of the low income areas. The reason

for this was that the children from the lower socio-economic strata might benefit by the extra year in schooling, for some of the reasons I have mentioned, for the report concludes they are not the children who are sent to junior kindergarten. What that means, Mr. Chairman, is that although the junior kindergartens were purposely set up in those schools where the income level of parents is low in the city, the children who ended up in those junior kindergartens were from the wealthier people living in lower income areas. The programme did not on the whole get to the kids who really needed it.

4. In Ontario, the number of five-year-olds in kindergarten in the public school system increased by 40 per cent between 1956 and 1961; the increase in the Roman Catholic separate schools was 107 per cent. Looked at from a different index calculated from the Minister's statistics, kindergarten enrolment to total elementary school enrolment, the increase was 10 per cent in the public schools between 1956 and 1964 and 98 per cent in the Roman Catholic separate schools.

So the rate of increase in the enrolment of five-year-olds in the Roman Catholic separate schools was greater than in the public school system, but one of the reasons for this was the Roman Catholic school system started from a lower base, so it should be noted that in 1964, 9.5 per cent of the pupils in public school were in kindergarten and 8.6 per cent of the pupils in Roman Catholic schools were in kindergarten. The final fact before I interpret them, is this.

5. That in Ontario there are about 157,000 five-year-olds. Ten years from now there may be 183,000; an increase of 26,000—17 per cent—so we have come up with a growth factor there too.

Various interpretations can be given to these facts. One set of tentative conclusions could be the following. There are vast provincial opportunity gaps for five-year-olds to attend school. Within each province there are vast regional opportunity gaps for five-year-olds to attend school particularly in Ontario. Within areas in which junior public school kindergartens for four- and five-year olds are widely available, the children of the lower socio-economic strata are vastly underrepresented.

In Ontario the Roman Catholic separate schools made a much greater relative thrust at the pre-grade 1 level over the last decade than did the public school system. Over the next decade there could well be a 17 per cent increase in the number of five-year-olds in Canada and in Ontario. There could, of course, be a dramatic downward shift in the birth-rate; we cannot calculate that yet.

The children who will be in their early twenties in 1985 in Ontario are already born. The vast majority of the 25 per cent of the five-year-olds who are not attending school are from poverty and low-income families; children who were born behind the eight ball of disadvantage; children who need preferential pre-primary school education if they are to have a meaningful chance to develop the abilities with which they were born and have an equal chance in competition in school against the children from more affluent and advantaged homes.

In the world of 1985, it is doubtful that very many of these children will feel like worthwhile citizens and independent members of society. Their process of alienation started the day they were born and little is being done in this province before they are five year old or even at the age of five to help them lift themselves up. Virtually nothing is being done for them when they are four years old, an age which some learning experts state is much, much more potentially productive than five.

I would like to turn, Mr. Chairman, to a concept of poverty, education and technological change, because it is tied up with this programme very drastically.

It is difficult to predict what the effects of the new technology will be on Canadian society, particularly in education and the world of work. Nevertheless, the following speculative view represents a state of affairs that might come about, particularly in Ontario.

The evidence of an extremely wide gap between the level of formal education reached by the children of the relatively well-to-do in this province and the level reached by the children of the poor has already been noted, as has been other evidence indicating the sheer magnitude of the under-representation of children from low-income homes in Ontario's educational institutions, particularly in grade 13 and in post-secondary school institutions.

Regardless of the reasons why children born into low-income homes in this province do not occupy anything near their share of places now available in the final years of high school and beyond, the clear fact is that they do not. It can be argued that what the new technology is beginning to do is to freeze those conditions in our society which tend to perpetuate the sons and daughters of the poor in the cycle of poverty, and to

perpetuate the sons and daughters of the middle-class and wealthy in the cycle of middle-class and wealth.

The basic reason for this as the Minister well knows is this ossification could be that, for the first time in the history of man, education is placed squarely between man and the work which is his acceptable and moral means of livelihood. Thus, the children of the poor tend to be the drop-outs from elementary and secondary school education.

These under-educated members of the labour force are increasingly becoming the unemployed. The unemployed are the poor. The children of the poor are the school drop-outs and so on. Even if the average child from a low-income home survives to secondary school in the province, he ends up in an academically watered-down, technically, commercial or arts stream for two to four years to prepare for a low-grade and low-income, and often a personally unrewarding job—particularly if he happens to be born quite bright.

In the industrial economy in the pre-1960s, he probably managed to get a steady job and considered himself fortunate to have achieved the same low-income category as his parents. Today, and in the future world of automation in this province, however, the likelihood of the average person with such an educational background securing a steady job will be much less. Instead he will join the ranks of the occasional labourer and eventually take his place as a welfare recipient, possibly before he is 25. If his children have only the opportunities he had to make his way in life in this province's education system then the saying, "If they're poor now, they will never be anything else," will continue to tell the story from one generation of school drop-outs to the next.

The other cycle is the reverse. The children of the relatively well-to-do stay in school—some of the less able enter and scrape through our university. The highly educated are the employed who receive good middle-class salaries. The children of the middle-class stay in school. The average child from the middle-income home will get into the academic stream in secondary school which has an "open door" to universities.

He will end up with a good job and a good salary to enable him to hand on a middle-class life to his children. The shift from the industrial age to the age of automation will certainly affect his life but it will not cut his job and income out from under his feet.

Unless, therefore, Mr. Chairman, the link between drop-outs from education and young people from low-income homes is broken before the full impact of the new technology makes itself felt in the world of work, automation could virtually eliminate social mobility from one generation to the next in this province. The poor and their children will not only be alienated from education but will, as a direct consequence, be alienated from participation in the productive process, and fail to receive any income from such participation. This could mean increasing alienation of such individuals from society.

This speculative view of the new technology and opportunity should be considered. It could happen. However, if the right policies are pursued by this Minister of Education today, it need not happen and the possibility need not exist.

What then, Mr. Chairman, should be done? In some of the better financed and socially concerned school board districts in Ontario, the need—and hard-headed economic returns—have been identified and action taken. The city of Toronto has been mentioned already—an outstanding example of a school board which is trying to fight its war on poverty without a moral or financial commitment from other levels of government. Another example as the Minister noted in his introductory remarks is the ENOC programme in Hamilton, Ontario. ENOC stands for the educational needs of the older city. The Minister knows about it but just because there is one such programme in this province that is no reason to beat his chest.

The ENOC programme is designed to uplift many of the children in the older, poorer areas of the city who are greatly handicapped by circumstances — unemployed fathers, broken homes, inferior housing conditions, large families, lack of parental concern and interest. For example, only half the parents attended the school open house compared to an almost complete turn-out of parents at a school in a middle-income area in the same city.

The ENOC programme includes a kindergarten for four-year-olds, not five-year-olds, with emphasis on remedial English, teacher visits to the home of each child, medical examinations for each child and in some cases dental examinations—because they believe that "children whose teeth hurt cannot study"—and trips and excursions in order to broaden the experience of the children and to increase their vocabulary.

Surely, if disadvantaged children in Hamilton, Ontario, have this chance, similarly disadvantaged children throughout Ontario should also have an equal chance. And it is not just a meaningful chance to develop their individual potential; it is a meaningful chance to become trained and educated to make their way in life in the world of work of the age of automation; it is, Mr. Chairman, manpower training at the beginning which this province has shirked.

In summary, the first public-policy principle that must be accepted in Ontario by the present Minister of Education is that of universal accessibility to education. The first programme to achieve genuine accessibility to education is one which makes it possible for children born into low-income homes to have as good a set of initial communication skills as children of equal inherited ability from well-to-do homes. Ontario's kindergartens are certainly not even attempting to do this. Many children from low-income homes have been born into a poverty syndrome and again I repeat they need preferential treatment in education, not simply equal treatment. Equality of opportunity does not mean equal treatment; equality of opportunity in this province, at this level, in a Head start programme means preferential treatment. This is not happening, particularly in the rural areas and small towns of Ontario. Furthermore, Ontario's private nursery schools have children who are mainly from well-to-do homes where the exact opposite ought to be true. Quite simply, without universal opportunity before kindergarten and grade 1, universal accessibility to education for a child to develop the gifts with which he was born is impossible. The hard fact which has been recognized in the United States but not in this province, not by this government, and not by this Minister of Education, is that five-years-old is too late for the underprivileged child to begin schooling.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister specifically, whether the statement he made in this House last year is true. I will read it directly from *Hansard* and see whether he was just mouthing phrases this time last year.

I quote from *Hansard*, May 17, 1967, pages 3536 and 3537: There is another interesting point here, but it is a subsidiary point to the one I want to make. I am concerned with the statement of the Minister's intention at that time. He said:

> It is the feeling of my officials that it would be unfortunate if any programme designed to assist our children in this same area—

Before that the Minister refers specifically to the Head start programme.

> —should be undertaken without the detailed and thorough planning so necessary to success.

I continue with the quotation:

> During the next year—

That is starting from May 17, 1967 to the present time; in fact the year lapsed May 17, 1968, the Minister said:

> —this whole area will be the subject of study and research with the objective of designing methods and procedures to ensure equality of opportunity for children who do not enjoy the same advantages as some of their more fortunate classmates.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister was referring to many of the statements I have made. He continues:

> An international conference on the subject—

This question of early educational opportunities for the culturally disadvantaged at the age of four.

> —of this type of programme was held at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education during this past year under the joint sponsorship of that institute and of the policy and development council of my department.

So the Minister has had a conference. He states that he is going to do something about it and finally, Mr. Chairman, he said:

> I am pleased to announce that Dr. Carl Breiter, one of the outstanding authorities in this field in the United States, who took part in the conference, is joining the staff of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in the fall.

And that is for specific research into the area of what might be called loosely Head start programmes. I would like to ask the Minister therefore, Mr. Chairman, what action, if any, he has taken to provide equality of education in a meaningful sense instead of in a sense of sheer rhetoric for the children in this province—to have to be born into disadvantaged homes, and there are many of them, to ensure that they have their chance to make their way in this so-called province of opportunity where a lot of people do not have a place to stand, let alone a place to lie down.

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister wish to reply to the question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will reply, perhaps not quite in the same manner or the same length as the member for Scarborough East—

Mr. Nixon: It is an important subject nevertheless!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and I shall endeavour to do so in a way that I hope will indicate that

this matter is not being ignored in this jurisdiction at all. I must point out to him that I have read very carefully his articles relating to this subject and other fields. I think they started in about 1965. I have read a great deal of the hon. member's material.

I have even read some working papers of a particular conference where the member is suggesting, and I think he is right, that education can also inculcate social and personal values in more direct ways. I assume that he is the author of this document referring to nursery schools.

For example, a nursery school teacher could have a small model canoe in the classroom suspended from a ceiling and sit five- and six-year-old children—this is not the four-year-olds, I guess there are the five- and six-year-old children in it, saying, "Now when you grow up to have leisure time, you can enjoy yourself paddling a canoe on one of Canada's thousands of lakes and rivers. This is, I think, part of the working paper prepared by the member for Scarborough East to the Liberal policy discussion. I forget whether it was two years ago they had this and he goes on to say—

Mr. Nixon: I do not remember seeing you there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Pardon?

Mr. Nixon: I do not remember seeing you there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was not invited to attend.

Mr. Nixon: You are welcome to attend.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Am I really? I was not invited to attend, and the hon. member, the author, goes on and says it is noted before teachers and parents can educate for social purpose since the—

Mr. T. Reid: You agree with that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought this related to the Head start programme. We are talking about five- and six-year olds and the social and personal—

Mr. Nixon: Get to the point.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the social and personal values that can be inculcated through the school system and I think this does. However, I will not go through the whole working paper.

But let us deal with some of the statistics and let us—

Mr. Nixon: It might do you good.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have read it very carefully. I would say that the hon. member presents—I do not say necessarily in this particular area, but in some areas—some very worthwhile thoughts. I would be the last to say not.

Mr. Nixon: Let us have some answers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would also suggest that they are not all irrelevant. There are some worthwhile thoughts, no question about it.

But let us look at some of the statistics here in the province of Ontario. There is a great tendency, and I guess I am guilty of it on occasion, Mr. Chairman, to compare. This is perhaps how one makes an analysis of this jurisdiction with others. So let us look at the figures. The hon. member has indicated that kindergarten, while in itself is not sufficient, is nonetheless a very basic ingredient in any educational programme and then he suggests that it should move down to the four-year-olds. Let us look at the five-year-old position here in this province.

In September of 1967, there were 136,233 children enrolled in kindergartens in Ontario; I refer only to those in the separate, public and the pre-kindergartens. They represent—

Mr. Nixon: How many five-year-olds are there in—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will get to that. They represent 86 per cent of all the five-year-olds in the province of Ontario. This is in September of 1967. Eighty-six per cent—136,233.

Mr. Nixon: DBS figures?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, this is not DBS. I recognize that this is one of the problems that we have when we get back to statistics. I am giving you the information that I have and think is relevant and hopefully up-to-date.

Mr. Nixon: Unfortunately, your statistics are not available to us.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, because this is even more up-to-date than the Minister's report will be. However, the hon. member, I am sure, wants these up-to-date statistics. Taking the enrollment of public senior kindergartens only, in 1966 we served 86.9 per cent of the estimated five-year age group in our cities and town and urban townships, and 60.7 per cent of those in rural villages, townships, unorganized townships and Crown lands.

Let us see if this is not a pretty high level of educational service. In 1956 we had only 58 per cent; that is 11 years ago, since we used September, 1967, as the base. In 1956, we had only 58 per cent of our five-year-olds in publicly supported kindergartens in Ontario. By 1961, there were 71 per cent and, as I say, by 1968, 86 per cent.

From a kindergarten enrollment of only 70,280 youngsters in September of 1956, we have grown to 136,233 in September of this past year.

In absolute numbers—I am not an economist, and I am sure the member for Scarborough East would understand this terminology better than I—this is an increase of almost 94 per cent in an 11-year-period. I would suggest that he might search the statistics because I would like to see figures for other jurisdictions, as I am sure there are some where the same absolute percentage increase has been substantially higher than in the province of Ontario.

I think you have to determine the starting point when you are talking about operation Head start, because it really varies from state to state, I have some very slight knowledge of it.

In October 1966—the latest date for which I have available figures—in the United States there were 244,000 five-year-old children. Only 62 per cent were enrolled in kindergartens and schools.

Mr. T. Reid: What about the best states?

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right, I will get to California, Michigan, Nevada, and every other state and I hope to do it in a very short time. I listened very patiently to the hon. member for Scarborough East; I think that he will acknowledge this, and I thought that some of it was very worthwhile.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of the total enrollment of 2,641,000 children, 82 per cent were served by public institutions. The rest were in fee-paying private schools. Taking the country as a whole, their service is less extensive. I think that this is fair and accurate, both to cities and towns and to the rural areas.

This is taking the total jurisdiction of the United States. The Americans, as the hon. member will know, divide their statistics into three categories—the central cities; the outside central cities—I am sure that he is aware of this—and then the rural areas. Including both the public and private kindergartens and nurseries in 1966, they enrolled 70 per cent of their five-year-old children in their first two categories and not quite 50 per cent of those in the rural areas. I am sure that there is some objection.

The leader of the Opposition has already suggested that a valid comparison is not with the United States as a whole but with individual states. Perhaps this is right. Now, taking publicly enrolled kindergarten enrollment only—as a percentage of the five-year-old age group and comparing it to our level of 82.7 per cent for the last year—in October 1966, New York state enrolled 72.7. This is a fairly close and neighbouring state of the union. I guess that there are not many closer. Only three states exceed our level, they are California, Michigan and Nevada.

Mr. Nixon: There is a difference of a full year.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. I would say with respect, Mr. Chairman, that there would not be. I think that even the economist, the member for Scarborough East, would acknowledge this—there would not be a substantial alteration in percentages.

Mr. T. Reid: When I finish this, I shall endeavour to clarify it for the hon. member. I do not guarantee that I can, for him, but I shall try.

Mr. Nixon: But your figures are for 1967.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is right, 1967, and 1966. I acknowledge this and I also suggest that I am not a statistician and that the percentages would not alter that much. There may be some. Virtually every elementary school—

Mr. Nixon: There would be a substantial difference.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sure that the member for Scarborough East is finding this helpful. Virtually every elementary school in Ontario has a kindergarten. 98.3 per cent of the elementary schools in the province of Ontario have kindergartens. This is I think, and once again I cannot get the statistics on this for the hon. member, substantially higher than the national average in the United States.

Mr. T. Reid: You sure take care of the five-year-olds.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With respect, Mr. Chairman, the area where we still have difficulties relates really to matters of geography. I think that the hon. member must be fair in recognizing this. With 60 per cent of our rural children enrolled, I think we can really say

—and I say this as objectively as one can in my position—that we have made very real progress in the rural areas of this province. There is no doubt in my mind that with the establishment of the larger units of administration that we can increase the 60 per cent factor in the rural parts of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, I would be delighted to have a copy of whatever is new in the hon. member's address so that I can pursue it at greater length. It was not included in the three articles that he wrote previously. I would appreciate receiving this when he has a few moments to prepare it, because I think that it could be helpful.

Dealing with the concept of operation Head start, I can recall certain statements made by the hon. member a year ago. I am not going to read a letter by David Brison from the applied psychology branch of the Ontario institute of studies in education with respect to the hon. member's views and the position, as this gentleman saw it, with respect to the United States. While there is some conflict in point of view, I think that there is a fairly factual analysis of the difficulties that our American neighbours have had with respect to operation Head start. I think that there is a tendency, Mr. Chairman, for some people, in taking statistical approaches to this situation, to tend to ignore the very real influence of the learning environment.

The people I discussed this with from time to time say there is no question that operation Head start has had some measure of success. They have also discovered, and I think that this is relevant in some jurisdictions at least, that in the United States unless there is an on-going programme for these young people, if the youngster goes back into the mainstream of the educational programme in that state or city jurisdiction, then much of the value of operation Head start is dissipated.

We have recognized this and we are studying and have made some real progress. We have had personnel visiting jurisdictions in the United States and studies conducted within the institutions on the basis that much of this relates to the qualification and the talent of the teacher at the primary level. I think that this is one—and this is a personal point of view—of the main characteristics in whatever type of compensatory programme is developed for junior kindergarten, or the term used by the hon. member—the culturally disadvantaged.

It must relate to the qualifications and the training of the teacher who is going to deal with these programmes. There is no point in saying: "Here, let us open up a class for 50 culturally deprived youngsters" and then put them into an environment where the teacher does not have the skill to do it. This is where they have had difficulties, I say with respect, in some jurisdictions to the south of us. This is something we are trying to avoid here in our approach to this problem.

I think, in the alterations that are taking place in the programmes for the primary school specialists, that we can come to grips with this. At the same time I think we must also be very realistic and accept the fact that while we have been, I think, given some insight into these situations, the answers are not as clear cut as the hon. member would suggest. This concept that these youngsters are being deprived and this reflects itself through the elementary to secondary system and then of course into the post-secondary system, Mr. Chairman, there is a degree of relevance in this. I do not say that it is not true, but I say that it is quite unfair and, I think, improper to suggest that the situation here in Ontario is as it is painted by the hon. member.

I take exception to it, because I think not only does he exaggerate it I think he emphasizes without any question the negative aspect of it.

I go to the state of California where, let us face it, their figures are higher than ours. I would ask the hon. member to see, and I think I am relatively close on this, that even with a system of more junior kindergartens, I do not think they have that large a number of Head starts in the state of California. Apart from four or five major cities, I guess the programme has not had the same impetus there as in some other jurisdictions. I am not sure of this; I would not want to say this is factually so, I should not make this observation. But let us assume that they have had a higher degree of programme at the elementary level. They have free tuition, theoretically—which in fact does not exist—but I have heard a great deal about it from the members opposite in the institutions of higher learning over the last three of four years. And I say, with respect to the hon. member, I think he will find—

Mr. Nixon: Conservatives ruined the system when Reagan was elected.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought he was reflecting the traditional approach that I sometimes see even in the fields of education from some of the members opposite from time to time.

However, we will not go into that on this occasion. The statistics or the facts, I think will demonstrate that in the state of California, and I am subject to correction here, if one wants to get into the discussion of classes—which I do not, I do not like it—but social or income groups that we have in California, there is a higher percentage of the total age group or population in post-secondary institutions than the percentages as they relate to the higher, the middle and the lower income groups in that state of the union which has probably one of the most progressive approaches to post-secondary education.

The relative percentages, I think, are fairly comparable to the province of Ontario except that they have a total percentage higher. But when you break it down into groups rather than classes, you will find they come from relatively the same number; the same percentage numbers are enrolled in their post-secondary institutions. I think, Mr. Chairman, that this is something the hon. member should keep in mind when he is comparing this jurisdiction to others.

Let us face it, it is an area that does need very definite work and development. We do not say this; what we say is we want to do it right. I do not know what all the exact, answers are yet, but there is an increasing feeling that much of the validity of this type of compensatory programme must be related to the qualifications or the ability of the teacher. We pay grants on junior kindergartens. Many states of the union or state jurisdictions do not pay grants to junior kindergartens. Operation Head start is of course under the auspices of the federal administration—under the auspices of the federal administration, I emphasize this.

Mr. T. Reid: It is manpower training, at the beginning.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I emphasize this. I do not know how one can equate the hon. member's philosophy and his approach to things when he tells me manpower training is an area of federal jurisdiction. I do not want to get into this again tonight. He says that this is not educational. How can anyone say that manpower training is not, in some form, educational. I have argued this with the Minister of manpower and I think I am right.

Not to prolong this discussion, let us sum it up in this fashion—that we will not be moving the same way as our American neighbours because I think their problems are different. We recognize that more can be done at the lower grade or kindergarten or junior kindergarten level. We recognize that certain compensatory programmes can be desirable as long as they relate to a continuing educational experience and they are not isolated from what perhaps the child's future educational experience will be.

I am, perhaps, phrasing this in a clumsy way but I hope the hon. member understands what I am trying to say. I think, Mr. Chairman, we can anticipate that we will, in this jurisdiction, come up with an approach because of the experience elsewhere over a period of time that will have relevance for the students in the school system of this province.

I am very optimistic. I cannot spell out for the hon. member all the details of what may occur over the next few months, I can only say that we are, I think, as deeply aware of this problem as he is. Perhaps some of the answers we will be finding he may even enthuse over after he has an opportunity to assess them.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to, if I may, comment on this again. It is a direct follow-up and I will keep my remarks quite brief because we have explored it fairly extensively.

The first thing I would like to point out is that the concept of education and the perpetuation of class structure in our society and the lack of vertical mobility, is a very important point. I simply refer the Minister to a book called *The Vertical Mosaic* by John Porter—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have read it. I would like the hon. member to relate the statistical information in *The Vertical Mosaic* from the date it was written, or the year it was published, and check the existing statistical information.

Mr. T. Reid: I refer the Minister to this; that social change cannot take place in a decade. It takes much more time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I realize that.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like secondly to object very strongly to a statement that the mobility from one class to the next in Ontario is no worse and no better than the vertical mobility—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not say the mobility. I am talking about the percentages of students in a particular age group in one jurisdiction as they compare to the percentage of students in the same age groups in our own jurisdiction.

Mr. T. Reid: That is fine, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what I mean.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, okay.

Mr. T. Reid: He said that in Ontario we are no worse, no better perhaps, than California in this respect. I simply say this. In California they have black, coloured, poor people. If the Minister thinks that we have the same type of problem, he is way out. In our society in this province we should be away ahead of California, not behind them. If we had a colour problem we could make this analogy. It just does not wash.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Are you comparing Watts with downtown Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I am not; you may.

Mr. T. Reid: A very interesting example—

Mr. S. Lewis: That is what you did.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. I did not; I did not.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the Minister that when he wants to draw parallels he had better have his glasses on. Second, I would like to say—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not wear them.

Mr. T. Reid: Second, I would like to say that the Minister noted that one of the reasons he is delaying the initiative in the area of Head start is because of the lack of a continuous process which these students would go through, particularly when they hit the primary school system. I would simply like to state there is some very interesting correspondence in the *Globe and Mail* which the Minister has, I am sure. I got cut up badly but I am interested in his remarks because he comes out on my side. I am not trying to score a debating point here. I would simply like to state that in a letter to the editor in the *Globe and Mail* of May 23, 1967, I made the following short comments:

> The only reason why some children benefited from Head start when they went into the primary school system was that they had good teachers in the primary schools they went to after their Head start experience. Teachers as good as their Head start teachers. The basic reason why some children did not benefit was that they had bad teachers in the primary schools they went to after Head start.

David Brison, in his letter, attacking me—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not think he attacked the member. I do not think you could term it that way.

Mr. T. Reid: In David W. Brison's reply to my letter commenting on the Minister's speech, he said—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not enter into it at all.

Mr. T. Reid: Prof. Brison stated that this was not a basic reason and I will just leave it at that. He goes on with a lot of hodge-podge about short term research results. However, I do like the statement that Prof. Brison made in his letter of June 12 in the *Globe*, where he said:

> Mr. Reid and Mr. Davis apparently both accept the same objectives, quality education for school-age youngsters and, if necessary, effective compensatory pre-school education for those children who will not succeed if they are not given special help before they reach school. At issue is a method of achieving these objectives. Mr. Davis advocates a year of study.

This is dated June 12, 1967.

> Mr. Davis advocates a year of study to review different types of pre-school programmes aimed at special problems of Canadian youngsters. This review will then be used as a basis for planning.

And then he goes on and makes a nasty comment about me. I will end the quote there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was not nasty.

Mr. T. Reid: I would just say that I accept this. The Minister understands the problem. I have to push him harder. Another point I want to make here, is that Brison thought last year at this time that the Minister wanted only another year's study.

Finally on this, Mr. Chairman, my reply of July, 1967 to Mr. Brison's letter included the last paragraph.

> Perhaps the best one can do is to wish Mr. Brison and the OISE the best of luck in their report writing and hope that ten months from now—

that was said on July 17, 1967:

> —the Ontario government will translate their recommendations into insti'utional, moving reality instead of calling for yet another year of study.

And that is exactly what the Minister has done in this House tonight, Mr. Chairman. He has called for yet another year's study.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I—

Mr. T. Reid: If I could only push him a bit further.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into a debate with the hon. member but I—

Mr. T. Reid: I did not yield the floor.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But on a point of order, I did not call for another year of study.

Mr. T. Reid: I repeat, I did not yield the floor.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not say—

Mr. Chairman: Point of order, yes!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think if we are going to have a constructive debate here, Mr. Chairman—you know, a little bit of fun is quite relevant, I think, but let us not be misquoting people. I did not say, as the hon. member suggested, that it would require another year of study. I think I am reasonably accurate in my memory of that statement and I think I said that—

Mr. Lewis: You are right. You have given up all together.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I have not.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, may I comment on a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have not at all.

Mr. T. Reid: May I comment on a point of order?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to quote from *Hansard*, May 17, 1967, page 3536—unless the Minister did not correct *Hansard*?

Hon. Mr. Davis: But you said that I said tonight that I would.

Mr. T. Reid: Right.

During the next year, this whole area will be the subject of study and research with the objective of designing methods and procedures to ensure equality of opportunity for children who do not enjoy the same advantages as some of their more fortunate classmates.

He has done the study. Let us have some action.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, the Minister began his response to the hon. member for Scarborough East by saying he was not going to respond in as great length and depth and then he went on longer than the hon. member for Scarborough East.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I was not as long.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I want to challenge myself and say that I am not going to deal with this in a substantive way. I just want to comment on the debate without repeating all that has been presented to the House by the hon. member for Scarborough East.

What he has presented is a very valid thesis. I would say to him, with respect, that what he put on the record tonight he gave to the Ontario college of education summer school course some years ago and was repeated in the *Labour Gazette* and I had the benefit of it at the time. Along with *The Vertical Mosaic* and others, I presented it to this government then. And if it gives him any comfort, the reaction of the government was a combination of the gauche interjections of the hon. Minister from Sharbot Lake—he is not here, so we can get away with any further gauche interjections—and the tendency on the part of the Minister, if I recall correctly, to dismiss it as being "class oriented"; the kind of thing he really did not believe existed; that this was—well let us put it in blunt terms —the kind of thing you would expect from the socialists.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I never said that.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, this was the implication of your comment that I was presenting, a class oriented view. I tell you it was so class oriented that in spite of it being available and being factually solid, the provincial Liberal Party never touched it even though it was available from the member for Scarborough East.

Mr. Nixon: Not so.

Mr. MacDonald: It is so. Indeed, it was ignored—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): You are only trying to confuse matters.

Mr. MacDonald: It was ignored by the leader of the Opposition all throughout.

Mr. Nixon: Let us see you make a valid point here tonight. You have got the floor.

Mr. MacDonald: I have obviously made a very valid point because it has got you into orbit. Now if I can go into the substance of comment that I would like to make on this, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister is very skilful and he has tried to twist the figures that have been presented in the comparisons with the United States.

What I would like to see is, if the Minister has got up-to-date figures, let him give them to us. What is the position in rural Ontario? What is the position in some areas that are as culturally disadvantaged as, for example, the lower income groups of California? What is the situation, for example, among our Indian children? Let us not take these great general pictures and say we are just behind California, when without the lower culturally disadvantaged groups in California, the hon. member for Scarborough East is right, we should be ahead. But, I shall not focus on that. Let us focus on solid real Ontario. Indeed, go back and take a look, for example, at the Sharbot Lake area from which the Minister came, and examine that closely.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Do not start that!

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Do not talk about rural slums.

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Do not talk about rural slums.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I will talk about rural slums. I will talk about the rural slums in the places where a great percentage of the adults have no more than grade 4 in school. I will talk about them and I will not shy away from it. As a matter of fact, it is a kind of petty Tory parochialism that panders to the people who happen to live and die there and is willing to sweep that kind of condition under the rug. We have a product of it in this House from Cabinet Ministers whose interjections are gauche. So do not try to defend that kind of thing.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Carry on.

Mr. MacDonald: I talk about rural slums and what is more, Mr. Chairman, I will not go in and play politics. I will go in and talk right in that area about it and ask them to face up to the fact they have been mistreated by Tory government—

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): You did last October.

Mr. MacDonald: They have been mistreated by a Tory government which has not been giving them a fair deal. So if you want to bat in that league, I am with you, just get right out into the ball park.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am listening.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, I was interested to learn that a few people in eastern Ontario who were willing to look at the facts were on my side, not on the Tory parochial approach to the thing.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to conclude my comments with regard to the attitude of this government in trying to ignore the areas where there is a desperate need for tackling this problem, with some specific questions with regard to the Indian situation.

This vote is the only one, I think, that has any specific reference—

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): You had Indian day last week.

Mr. B. Newman: Where is that voice coming from?

Mr. MacDonald: That is the voice of the culturally disadvantaged.

Mr. Chairman, the only reference as far as I can see, throughout the estimates, and I may be wrong on this, to the whole problem of Indian education is estimate number 4 in vote 507, which says: "Inspection of Indian schools—services and travelling expenses—$4,000".

Now, Mr. Chairman, that in itself is a magnificent symbol of our failure in the whole approach to the Indians and their needs. Because anybody who has studied it will acknowledge that the desperate need in the Indian community is education. It is the open sesame to getting into economic development, for lifting standards to the whole approaches of welfare needs and everything else. I want to ask the Minister specifically, since I did not get too far with his colleague who chairs the interdepartmental committee.

He tended to put off answering in any substantive way what is going to be done as an alternative to the piecemeal approach of negotiations with the federal government on the various aspects of meeting Indian needs by saying that after the election of June 25, they would sit down and consider an approach within the whole context of the Dominion-provincial fiscal agreements. They might consider some massive decentralization of the whole problems of Indians to the provincial level, as has been proposed by the Indian-Eskimo association. Now, I am not really blaming the Minister because it is

admittedly the case that he has got to sit down with Ottawa and he is not going to publicly state his case with any degree of vigour until he gets into the negotiations.

But what I want to ask the Minister of Education is: Since the leading item of concern in the Indian community, among the culturally disadvantaged people, is the question of education, is the Minister willing, along with his colleagues, when they go to Ottawa, to try to implement the kind of proposals that have emerged in the Hawthorne Tremblay report, but more particularly, the Indian-Eskimo association studies, that education should be taken completely out of church jurisdictions and should be brought completely within the jurisdiction of the provincial government, so that we have some possibility of the same kind of educational approach perhaps with Headstart programmes to help them lift themselves up by their bootstraps?

I wonder if the Minister would comment on what his own views, or the government's views, are on this specific aspect of the great Indian problem.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, if you are asking me for a personal view, I think perhaps I could express that on this occasion. I think it must be recognized by the hon. member that the question of the education of Indian youngsters is not a problem that is unrelated to the question of jurisdiction. I think the hon. member is fully aware of this.

From my standpoint, and I am speaking strictly individually and I emphasize this to my Prime Minister, if we can provide a better educational service through agreement or in some other fashion with the boards, and the department assuming a greater area of responsibility, then I, as an individual, and I think I could so far as to say as Minister of Education, we would welcome this opportunity. Fifty per cent, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. member should know this, of the Indian youngsters in the province of Ontario today are integrated in the school system.

I think the hon. member must also understand whether or not the Indians themselves wish to relieve their traditional environment with some of the church-related institutions and the federal department that is running the schools in some areas of the province. If an agreement can be worked out to the satisfaction of both governments, our department has no aversion whatsoever in endeavouring to come to grips with this problem, but Mr. Chairman, I cannot say this, as a matter of government policy, since I have not discussed this with my colleagues.

It is something that obviously must be done in conjunction with the federal authorities, and is something that must be done in conjunction with the wishes of the Indian people. If you are asking me, Do you think the department can assist in providing this service? —well, Mr. Chairman, obviously I think we can. I think we can help.

Mr. MacDonald: I have just one brief 50-second comment in reply. I am glad to hear the Minister say this, I hope he will move quickly. If I may quote the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier), sir, it is about time you moved a bit more quickly, instead of the piecemeal approach, because more initiative is needed on the part of the provincial government. I hope the views that the Minister has expressed will be expressed as part of the negotiations with Ottawa, and some action will follow within the next year.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 507?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): One last question for the Minister. Perhaps he does not have the answer now and he can provide it later. When you referred to the number of five-year-olds in school in Ontario, did you mean this, or did you mean something else?

First, did you mean that you added up the number of five-year-olds in Ontario, then you went into the schools and found out in that year how many five-year-olds there were in school, and then did you put the number of five-year-olds in school, over the number of five-year-olds in Ontario, and came out with your wonderful figure of 82, 83?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Eighty-six.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Or did you take the number of children in Ontario in kindergarten, and divide it by the number of five-year-olds in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I really do not have the facility with economics or statistics of my hon. friend. I would relate to him the information that I asked to have assembled, in that I felt this matter would be raised by the hon. member, and I shall relate it to him as I have it. If you would like further clarification, I shall endeavour to give it. This is how it is phrased, Mr. Chairman.

There were 136,233 enrolled in kindergarten in Ontario in September of 1967, and these are those only in public, separate and free kindergartens. They represent 86 per cent of all the five-year-olds of this province.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the following comment. The Minister has, unknowingly, badly misled the House on this fact. Now he—

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is a fact.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Those are the facts. And your conclusion in *Hansard*—again I am really making a bit of a collection of the Minister's remarks in *Hansard—Hansard* will show that the Minister said that 86 per cent of five-year-olds in Ontario are in school. That is rot. That is nonsense.

I will just point out to the Minister that that figure he has used is only relevant if he is comparing the increase over time period to get the rate of increase in the participation of five-year-olds. It says nothing about the absolute number of five-year-olds in Ontario, in school, compared to the number of five-year-olds in Ontario. If you get that statistic from DBS, Mr. Minister, you will find it is 73 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would be delighted to pursue this with the hon. member. The material I have says the figure of 86 per cent is representative of all of the five-year-olds in the province.

Mr. T. P. Reid: And I suggest your researchers go back to school.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You can meet with the researcher, and the two of you can discuss it.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, the Minister was criticized last evening for ignoring members in their ridings, when he opened schools. I would like to bring to the Minister's defence, when he opened a school—

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was only by the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), who I regret could not be here tonight.

Mr. Burr: —when he opened in Windsor recently—it happened to be the William Davis school, I believe.

Mr. Nixon: William G. Davis!

Mr. Burr: And, he did not ignore me, and that is my complaint. I had two engagements that evening. I went to the school, made a tour of it, and waited around, but the Minister was delayed by weather. After a while I had to leave, and he arrived and, during the course of his remarks, he asked if I was in the audience—much to my embarrassment, because I was not there. So he—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wish you would tell the member for Sudbury, I was—

Mr. Nixon: With friends like that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Windsor-Walkerville is still there.

Mr. Burr: The Minister cannot win whether he ignores us, or whether he draws attention to us. I should like to apologize to the Minister for not being present on that occasion.

Mr. Chairman, I have taught many subjects of the Ontario secondary school curriculum, and I do not want to belittle any of those subjects, but the most important subject in the whole school system, in my opinion, is family living. There was no mention, as far as I could notice, in the Minister's opening remarks, so I should like to spend about three minutes speaking on that item in the curriculum.

I am aware that progressive school boards have made a start on teaching family living, and last week I spoke under the Reform Institutions estimates at some length on the importance of teaching this subject, as one method of reducing the number of young offenders. At that time I outlined a suggested course and the methods for teaching it. I have no intention of repeating that, but I should like to point out that large numbers of young people are entering upon hurried, unwise and foredoomed marriages, for which there has been virtually no preparation.

The popularity of such columns as Ann Landers is one example which points out the need of people of all ages for advice on this subject. Now various private organizations are holding panels and seminars and courses on the subject of marriage, and these are most commendable, but they reach few of those for whom the need for counselling is greatest.

Marriage is the number one occupation. It is the commonest occupation, or vocation—whatever you would like to call it—in society today, and yet the marriage licence is one of the few for which those applying need have no qualifications or instruction. I am not suggesting that there should be tests. I am merely pointing out that for a driver's licence previous instruction is essential. For a licence to practise medicine or law, teaching or plumbing, proof of ability and aptitude must be shown.

If family living were taught in our schools as a major subject—a major subject—the parents of the next generation would have greater opportunities for success than the parents of the present generation have had.

Generally speaking, Mr. Chairman, those who are getting married at the present time will follow the practices and the habits and the behaviour patterns that they saw in the homes of their parents. Those that have had good family environments may well do a good job themselves, without outside instruction, but with it they could probably do an excellent job. Those who have had inadequate, or unfortunate, experiences in their own family backgrounds, will probably repeat the mistakes of their parents. These are the young people who could profit greatly from such instruction, advice and discussion, during their days in school. I would like to urge the Minister to use his persuasive influence to help make family living a subject of major importance throughout Ontario's school system.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: On article 13507 I raised a question some time ago about whether the Minister intended to bring in assistance for elementary school students who could not afford to get to school if the parents did not have the money. In northern Ontario we have a certain number of these cases. At that time, I did not get what I considered a very positive answer to this question, and I am wondering if the Minister has had any afterthoughts, since I raised the question, as to implementing this for the forthcoming year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think if the hon. member will be patient for a few days—this really does not reflect itself in this vote at all. It relates to alterations in legislation that may be presented to the members for consideration that will relate to this particular subejct.

Mr. Martel: I thought that special assistance for students in northern areas would come under that.

One other question, if I might, in pursuing this. Do students who miss a day, under this $3 a day, lose this allowance? I understand that, in the high schools where this exists, if they miss a day's school the $3 is deducted from them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is $3 a day, the way the regulations are worded—$3 a day for attendance.

I will check to see whether, if there is a valid reason for nonattendance, there is any penalty. I would think, perhaps, there may be—not penalty, but lack of payment, if the student decides to be away for some other reason, for three or four days. I will check this out for the hon. member.

Mr. Martel: I agree with the Minister—if they are just playing footsie and not at school. But I know of occasions where the students have come in and have had to stay in the nurse's room all day because they were sick and because they could not afford to lose this $3.

I think if we had some regulation that they had a medical report, they would not lose this, and it would be most helpful in many cases.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 507. The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York South raised the responsibility of the department for the education of Indians. Other discussion has intervened, but I want to go back to that subject briefly, and I feel that it is encumbent upon me to tell you, sir, about the excellence in the Indian education as established under the Indian affairs branch, in the Six Nations reserve.

I think it is important that we take a balanced view of the problem as we find it in Ontario. There is no doubt in my mind, and from the facts that are available, the problem is entirely different in the northern part of the province. But, Mr. Chairman, I think the members should be aware of the fact that the programme at the elementary level on the Six Nations reserve is an extremely progressive one. As a matter of fact, the number of students that go on to secondary education in the integrated secondary schools in the surrounding communities, is relatively higher than in some of the nearby municipalities.

There is a tendency I believe, to see this problem as an unsolvable one, as it applies to the province of Ontario. I believe our experience has been on this particular reserve that it is not unsolvable and that the Indians have taken on themselves the responsibility —naturally with a heavy financial assistance of the government of Canada—at the present time to build a system of modern, well-staffed schools with a programme which is reasonably well adapted to the special needs of that community. The young people go on to secondary education in good numbers.

I will say that I have got some feeling that not enough of them go on to post-secondary education. They seem to be satisfied before; perhaps they should be. Because I am in a position, or have been in a position,

to assess their natural abilities, I can say that they are not only average, but in many cases they are well above average.

In the other part of the province, however, the Minister was quick to tell us that a large percentage of the Indian youths are integrated into the provincial system as it is presently established, and that their tuition is paid for by the government of Canada through band funds in some instances. It seems to me that the Minister, through the chairman of the cabinet committee which deals with the government of Canada in this regard, should certainly be negotiating for the responsibility, that would be funded by the government of Canada through this department, to establish schools in those parts of the province which are not properly provided for now—and right on the reserves themselves, with the co-operation and enthusiastic acceptance of the Indian band councils.

I believe that there is much more that can be done in this regard. There is a tendency for some people, in talking about this problem, to come to the conclusion that many of the Indians in the northern part of the province cannot benefit from education as we understand it. This may very well be so, since the curriculum that is applied in the standard schools is so far removed from the needs of the Indian population in the more remote areas. This leads me to two comments, two questions.

The first has to do with the Minister's responsibility for community programmes on the Indian reserves. There is no thought in my mind that we should impost some group of young students who would be sent under the auspices of The Department of Education to these reserves to show them what they should be doing, as far as cultural and recreative activities are concerned. I do believe that the community programmes branch has a very large part to play in the provision of operations beyond the schools themselves.

Second, I do not find in these estimates, and I may have overlooked it, the vote for the development and establishment of the Indian school at Moosonee. That particular school is one of great importance and the programme there and the attitude of the administration of the school is particularly critical. During our tours in the last few years of the northern part of the province, and meeting with the Indian bands and their chiefs, we have heard the criticism that their young people are drawn out of their local community into these centralized schools. They are given a type of education which does not fit the needs of the Indian community and I want the assurance and some specific information from the Minister that the programme that is going to be offered in the Indian school at Moosonee is going to be of a type that is designed to meet the needs of Indians in that part of the province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. member has read the material on page 62 of the yellow document, relating to the Moosonee education centre. Perhaps it would be best to cover that. I think it answers the hon. member's question that during 1967 construction work was started on a $2 million Moosonee education centre. Part of the cost, in the amount of roughly $740,000, is being borne by the federal government through the Indian affairs branch of the department of Indian affairs.

The director of the centre and his assistants are teaching 100 adult courses—heavy equipment and maintenance, upgrading classes in English, mathematics and social sciences together with sewing and crafts. The entire community has the use of the centre's library services. The nursery school classes cater for 30 pre-school children who come in by bus transportation. The enrolment at the centre is roughly 75 per cent, made up of our Indian citizens. By September, 1968, an expanded teaching staff of about 20 will offer service to both public and separate school students at the Moosonee centre.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, where is the vote for that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: If you look under the miscellaneous grants.

Mr. Nixon: There are one or two other matters I wanted to raise. One is rather a perennial one, and it has to do with the ordering of the programme in the elementary and secondary schools, so that students can achieve their matriculation in 12 years. I have said many times, and the Minister, I felt, has agreed with me in the past, that it would be far better if the curriculum, or the programme, were arranged in such a way that we could accomplish 13 years, or let us say 13 grades, in 12 years rather than somewhere along the way compressing three years' work into two. I have felt very strongly that there should be this strong core in the curriculum that will permit the students—and really it is the average students that go on to post-secondary education. There should be this strong core that will permit them to achieve this in 12 years of public education.

I wonder if the Minister can tell us if any further work has been done in the establishment of this stream in the curriculum.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps there has been some misunderstanding. I am not sure that I agree with the hon. member with respect to establishing a core. I think if there is to be an alteration in grade structure, in my view, it would be a case of restructuring the entire system from kindergarten through grade 13 to offer in 12 years what we are presently offering, as far as content is concerned, roughly in a 13-year period. I pointed out some of the problems inherent in this and, of course, I have also pointed out that perhaps 40 to 45 per cent of the students in the school system do, in fact, complete the 13-year programme in 12 as it relates to a period of accelleration usually at the grade 4, 5 or, perhaps, 3 level.

Perhaps this is one matter that the whole committee will be dealing with, although I am not sure. I think it is related to the changing philosophy of the approach that we envisage within the system and that is a movement away from the grade structure per se.

I think that it is too early to make final judgment although I have some of the results, as I say—and I would be delighted to send these to the members—of the experience in the six or seven secondary schools this year with individualized timetables and what amounts to a partially non-graded system in secondary education. If this is a workable situation then conceivably the question of the grades will become less relevant. We will be saying to the student here is the course of study that we wish you to complete in the formal educational programme. It will become less relevant whether it takes 12 or 13 or 14 years for a particular student to cover this total spectrum of work that is necessary.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree, and I said so in my own remarks, that the more we can get away from the structures of grades the better. Yet we are still quite a considerable distance from achieving the goal that the Minister has described. This has been hanging fire for a good many years, and we have not been serving the young people of the province in not taking some more definite steps along these lines.

At the end of the programme or of the structure, whatever it may be, graded or otherwise, we come to the point where the paper qualification that would be examined by the registrar of a community college or university or some other post-secondary form of education—the individual student's passport to continuing education—will be based on whatever the structure will eventually end up as being. But there is no doubt that a single piece of paper that the graduate, or matriculant carries as he goes to some other form of education is soon going to be a thing of the past.

It may very well be that someone with the authority to do so is going to push the total button on the big machine under the jurisdiction of the Minister and the statistics that will come out of that with the background of the student over a number of years, would then be assessed by a registrar in a new and modern sense, so that the decision made on the future of the student is going to be based on all those bits of information from the past.

I do believe that we are at a point now where the decision that must be taken objectively somewhere on the intellectual ability and the other abilities of the individual that would merit his progress in further education is going to have to be made on some other basis than that which we use now.

The hon. member for Peterborough raised something having to do with the financing of the testing of students to assess their ability to progress further. I know that no one in this House wants to return to the situation where one test or a group of tests is going to be the operative force in a decision that is going to affect the future of the individual in that case.

I wonder if the Minister would comment on how he views that decision that would be taken by the registrars in the immediate future at the post-secondary level, on whether a student, from the system as he sees it evolving, is going to gain entrance to post-secondary education.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, with the statement at the outset that I am not in any way competent, nor have I attempted to determine what the admission policy should be for our universities, my own feeling is, and I have stated this on other occasions, that no single factor is sufficient in my opinion as a layman, with respect to the assessment of a student's ability.

I think that registrars and the members of the Opposition who have some involvement with the universities, would agree that there is a very real tendency on that part of the university to look at the total student record, not just the situation in grade 13. This has been particularly true in Guelph, for instance, where they have been admitting for the spring semester, students on the basis of their

total student record and their recommended marks, because obviously they did not write the grade 13 departmentals. And this year, they are not involved in departmentals in June, and they are being admitted early in the year. Obviously the University of Guelph is using some system other than the final departmentals as a method of assessing student capacity to do university work.

This is an area that I debated at some length with our friends in the OIF. I have always taken the position that principal and senior staff personnel should be in a position without the crutch of the departmental grade 13 examinations, and should know that by the time that the student is in grade 13, and they have had him or her within their school environment, barring some percentage of transfers, for say a five year period, whether that student has the capacity to do university work.

They may not know whether that student should get 71 or 75 per cent, this is something that, never being a scholar I have never been concerned about, but surely they are in a position, and are in a position, and I say this with respect to the profession, to say whether a student after five years in a school, has the likely capacity to do post-secondary level study.

I do not want to be misunderstood, and have it said that the Minister says that we are going to get away from all forms of testing because there must be a variety of methods of assessment. Any single method is not, in itself, an absolute method of assessment.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could enter this area of debate? I think that it really is time for the Minister to come clean on grade 13. I think that he knows, and all of us know, that grade 13 is well on its way out. Already we have admission to universities without it, not only at Guelph, but also I understand that Brock University will now be bringing the students from grade 12 into a six weeks' course in the summer, and then moving them into first year of university if they are successful in that enterprise.

I think that what is certainly going to happen is that the bright young people are going to get out at the end of grade 12, so that grade 13 will tend to become a kind of repository for those who can not make it from grade 12. This will definitely change the entire milieu of the grade 13 year.

I really think that this is an example of what I was speaking on last night, one decision in one area affecting so greatly the decision of another area. I am wondering if the universities are aware of the full implication of what has been going on at the secondary school level. A year ago, we were going into a whole new approach to grade 13, advanced in general like the British system. This fell through, and now we are into another situation of grade 12 admissions in some cases. The grade 13 examination disappears.

Once again, the Minister is playing games in a sense. I cannot help thinking, when he was talking about teacher education, that we are very soon going to be able to take people at 60 per cent.

Now, I do ask the Minister, what is 60 per cent? It is meaningless now. With all of his—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do you admit, and I will make a note here, students with less than this next September?

Mr. Pitman: I am suggesting to you, sir, through the Chairman, that 60 per cent as a term mark has a certain connotation of 60 per cent on a grade 13 examination which is centrally set. In the past all of the examinations have been centrally set and marked. Sixty per cent means that these marks have gone through the machine. Now, any teacher who has gone through the grade 13 examinations in Toronto will agree, it has always amazed me that we were not able to do anything about grade 13, except mark them almost within the shadow of this place here. But the point is that 60 per cent represents the end product of The Department of Education machine.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It does not. It represents that standard of admission set by your colleagues in the university community. I say with the greatest of respect to the hon. member, we issue a certificate on the basis of a passing mark of 50 per cent. There were days when universities accepted students with something less than 60, and in very recent history I think.

I would suggest that this so-called 60 per cent factor was something that was established by the university community, and not by The Department of Education. Now I am not here to defend the department or to be interpreted as being in any way critical of the university. But the fact is that The Department of Education did not set 60 per cent.

Mr. Pitman: You are absolutely right. What I am trying to say is that 60 per cent represented a mark that had come out of The Department of Education machine.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, no. Mr. Chairman, with great respect, it did not. The 60 per cent represents the level of achievement that was requested by some of the universities of the province—

Mr. Pitman: On the grade 13 examination by The Department of Education.

Hon. Mr. Davis: At the teachers' college we accepted something less. This is not coming out of the machine as an assessment for moving into university. That is what you people determine. That is what the hon. member as a member of Trent University can determine.

Mr. Pitman: I do not think that we are quite connected here. All I am suggesting is that 60 per cent represented the line-up which was created by The Department of Education. I have the same reservations which the Deputy Minister has indicated in terms of marking and so on. At least a mark which came out of The Department of Education in August represented a point in this line.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was always much earlier.

Mr. Pitman: I will not quibble with that interjection, Mr. Chairman, but that mark represented—let me put it this way—it had gone through the machine of The Department of Education. Anyone who has marked in Toronto knows that there were all sorts of changes that took place as the examination went by. There were a certain number of people passed—usually around 80 per cent. Do not pin me down.

But the point is that across the province there was a certain number of students that came out of the high school with 60 per cent, and by some magical way, and some planning I will admit, this did represent those who usually could get admitted into the first year of a university.

All I am suggesting to you, in this comment that you made a moment ago, is that 71, 74, or 75 per cent may not be very important, but I do suggest that you are going into a very different situation in terms of the granting of your scholarships.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are not granting them.

Mr. Pitman: Well, let us put it this way. This is an example of a decision taken by The Department of Education which has created tremendous difficulty for the university community, and I am wondering whether there has been sufficient interchange of communication or sufficient consultation. Simply because the university will be awarding scholarships now on the basis of marks which have not gone through the machine there will be a very different situation, I think, in trying to determine where a student stands in the line-up—from 99 per cent through The Department of Education machine down to 44 per cent, or whatever the mark that was the lowest given by the department. I am suggesting that now the university faces a very real problem in deciding this.

The universities do not go around trying to keep people out. This is one of the mistaken concepts that people have. They are trying to get people in, but the right people.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They all try to get the same percentage of bright students.

Mr. Pitman: You are quite right. We do want the right people in because it costs the taxpayers of Ontario a great deal of money when you get the wrong people in.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not want to get into a debate on university affairs, but I think it is not a question of the wrong people being admitted, but a case of the universities failing to develop programmes to meet the needs of the people they admit.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): The eggheads we got in our universities!

Mr. Pitman: I find it humorous that this is a medical doctor who should be applauding this comment with such enthusiasm, because there is no faculty which forces more people out than the medical faculty.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am loudest in my condemnation of them.

Mr. Pitman: Good!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will rephrase what I said. It is not a case of not developing programmes. I think, seriously, that the university can—and perhaps the high schools have to help—relate the ability of the student to the courses available within the specific institutions. In other words, I think that there are students who come in with what was, say, the 60 per cent mark who perhaps are directed to a course where it is not relevant. If they were directed into the right area, they would probably achieve far greater results. This is what I am attempting to say, and I think that the university could do a shade more in this area.

Mr. Pitman: I think that probably the universities could do something in this area. But what is bothering me is to what extent. We are talking about a continuance of education. If, indeed, the secondary schools are graduating people with marks which no longer represent the line-up, grade 13, with all of its defects, seems to be the best way of telling whether they would achieve or not at the university level.

I think that there were a number of studies which pointed this out. Now, either the university has to change its concept of what is an achieving student or how a student achieves, or you have a very serious breakdown, I suggest, in that continuum.

I would suggest to you that the university will face very real problems of deciding who goes and who does not go. Is a 60 per cent student from North York the same as a 60 per cent student from Hodon Corners. We do not know. We do not know whether the standard in the grade 13 examination or rather the grade 13 year will be the same.

These are some of the difficulties, and all I am suggesting in these comments. I did not expect to get such a rise from the Minister as I have. I am suggesting that there should be far more consultation if you do want this whole educational system unified vertically up to the end of grade 13 and the undergraduate programme. For heaven's sake, there has to be a continuing consultation at every level.

I made this comment last night. Decisions that are made in this system are totally interdependent. Let us suggests, just for a moment, that we do get a whole group of students, who have turned out the SATO and OSAT test, and all these various factors.

They arrive at the university, and then we discover that this may have got them through secondary school, but they will not achieve in the university.

It seems to me that this would be tragic. For the first time in Ontario's history, the high school is not simply a dead end for students. There are now the colleges of applied arts and technology. What I am suggesting is that we would need much more consultation to ensure that people are directed in the right paths, and that the changing method of movement from level to level of the educational system does not become a means of tremendous frustration both for the secondary school—who will be unable to tell who should go to university—and to the university—who will not be sure that they can fit the entrants into the courses that they offer. If not, they will not know how to change the courses to fit.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will reply very briefly. I think that the hon. member expresses a greater concern than will, in fact, be justified in the next few months. He asks how the secondary schools respond and determine. I repeat that the hon. member was a secondary school teacher at one point; I say to him, with the greatest of respect, that if he is teaching the 12 or 13 level, and if he does not know by the time that student has been under his educational programme for one or two years, if the student is capable of university work, then he should look to his own professional capacity. I say this with the greatest of respect.

I think that the hon. member is contradicting himself to a degree. In one breath he is suggesting that we must have this very extensive consultative process, and in the next suggests that the Minister should make a declaration that grade 13 is going to disappear. He is even pre-supposing that it will. This is highly inaccurate. There has been a high degree of consultation.

The consultation is a two-way street and I wonder how many university communities—and I have had the questionable advantage of becoming involved on occasion with both areas—on how many occasions have they involved themselves in The Department of Education with respect to the contemplated changes. And should they?

In my experience as Minister, this aspect of consultation, if it needs to exist, has never occurred. I think that consultation is a two-way street. I would suggest that The Department of Education has a responsibility for the student total in the secondary programme. On the basis of present statistics—and I am subject to correction here—let us say somewhere in the neighbourhood of 45 per cent of the grade 13 graduates go to university. The percentage is on the increase. Let us hopefully suggest we will get the 50 per cent fairly soon and perhaps the percentage will continue to increase.

Nevertheless, a substantial percentage of these students will not be going to university. We have a responsibility as a department of education, to give them the type of educational experience that will be of some benefit, assuming that a goodly percentage of them will not be going to university. You know we have this responsibility.

I would also pose this question to the hon. member, because I think it is once again relevant. If we were now, and I mentioned

this to the leader of the Opposition, to move away from grade 13 without a complete restructuring, does this not present the problem of, perhaps, adding to the three-year general course at some universities, the possibility of a fourth year? I mean, have the universities considered this? I think this is one of the considerations that has validity and must be part of any discussions that take place.

I am not as predisposed as is the member for Peterborough, who says that all signs point to an elimination of grade 13. I am not sure that this is necessarily correct. I think the members should know grade 13 for years was attacked on the basis of the lack of flexibility, the external examinations and so on, but there is always a final year in the secondary school field, whether it is grade 12 or 13. If you can be offering a valid educational experience for five years at the secondary level—and it would have to be valid—if you can offer this for five years at the secondary level, why transfer what might be an additional year to the universities if we can accomplish it, educationally and with validity, in the secondary school programme? I think this is something that has to be—

Mr. Nixon: You know what the Smith report says about them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Pardon?

Mr. Nixon: You know what the Smith report says about them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. Nixon: This report says—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, this does not mean the Smith report is right.

Mr. Nixon: Well, it does not take your stand in that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, no, I recognize this. I recognize this and this is an area about which I even informed the House tonight. I am not prepared to make an immediate decision as to whether we will have a 12- or 13-grade structure. There are some jurisdictions, as I am sure some of the members know, that are considering, and I do not say how specifically, whether there should be an extension from the 12-grade situation just because of the tremendous increase in the amount of education that a person must accumulate or assimilate, whatever is the right term.

I know the member for Windsor-Walkerville is pretty closely related to the jurisdiction to the south.

Mr. Nixon: And you are pretty close to Florida.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh no, no, they are not. But these are the considerations and I recognize and I think we are getting into university affairs once again. I recognize the problems being created for the universities in the determination of their scholarships.

Mr. Pitman: That is the problem.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I say this: this fact was known to us and it was known to the universities. The discussion of doing away with external examinations in grade 13 really has been part of the educational scene in the province of Ontario for at least four years, and I think the universities have had ample time. Really there has been great lead time today, as the technicians say, for the universities to come to grips with how they are going to award their scholarships. I think they can do it.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 507. The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get into this discussion on grade 12 because ever since I have been in the House I have advocated the elimination of grade 13; the elimination by absorption into a 12-year system. In fact, to substantiate my remarks, the youth committee report contains that recommendation. Surely if the Minister can pick out other recommendations of the youth committee report he should have given this one a little more serious consideration. As you have it now, one of the reasons why you want the grade 13 kept in there is that in this fashion you increase the amount of costs to a municipality, because—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, we have not.

Mr. B. Newman: Sure, you have an extra year to—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to debate the question of whether it costs the municipalities more; it has nothing to do with this aspect of it at all. But I am saying this to the hon. member. If the average cost for a grade 13 student is in the neighbourhood of $800 to $1,000, for the sake of argument, if by any chance by restructuring you then add to the university programme a year, which is conceivable under a restructuring, let us say $2,500, whether it is the municipality or whoever it is, somebody is paying an additional $1,500 a year.

Mr. T. Reid: The quality changes.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Nonetheless it is the total dollars though. There is a difference.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the municipality still would have to carry that student in the grade 13, and to carry that student it would have to increase its revenue and increase the tax rate. By ending the education at grade 12, you make it cheaper for the municipality to operate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you suggesting—

Mr. B. Newman: You will say that they have to go to the university and in that fashion the youngster, or the parent, will still have to pay. That is true.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the hon. member—

Mr. B. Newman: As it is now in grade 13, Mr. Chairman—after I finish the Minister can reply to me.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I was just going to ask a question.

Mr. B. Newman: As it is today a youngster will go into grade 13 and if it requires him two years to complete grade 13, many of the universities will not take him because they say, "Well, it took you two years—you are not university material." So you see it is a handicap to him right then and there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: So he takes two years in grade 12, what are they going to say?

Mr. B. Newman: That is all right. That would have been equivalent of grade 13.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, no!

Mr. B. Newman: Whereas this makes grade 14—if he spends two years in 13, he spends 14 years in his total education.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not think that is right.

Mr. Nixon: Fifteen, if he went to kindergarten!

Mr. B. Newman: Fifteen, if he went to kindergarten. By making that student go to school to grade 13, you have robbed that student of one year of productivity. In other words, if he does not continue his education he becomes gainfully employed one year later. So he has lost $5,000 or up, as far as income is concerned.

I know, Mr. Chairman, the Minister will come along and say he consults with people. When you consult with the high school principals throughout the length and breadth of Ontario, they want grade 13 to continue, because it raises the academic level of the school. It is only natural they want these grade 13 students because they are an excellent example to the students attending school. They are the cream of the crop generally.

Why do you not cut it at grade 12, set up your programmes so that a student can still get his 13 years of education in 12 years. I do not think that it is that complicated. You should have started a programme like this years ago when it was first recommended to you. If you think grade 13 is so important it must be continued in the secondary level, why not include 14? Why not give them two years, why not give them three, why not give them four; why not let him complete his university education at that level?

You should complete your programme at the end of grade 12 with 13 years of studies within that period of time. The youth committee made that recommendation and it was members from your own side who signed this youth committee report. Surely, Mr. Chairman, if the majority of the youth committee would come along and be in favour of this, it must be the government that is in favour of this. Yet you refuse to act on this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the member one question.

Is he suggesting to me that we should make a decision, of this magnitude and significance to the educational system based on what it may or may not cost the local municipality with respect to the administration of the programme? This seems to be the basis for a good part of his discussion and I will answer from my standpoint.

I would be very reluctant to make a decision of this magnitude based on the cost to the municipality for grade 13. I think this is the indefensible way of coming to such a conclusion.

Mr. B. Newman: But it is one of the additional reasons why you should come along and make this change.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is one of the basic ones—I am surprised that you, a member of the academic community, would suggest this should be the basic reason for doing it.

Mr. B. Newman: It is one of the reasons.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well!

Mr. B. Newman: Not the basic reason.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, if I could continue on a couple of points raised by the hon. member for Peterborough.

The first is this. I was down at the educational testing services in Princeton about three weeks ago and I was talking about a number of things with Dr. Henry Chancey, who is president of the educational testing service. He mentioned that they had quite an international programme and that they were sending out research teams in co-operation with local educational authorities and teachers, to countries around the world, and one of these countries was Canada.

So my question to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is to what extent is the educational testing services in Princeton involved in the re-evaluation of testing high school students both in the general aptitude test and the specific tests—math and so not, to gear those—I will wait until the Minister is finished consulting with his experts.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Go ahead, I am listening.

Mr. T. Reid: To make sure that those tests bear some relationship to the value structure of our society as opposed to the value structure of the American society? I know the Minister realizes that in these tests there can be a national cultural bias in the test if it is simply transposed from one jurisdiction to the other.

So I would like to know from the Minister where in his budget, if anywhere, there is an item for research into this area of educational testing from the educational testing service in Princeton, to gear their tests to the Ontario and Canadian environment so that our students will not be writing American culturally biased exams from which our universities must evaluate to have as one of their criterion for admission to a university.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member—and I guess I am guilty of it too, so I am not being critical; I think we jump from vote to vote and perhaps we are covering ground that will be covered anyway. If the hon. member will look at vote 521 he will see an item of $9,120,000 relating to the Ontario institute for studies in education, which institute is developing the tests for the province of Ontario.

I cannot say specifically but I think, if memory serves me correctly, the personnel at the institute have been discussing some of these problems with the people from Princeton testing service. We have the two sets of tests; we are moving ahead with the Ontario ones, we are financing them through the institute.

The national tests are running into some problems from a financial point of view and I cannot tell the hon. member which organization it is, perhaps both, that has been consulting with our neighbours to the south. But the institute is developing the tests for the province of Ontario.

Mr. T. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We might come back to this very important area in vote 521 without duplication.

The second question I have on this particular estimate, Mr. Chairman, is a factual one and perhaps the Minister will have to get his researchers to dig this one up. How many secondary school teachers in Ontario, who have taught grade 13, have left the secondary school system and are now in the CAATs or in the private sector of the economy? Say over the last two years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say the last year and a half, Mr. Chairman, I am not even sure —well, I guess we can. It will take me a period of time because it means canvassing all the faculty members of all the colleges of applied arts and technology in the province to determine whether or not they came from the secondary school system. I shall endeavour to do this but it will take a period of time.

Mr. T. Reid: The reason I bring up this question, Mr. Chairman, is that I think some of the problems the member for Peterborough was talking about might be solved without a policy on the part of the government. In other words, if we find, like some of the best CAATs presidents, former high school principals, that there is such a leakage from secondary schools, particularly—in a sense I hope this will happen—from the academic stream in the secondary schools to the so-called applied arts programmes in the CAATs, then you may solve your grade 13 problem because you will not have enough good teachers. So I think it is a very relevant point. I have heard comments on it on a miscellaneous basis, if you like, so I think it is very relevant not to this year estimates but next year's.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that this, in fact, will occur or is a solution and I just say with the greatest of respect, to me it is a very negative approach to a problem.

Mr. T. Reid: I just say the Minister must have the facts before he can make decisions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I say it is a negative approach, even though the facts would substantiate that a goodly portion of teachers are moving, which I do not think are the facts, I think it is a negative approach to a problem.

Mr. T. Reid: It is called the cost side of a cost-benefit study. Right?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not think you can apply that to this particular situation.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in my opening remarks that all is not as bad as it seems. I think that in my short experience in this Legislature I would have to say that this Minister has given a better account of himself than almost any Minister in the House, and because of the experience with regard to the educational system across the province, do not think we need to take a back seat to any jurisdiction. I think that as time goes on the fruits of his labours will be quite evident and I have no reservations about saying that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: He is beginning to see the light, he is doing well!

Mr. Stokes: However, I will try to be very kind and very constructive. What I want to say is that in a recent survey that was done with regard to the educational level in northwestern Ontario, it was determined in a survey taken in the early 1960's that there were 50,000 people between age 22 and 65 with less than a grade 8 education—this was in northwestern Ontario. These facts were brought out when Quetico centre was having such a great deal of trouble getting back on the rails again after the federal authorities—Manpower and Immigration — scrapped their programme five.

They are operating now and what is being done there is showing very tangible results but unfortunately they handle a very limited number of people in that establishment and it is only a very insignificant amount in terms of what has to be done in the north.

Now a good many of those 50,000 who have less than a grade 8 level of education are Indian population, which is the responsibility of the federal government. Now in correspondence with various heads of branches of this department, I have been given a lot of encouragement and a lot of reason to be optimistic about what they will be doing in the future, but I have been in contact with members of the Minister's department for some six months now and nothing of a tangible nature has happened yet.

To be more specific, I would like to relate to the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, what is going on in Armstrong. I have given these facts, I think, to the Minister in a previous speech and yet nothing tangible has happened.

Now in Armstrong, we have an Indian settlement on the outskirts. It is called Happy Valley and I can assure you that if the Minister wants to come with me to the outskirts of Armstrong where these people have the misfortune to live, in the conditions that they are living in, it is certainly no happy valley.

There are 28 students who are the children of treaty Indians who cannot get schooling and where no schooling facilities are provided for them in the town of Armstrong. They range in age from six to 16. They have to travel as far as 200 miles to the Lakehead to go to school. They do not see their parents from one school term to the other unless they are willing to pay—I think it is something like $32 to come home for Christmas or Easter, Mr. Chairman. And with Indian people living on the very meagre income that they have to survive on in that particular area, in fact all over the province, the rates of welfare payments just do not permit it.

Now I have had some correspondence with the superintendent of supervision on this and he says at the moment the present school is filled to capacity. And although the department of Indian affairs has agreed to provide a room as an extension to the school, the board and the community have resisted efforts to accommodate the Indian children in the school.

This is an intolerable situation where, because the white population in any one community does not want to have children of Indian people integrated with them, as a result, you have children travelling 200 miles to go to school, or they stay at home and are drop-outs and we then have the same problem that is continually being aggravated. Unless we recognize the fact, and unless this department accepts the responsibility for the training of our Indian people, a responsibility that has been abdicated by the department of Indian affairs, we are not going to be able to resolve this problem, and in fact, the whole Indian problem. I would suggest to you that education is basic to the problem and I do not know how we are going to make any headway.

To give you some examples, in Osnaburg, a reservation some 20 miles south of Pickle

Lake in northern Ontario, I went into one of the schools and I happened to be campaigning.

The principal of this one-room school tried to introduce me to the students—now these were grade 7 Indian students, and it took him 15 minutes to explain to them what a candidate for a particular provincial party was. These are grade 7 students and he had to go back to where he explained that they had a chief of the band and they got all the people in the band together and by a process of election they were able to name the chief and he said the chief of the province of Ontario is Mr. John Robarts.

They had never heard of him, it was a name that was completely foreign to them. Now, he tried to explain to these grade 7 students that I was not trying to take John Robarts' job but he likened me to one of the councillors—I think there were something like seven in the band—and he said through a process of going through an election you elect so many councillors. He said Mr. Stokes is trying to be a councillor in the province of Ontario, representing a particular political party.

Now keep in mind these are grade 7 students. This school teacher was doing a wonderful job, I thought, with the material he had to work with, but I think this department must accept some of the responsibility for upgrading the educational facilities that are available to our Indian people. Obviously it is not being done by the other level of government so I think you people have to step in and fill the breach.

One of the ways I think you could accomplish this, Mr. Chairman, is to offer isolation pay to young teachers who are willing to go up into those remote areas at a great personal sacrifice, leaving all the amenities of life. You really have to be a dedicated person to go into that type of environment and atmosphere, and I would suggest to the Minister that he urge the department of Indian affairs to take more action in this particular field and provide the necessary money. I think that this government and this particular department, who are responsible for the education of all people of Ontario, should step in and fill the breach and take on the total responsibility for the education of our Indian people.

I would like to suggest, too, if I may, that one of the ways in which you could educate the young Indian people about what life is like in the more urbanized centres of Ontario, would be to initiate and sponsor student exchange. I do not mean just an afternoon exchange, or something like that, but for a longer period of time so they get a better idea of what facilities are available, the kind of educational opportunities that we have in the more populated areas.

I think it would give these people a much greater outlook on life as it really exists in Ontario and certainly in Canada. I think it could demonstrate to these young people what is available. I think it would be a step in the right direction to complete social and economic integration at a much earlier time than will be possible under the present arrangement.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one or two comments on two items that are found in vote 507. I will try to be short but I think they are important. One is radio broadcasts and the other is films.

I think there are two problems involved that have an impact on this. First, the Minister's decision to decentralize authority, decentralize the impetus on education in Ontario. And second, the fact that we are now beginning a surge of concern in the area of educational television. Certainly I think that these school broadcasts have been one of the most qualitative aspects of the educational scene. What I am wondering is how the Minister has planned to integrate the use of the various forms of media—radio and film particularly. Of course, thinking ahead to the far greater role that educational television is going to play to what extent he sees the possibility of decentralizing? Now I understand that the film libraries have already begun to decentralize. Certainly that is an important aspect because I really feel that the whole audio-visual programme was less effective in trying to have it run from where it was before on Jarvis Street.

In the other area of radio broadcasts, one of the things which has always bothered me —I am sure it has bothered the Minister, too— is the fact that so many of these radio broadcasts are not effective in the sense that they cannot be related directly to the day-to-day work of the schools. This is particularly true at the secondary level, of course, when virtually no schools change classes at the time the broadcasts are on.

I am wondering if there is any way that the school broadcasts can be decentralized by possibly making use of tapes. I know that schools do make tapes themselves, but this seems to me to be creating a load upon the individual school, which is an unnecessary

load. Here again, I would suggest that a far more effective use of school broadcasts might be through the use of tapes.

Finally, to tie this up, I am wondering to what extent the Minister is going to give local authorities an opportunity to, in a sense, plan their use of media, along with the central authority. It seems to me, as I said last night, these young people are in a very sophisticated society and the use of media in the education system will be just that less effective if they are unable to use media in an exciting way.

I am wondering if what the department needs is almost a commission on the use of educational media to integrate the use of films and filmstrips and tapes and school broadcasts and so on; see how they can fit into the educational programme, how they relate. I think, particularly, to see how the courses can be planned in relation to all these various kinds of media; how schools can be time-tabled to deal with them. I suggest to you that this may seem like a sort of off-hand suggestion but I think it is about time we brought the people who are concerned with the media into the situation. I am wondering about the text books, the text book publishers—how they see their role, and whether we have had enough contact and enough negotiation and consultation with all those who are concerned with educational hardware, if you want to call it such.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just to reply to this very briefly. With respect to radio broadcasts, I think that one might anticipate that the department will perhaps be moving out of this area of educational involvement. There is a decreasing amount of interest both by the boards and by the stations with respect to the radio broadcasts. I would think, perhaps in 1969 or 1970, the department will be moving out of the area of radio broadcasts.

With respect to films, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Pitman: You will not make tapes?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, we will not. We just will not be in the field of radio broadcasting *per se*. Now with respect to films, as we envisage this developing some of the boards will establish—and some already have established—their own film libraries.

The moneys that we are referring to here will be used to develop our own central film library and the regional one that is being developed in Sudbury and, eventually, perhaps four or five others which will be resource centres in some areas for those boards that do not have the economic base to provide this type of facility. This shall continue to be a departmental resource centre for the other boards. I think, Mr. Chairman, there is no point in projecting ourselves into discussion of vote 508 at this moment until we get there, but I think there can be a relatively clear line of involvement between the availability of filmstrips from libraries and the potential that exists with respect to ETV. But I think perhaps we might leave that for vote 508.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 507? The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask of the Minister if, under films in vote 6, some of the video tapes will be likewise on film rather than video tape and sent to local school boards so that they could be used at any time in a classroom, or even just portions of that video tape translated into a film? You know, with the video tape as it is, now you have to look at the whole thing whereas the classroom teacher may want just one section of the film shown. Were it on a 16mm film rather than a video tape, it would be to his advantage to be able to use it in that fashion.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This may be possible.

Mr. B. Newman: Does the department plan the coordination of the tape recorder with the filmstrip, such as we now find used in the lessons we take in French? This method is very effective.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that we, as a department, do. I am sure that many of the boards will develop this approach in some subject areas.

Mr. B. Newman: May I cover one other topic under programmes? That is the opportunity of various ethnic groups to teach their native language in the secondary schools. As it is today, any ethnic person who may want to teach, say, French, German, Ukrainian, Russian and so forth sometimes runs into problems. If credits were given in the school curriculum for the teaching of these various languages on an after-school basis, and the various ethnic groups were allowed to bring their own instructors into the school system to teach the language on an after-school basis, not during the regular school day, it would not interfere with the school day at all. It would be on an after-school basis.

I think you would be doing the ethnic community a real service. The children of people

who have come from various parts of Europe and other parts of the world, would like to carry on the ability to converse in their parents' native language. As it is today, they have to go to their various ethnic communities or ethnic halls; whereas, if it were held in an educational atmosphere in a school, I think it would be conducive to better learning and likewise would be serving the ethnic community very well.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Actually, Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, once again, a number of boards are operating classes like this in night school programmes. I do not believe there is anything in the legislation that would prevent it. In fact, some boards are offering their premises to various ethnic groups to offer programmes and a lot of them are on Saturdays, not in after-school hours.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this is something that the local jurisdiction can involve itself in. My immediate reaction to giving these courses for credits at the secondary level is that I would question this, without very careful consideration. But certainly the use of the school facilities is being provided by many boards of sections of Ontario.

Mr. B. Newman: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that when one individual in my community did write he was told by a member of the department that this was not possible at all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: For credits, no!

Mr. B. Newman: Just the teaching of the language on an after-school basis. He was told it would lead to the fractionalization of languages, leading to serious economic problems for the individual taking the language. This sounds kind of strange.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It sounds strange to me, because it depends, I guess, on the form or the basis of the request.

I can only relate the experience in our own community here in the city of Toronto. The German community here in Toronto has—I am not sure how formal the arrangement is—an arrangement, I believe, with the Toronto board. I was at a meeting of their teachers some few months ago and on a Saturday they had, I think, 150 or so of them there. They actually had classes in many of the schools in Toronto on Saturday mornings for the German youngsters to receive instruction in the German language. And this is true of many other languages.

Mr. Chairman, I do regret that I did not reply to the member for Thunder Bay, relating to his suggestion with respect to some form of incentives to have young people move into some of the communities to which he is referring.

I think he has hit upon a very real problem. We explored this just very partially in my answer to the member for York South—it gave my own attitude to some of these situations. But if the hon. member will read, as perhaps he has, pages 57 to 59, or 61—he need not read all that letter from that northern corps teacher, in the yellow book, it is, I think, a very intriguing sort of letter.

We have already introduced this programme of incentives to teachers to go into these isolated communities. I believe there are some 14 this year, and next year our plans are for some 25 teachers to move into the isolated areas of northern Ontario. They are receiving some special incentive, some special training, during the summer months at the North Bay teachers' college.

This letter from one of the teachers perhaps gives you some indication of his personal experience in his first year in this programme.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue the teaching of a language, other than French or English in the secondary schools on an after-school basis. Do I understand—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member talking for credits or not for credits?

Mr. B. Newman: First, do I understand from the Minister that local boards have the authority at the present to permit others to come into the school on an after-school basis to teach this language?

Hon. Mr. Davis: If, Mr. Chairman, a board wishes to make an arrangement with any recognized organization to use the school facility, whether it is for the instruction of another language, the recreation commission, or what-have-you, they have the authority to do this. No question about it.

Mr. B. Newman: Do they have your blessing?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the boards have my blessing to do anything that is constructive—that is relevant to the needs of the community. I do not know how many times I have said this in various speeches around the province, but they have my blessing, I can assure you.

Mr. B. Newman: Then may I ask the Minister would he consider giving credits for proficiency in one of these other languages?

You see, when the youngster graduates from school, especially university, he is quite often asked to get into certain types of occupation where the ability to speak an extra language is a decided advantage. Were he to be given credit for it, an additional credit in the school for his ability to speak that other language, I think it would be an incentive to the youngster to learn. Likewise it would be to the advantage of the whole educational system and the youngster himself.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, it may be I am speaking very much without thought. Shall we put it this way—a board might give a statement of a level of achievement. I think we have to be very careful about getting into what subjects or what activities are related to credit.

Obviously, facility in this language, a second language, may be of great use to the individual. I can think of members, some opposite, who demonstrate very specific prowess in fields of athletics, who perhaps might have liked to receive credits prior to their days of playing for the Hamilton Tiger Cats or something of this nature. Just where do you draw the line on these areas? Where do you draw the line with respect to credits for what activities within a formal school programme? This is where you have to do it.

Mr. MacDonald: Read the B and B report and get some idea.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is certainly not serious when he makes those comments. Does he mean to tell me—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not serious about the athletics.

Mr. B. Newman: I know, but simply not to set levels even for language achievement, the Minister's department can certainly set standards to which an individual should be able to achieve—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. member did not hear me. I said perhaps a board can give some recognition for a level of achievement in a subject such as this, or a course such as this. But I question whether we should get into—or I certainly am not prepared to give an answer tonight as to whether another language taken after school should be given a credit towards a graduation diploma. I am just not prepared to do so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. B. Newman: The Minister is not prepared to consider the advantage—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am prepared to consider anything, but the hon. member is trying to get me to say tonight that I am prepared to recommend that credits be given for a second, third or fourth language, or some other subjects in the secondary school programme, Mr. Chairman, and I am not.

Mr. B. Newman: I am not referring to other subjects. I am referring to a specific thing that is of advantage to the country itself, and that is the ability to converse in another language.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say whether it is an advantage or a disadvantage, but if the hon. member really expects me to give him an answer to a question like this tonight, I think he is asking too much. I am just not prepared to do it.

Mr. B. Newman: All right. May I ask the Minister to consider it so that next year when I ask him this question, he will have an answer for me?

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could tie in with something that the previous member has just mentioned? Perhaps I might read a sentence or two. "The Peterborough board of education has decided not to go after a special grant for its oral French programme on the grounds that it would be more trouble than it is worth. Trustees propose that the board seek a special grant from The Department of Education to offset expenses of operating the course, which begins in grade 4."

Is the Minister and is the department considering the possibility of giving incentive grants or special grants to boards which are attempting to increase bilingualism across this province and are bringing the teaching of French right down to grade 4?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we, of course, have just given special assistance with respect to the extension of French language instruction to the secondary level. I question really whether this type of incentive is really necessary for the extension of the oral French programme. I am sure that in the case of the boards that are resisting it—and they are decreasing in number every year—part of it is related to economics, but I do not think this is of sufficient validity. I do not think the cost involved in oral French is that significant, when you have a viable unit.

I think the hon. member can have some influence on the board in that particular area of the province.

Mr. Pitman: I think that they have already established this oral French programme, so I am sure that my influence will not be necessary. But I do suggest to the Minister that this is the kind of subject which can be taught best at the lower levels of the educational system. I think that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I agree.

Mr. Pitman: —and I would suspect that, although you—I would admit that economics may not be the only factor, but I would suggest to the hon. Minister that economics is one of the factors that is involved in the lack of French instruction in the elementary schools.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The main factor is still the lack of teachers.

Mr. Pitman: I agree, and that also places the responsibility on the Minister too, which I am sure he is concerned with.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would always.

Mr. Pitman: The whole question of changing course—I brought the Minister's attention some months ago to the whole question of the change in the role of history, for example. I want to, just as an example, of the subject which has been changed, and I am wondering here again whether is there sufficient consultation with those who are coming before and those who are concerned with history afterwards. I received some facts from the university level and the fact that this would very much change their expectations, all of their figures, on how many would like to be taking history over the next four or five years.

They have to establish these as you well realize, as the Minister of University Affairs, in order to determine what needs they will have in terms of professors needed and grants, library facilities and so on, and I am just wondering is there no way by which these kinds of changes, once again, can be dealt with by consultation? I remember the Minister saying he was going to meet with the history heads of the various universities, and I do not know—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have indeed.

Mr. Pitman: You have indeed?

Hon. Mr. Davis: A very pleasant meeting.

Mr. Pitman: And all is well.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I do not say that all is well. I think there is a far greater understanding of what we are attempting to do.

Mr. T. Reid: Everything is positive.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was a very positive approach.

Mr. Pitman: May I ask just one—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wonder if there was somebody there from York. Better check with them.

Mr. Pitman: May I ask another question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Perhaps somebody was there from Trent.

Mr. Pitman: There could be. I wonder if I could ask the Minister when we can definitely expect the report of the committee of religious education, and perhaps he might tell us when the Hall committee report is definitely going to come down?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, with respect to religious education, I cannot definitely state but I am hopeful that it will be early this fall, but I emphasize that I am hopeful. The Hall committee report, I think, we can anticipate within 10 days to two weeks.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two items that I wanted to mention. Perhaps I can finish them before the House leader decides it is time to adjourn.

The Minister probably knows that there are several areas in the province that need some considerable urging to adopt the programme for oral French instruction at the elementary level. My own feeling is that this should soon become an obligatory part of the programme that we are responsible for.

I do not think that we can leave it up indefinitely to local initiative to take advantage of what must surely be one of the most obvious improvements in the curriculum that we can put forward. There are still a number of large major centres, and I know of some of them very well indeed who, in my view, have not taken—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Brantford!

Mr. Nixon: —the correct decision—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Brantford is one of them!

Mr. Nixon: —in providing this sort of instruction at the elementary level. I think it is disgraceful that we do not have an opportunity for our young people to have a basis in this language, and that we continue with the archaic and inappropriate method of teaching French that we have been exposed to for so many years in this province, and I feel that quite strongly.

Now the second thing I want to refer to is something that the hon. member for Peterborough mentioned, and it has to do with the teaching of history.

We had an opportunity in a private members' hour some weeks ago to comment on the Minister's decision that this will no longer be an obligatory subject in the curriculum, and I think this is another mistake. The Minister is very proud of the fact that The Department is withdrawing more and more from the responsibility that they have accepted in years gone by, and deciding that certain things be taught in the schools.

Now in my view we have an inadequate programme for the teaching of the history of our nation. I have made a point of keeping a book on some of the complaints that have come to me as the local member and perhaps as a leader of the Opposition, and I have verified them. I know many of these to be true myself, where students of the grade 7 and 8 level have, for memory work, The Gettysberg Address, and for that being one of the most excellent pieces of prose in any language.

I do feel that the emphasis on the political developments in history of the United States is undue emphasis in this particular regard. I know a group of students who have had to memorize the names of the states and their capitals, and having talked to them I know for a fact that they know very little about our county system which is coming into importance and prominence under this Minister's guidance, and having had an opportunity to become very interested in the history of Canada, and our province, particularly for Centennial year, and 10 years before.

I think we are making a serious and, in fact, a tragic error in not emphasizing this part of our curriculum more than we have. The Premier heard one of the participants in the federal-provincial conference in February talking about a very important aspect of the development of our nation. After the establishment of responsible government Baldwin and La Fontaine found themselves in the interesting position where one head of the government, La Fontaine, was defeated and came up to York and was elected here in a by-election.

And four years later, I may have mentioned this before, Baldwin was elected under similar circumstances in Rimouski of all places. I think that this is an object lesson that could have been used in a good many discussions in recent years, and is a part of history that seems to have been lost except to turn up in the thicker books or to be talked about by the people who have some special interest in this. I feel very strongly that our responsibility in this legislature is to see that the curriculum is obligatory in this regard, and that we evolve a better system so that our young people have a more meaningful appreciation of what we have established here over a century—actually longer than that, almost 200 years; the importance of our roots in the British system of parliamentary government and something about where we are heading from these roots. I feel very strongly that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: You will not eliminate—

Mr. Nixon: I feel very strongly on this. The Minister is not taking a proper decision in removing history from the obligatory list.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Perhaps it is getting late but I would say a little bit about history, because I think there is a misunderstanding. I am surprised really at the approach taken by the leader of the Opposition in this regard, and I shall explain this.

I think this Minister, and this government, and I have expressed this view before, have, I think, indicated very clearly to the teachers of this province our interest in history, particularly Canadian history. But I think it is also very apparent that unless courses are developed so that the students really want to participate in them; so that there is something meaningful and worthwhile – because you make it compulsory does not make it good—and surely a man with the experience of the leader of the Opposition, with respect to the educational structure and the educational programme, can see the obvious advantages in developing a programme that will in itself attract students.

Surely we do not have to make this compulsory, particularly in grades 12 and 13, in order to attract students to take a genuine interest in history, and I shall have more to say about this, I guess, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nixon: Well, so shall I.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it is very important that we recognize what we are attempting to do. It is not in any way a downgrading or lack of interest in Canadian history. It is a genuine attempt to make flexible the entire approach in secondary school and to recognize that history is a subject that must, as far as Canadian history is concerned, be made more interesting and more attractive to the students—and we are in the process of doing this.

This is what we explained, too, and I think there was some agreement from the people from the university who discussed this with us in our meeting some two or three weeks ago. This is what we are attempting to do. As I say, I have greater detail on it, but perhaps I will not get into it tonight.

Mr. Nixon: May I just make a comment? I just want to follow up, specifically when he said he was surprised at my attitude, because believe me, I am surprised at the Minister's attitude when he says that the history programme is designed to attract those who are interested in it, and that we can forget about the rest.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I am saying—

Mr. Nixon: I want to say further, Mr. Chairman, when I was critical of Brantford as far as French instruction is concerned a few minutes ago, that the flexibility that is available to them has caused them to develop one of the best history programmes, with the emphasis on local history, that is in existence anywhere in the province—so it balances out a bit there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, this is a flexible approach.

Mr. Nixon: All right, but the fact remains that in a good many of the schools there is not the reaction to the Minister's flexibility that both of us would hope and, in fact, there is a disinterest. There is not a programme that is available. I am not talking about the grade 12 level, I am talking about the grade 6, 7 and 8 level. Where there should be the sort of programme that is a bit different from memorizing the list of American states.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not going to disagree as to the content of the curriculum at the grade 6, 7, or 8 level. As I understand the change in policy that was taken by the department it did not relate to grade 6, 7, or 8. History is still a subject there.

What we are doing at the secondary level is endeavouring to find as many options, or to build in as much flexibility, as we can. This is what I meant when I was indicating my surprise with the hon. member in that I always felt that he agreed that we should have a higher degree of flexibility at the secondary level.

Mr. Nixon: We have to be sure our children know about our history.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Right, and a good history course. I could not agree more. This is a good history course.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I think the point is that making history non-compulsory at the grade level is not affecting Canadian history at all. The point is that it made history for the wrong place in the curriculum.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This may be, and I will discuss this. What I understood the hon. leader of the Opposition was saying to me was his surprise that we had made history an option. With great respect, Mr. Chairman, I think that I have said enough and have indicated a sufficient interest in Canadian history that equals that of the leader of the Opposition.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right then, why do you relate this in this way?

Mr. Nixon: There is no contest to that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right. If you agree with me that the decision to make it an option does not indicate a lack of interest of The Department of Education and the Minister in history, then we can call it a draw and that is it. Fine.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: May I have a word here, Mr. Chairman? Just before moving the adjournment, I would just simply say that a great place to learn Canadian history is right here in this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume the estimates and the discussion of Canadian history.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:10 o'clock, p.m.

No. 109



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, June 6, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 6, 1968

Tributes to the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald 4011

First report, standing committee on labour, Mr. Apps 4012

Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading 4012

Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading 4013

Fire Departments Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 4014

Police Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading 4014

Mining Act, bill to amend, Mr. Ferrier, first reading 4014

Purchase of land from the Rankin Indian reserve, questions to Mr. Gomme, Mr. MacDonald 4014

Meat inspectors in Ontario, questions to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Sargent 4015

Accident rate in mining operations, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Martel 4015

Gasoline transported to Timmins via the ONR, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Ferrier 4016

Investigation of charges by matron Shirley H. of the Don jail, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman 4016

Nipissing central school board, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Shulman 4016

Ontario Hydro policy of hiring summer students, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Stokes 4016

Highway construction, question to Mr. Gomme, Mr. Nixon 4017

Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, continued 4017

Recess, 6 o'clock 4057

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1968

The House met at 2.00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): In view of the tragic death earlier today of Senator Robert F. Kennedy, I feel it to be proper that we pause in our proceedings here this afternoon to pay a tribute to this very vigorous, able man who was cut down by an assassin's bullet as he strove to attain the highest elective office in his own country.

I do not think we, in Canada, view this as an event that has happened in a foreign country. I think the reaction, as I detect it among our people, is that it is a very tragic event that has happened to a friend, almost a member of our family, particularly in Ontario. Senator Kennedy was a senator from New York, which is one of our neighbouring states with whom we have many contacts; there is a very close personal feeling in this very tragic event.

I think we are all—and I share the feelings of the people of the province—saddened by the events of these last two days. Our sympathy must, of course, go to Mrs. Kennedy and other members of this family, who seemed to have endured so much tragedy. I must admit, my own thoughts go to the small children of this man; they face life without a father, who was killed in such a senseless fashion when he was doing his utmost to serve both his country and his people.

He always appealed to me as a man of very strong conviction with great humanitarian principles. He was striving for the disenfranchised; he strove mightily for the poor, for the needy, those who needed help. I do not think we can accept the fact that everything he did was in vain, because if there is one lesson in it—I think perhaps for all of us—it is perhaps the difficulties of man cannot be settled by violence. They cannot be settled by bullets. We must settle our differences by negotiation and discussion, tolerance, appreciation of one another's points of view. I think that this must be the point that has to come through during this series of events in the last few months.

I do not think, either, that we can be particularly smug about the lack of violence in our own country. The potential is there. Violence breeds violence. I think that is historically correct, and I think that what we must do is attempt to find methods of solving our problems without recourse to violence. In this way we may be able to leave for our children a somewhat more civilized world than that in which we live.

I would just like to quote a word from John Donne, and he said:

> No man is an island, entire of itself;
> Every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main;
> Any man's death diminishes me, because I am part of mankind.

That, I think, is quite appropriate in these present circumstances. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that at your direction we might observe a moment's silence following any comments other members of the House might care to make.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the Premier and on behalf of my colleagues, in expressing our sorrow at the great tragedy that the American people and the Kennedy family have experienced in the last few hours.

You recall, sir, that it was in the past few weeks that we had on a similar occasion, expressed views relating to the assassination of Dr. King. The death of Jack Kennedy some years ago is still, of course, very much a part of our vivid memory.

I suppose that Senator Kennedy's death is of particular shock to those of us here in Ontario since, as the Premier said, he was senator from a neighbouring state, and visited this province on several occasions.

As politicians, we had a special interest in his consummate ability to express the views of the people in his own community and his own nation, which so often remained unexpressed otherwise. I can well remember seeing him in action politically on television. On one occasion when he had about 200 young people at one of the state colleges sitting—on the floor as I recall it—he was

standing in their midst answering their questions in an impromptu way. It impressed me then, as it always will, that he had a tremendous grasp of the enthusiasm and idealism of the young people that were with him on that afternoon.

I know that many are relating this assassination to the state of our society. I feel this is beyond my competence, but I want to express my shock and sorrow, and on behalf of my colleagues, our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and the family.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I think this day is both a day of mourning and a day of worry for free men the world over.

It is a day of mourning because, for the second time in five years, a distinguished son of a family which has dedicated itself to public service in the United States has been cut down by an assassin's bullet—a tragedy that is truly awesome in its proportions.

But it is a day of worry because, as has been indicated by the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition, this is all too frequent an occurrence in North American life. I will say North American life including Canadian, and I agree with the Prime Minister that we should not be at all smug in feeling that we happen to have less of it.

Willy-nilly, we in Canada, as well as all countries of the free world, have our fate tied in with that of the United States. Therefore, as we view this kind of awesome event, we worry.

I would like on behalf of my colleagues in this House to express our sorrow and our condolences to a family which has had an inordinate share of tragedy in its midst.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the members and officers of the House, together with our guests, to rise and join with me in a minute of prayer and silent meditation.

Thank you.

Today, we have visiting us, in the east gallery, pupils from St. Cecilia separate school in Toronto and Mount Carmel public school in Leamington; and in the west gallery, from Ridgeview public school in Brampton and Central public school in Grimsby; and in one of the galleries we have the Orangeville public school safety patrol group.

Later this afternoon we will have students from Linwood public school, Linwood, and Levack public school in Levack, joining us. We greet these young people here today.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. S. Apps, from the standing committee on labour, presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment: Bill 130, The Employment Standards Act, 1968.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr Speaker, this Act amends the investment provisions of The OMERS Act and raises the interest rate on the funds of the system which are invested in province of Ontario debentures, from 5 per cent to 6.5 per cent per annum as of January 1, 1968.

An increase in the interest rate on the funds borrowed by the province from OMERS is considered desirable at this time to recognize the continued rise in the interest rates on public borrowings by the province since 1962, when the original investment provisions of The OMERS Act and the original interest rate of 5 per cent per annum on the province of Ontario debentures were established.

The funds of OMERS are invested in province of Ontario debentures with terms to maturity ranging from 40 to 50 years. In 1962, an interest rate of 5 per cent per annum was established for all funds borrowed by the province to 1973. The 5 per cent rate was set below the interest rate applicable in 1962 to public debentures of the province in consideration of the forward commitment by the province of the 5 per cent rate and also in consideration of the 40- to 50-year term to maturity of the debentures. The interest rate of 6.5 per cent per annum proposed in the bill is also below the long-term

public borrowing costs of the province, to recognize the forward commitment of the rate and the exceptional long-term of the debentures.

The long-term investment provisions of the Act were designed in 1962 to enable OMERS to offer reasonable and stable rates of contribution and thereby maximize the pension benefits available to the members of OMERS.

The long-term investment policy that was reflected in the provisions of the original OMERS Act is continued. However, the yield on the province of Ontario debentures to be issued to the system is being increased from 5 per cent to 6.5 per cent per annum.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this Act contains some rather significant amendments, some of which are of a technical or housekeeping variety.

Those sections related to "housekeeping" are numbers 4, 5, 11, 14, 15, 18 and 20.

Of the remaining 16 sections of this Act, five deal with the remuneration of members of the Metropolitan Toronto council.

Section 1 of the Act removes the limitations placed on the remuneration that may be paid to the members of the council, including the chairman. Section 2 similarly removes the limitation on the amount of remuneration that may be paid to members of the exectuive committee.

Section 3 removes the $100 limitation on the annual allowance that may be paid to each chairman of a standing committee. Section 13 deals with the preclusion of payment of remuneration to members of the board of commissioners of police who are members of the metropolitan council.

Section 17 precludes payment of remuneration to the chairman or his delegate as a member of the metropolitan licensing commission and provides for the metropolitan council to determine the remuneration of the other commission members.

Sections 1, 2, and 3, Mr. Speaker, are already included in the Ottawa-Carleton legislation. Similar amendments will be brought forward to The Municipal Act. It is our intention that all municipal councils in the province will have the power to set the levels of their remuneration.

The remaining sections deal with a variety of subjects. Section 6 increases from $80,000 to $130,000 the amount that the metropolitan council may grant annually to the Toronto transit commission toward the cost of providing free transportation for blind persons and war amputees.

Section 7 concerns board of education appointments of alternate members. Section 8 permits payment of an additional allowance to the chairman of the Metropolitan Toronto school board.

Section 9 makes provisions for a unified school building construction programme. Section 10 provides for the rights of wards of Metropolitan Toronto Catholic aid society to attend a secondary school in the metropolitan area.

Section 12 deals with altering the composition of the metropolitan board of police commissioners.

The board formerly consisted of: The chairman of the metropolitan council; a member of the metropolitan council appointed by the council; a judge of York county court and two magistrates, the latter three designated by the Lieutenant-Governor in council.

Under the new section, the board will have one magistrate, and one other person. Both will be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor. The other three members will remain unchanged, namely a judge, the chairman of the metropolitan council and one member of the metropolitan council.

Section 16 authorizes the metropolitan council to assume the function of enacting licensing bylaws. Formerly, this power was held by the licensing commission.

Section 19 authorizes the metropolitan corporation to acquire the O'Keefe centre. This section also establishes the corporation under the name of the board of management of O'Keefe centre which will be composed of three to seven persons to be appointed by the metropolitan council.

Section 21 authorizes the metropolitan council to pass bylaws for aiding athletic or aquatic sports and provides for grants or gifts to persons in recognition of outstanding achievements in sports.

Section 22 removes the limitation which limits the amount that may be expended for diffusing information respecting the advantages of the municipality.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Would the Minister give us an outline on the intent of this bill?

Mr. Speaker: If the member would kindly wait until the Minister has had the opportunity to give his explanation which I am sure he will do.

Mr. Gisborn: Sorry, sir.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, there is actually just one section amending this Act and it repeals the section which provides for grants to municipalities relating to the fire departments. This in turn is related to the takeover of the cost of administration of justice and the increased grants which were arranged there with municipalities so that the fire grant under the present Act is considered to be included in the new grant structure in the administration of justice.

THE POLICE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of amendments in this Act—one to authorize the use of the Ontario Provincial Police force to supplement municipal police forces in special circumstances. It has an amendment regarding a more appropriate means of fixing police jurisdiction on the King's highways and connecting links in municipalities; a provision to provide counsel and legal experts in arbitration matters between police associations and boards of police commissions or council committees. The employment of an arbitrator and for arbitration by the Ontario police commission as one of the final steps in arbitration.

There is a provision also similar to that in The Fire Departments Act for deletion of the provision that presently makes it possible for the Provincial Treasurer to make a grant to the municipality for the purposes of policing, that also being related to the takeover of the cost of administration of justice, and being included in the new grant structure. Those generally are the amendments contained in this bill.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General would permit a question? Does the use of the Ontario police commission as a determining body, insofar as some of these matters are concerned, preclude the normal arbitration procedure or the final arbitration procedure as it now exists?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The way the question is framed, Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is no. It is a further or final step which did not exist before.

Mr. Singer: Is the police commission on top of the arbitration or behind it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is a court of appeal, the last resort.

THE MINING ACT

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, a present ore mine under lease or patent granted after April 12, 1917, is required to be refined in Canada. The amendment extends the requirement to all ore mined under a lease or patent whenever granted.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South has a question from yesterday for the Minister of Highways and one for today.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Highways, which I think he got on Tuesday if I recall correctly, is: Did spokesmen for the city of Sault Ste. Marie offer to have the corporation purchase the necessary land from the Rankin Indian reserve at whatever price could be arrived at with the Batchawana Indian band, and then make it available to The Department of Highways at its top price of $31,000?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the city did not offer to acquire the land and convey it to the department for $31,000. This proposal was made and discussed orally but was not seriously considered and no serious or formal offer was made.

Mr. MacDonald: Would the Minister permit a supplementary question? Did the government regard the proposal with favour or

disfavour? In other words, did your disfavour persuade the city not to proceed in any formal way?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Speaker, this question has been discussed at very great length in my estimates and, I believe, at one other time in the House. The proposal for the building of the road—on the Black Dirt Road—was the one as given by the city's engineers and recommended by our own engineers, and this was the reason we continued to build the road on that alignment.

Mr. MacDonald: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Is the Ontario Hydro Electric Commission conducting any studies regarding the long-term effects of men working with bare hands on high-voltage lines?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, as most of the commission and senior people in Hydro were before the committee on commissions this morning, I was unable to get an answer. I will take it as notice and try and have an answer for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce has some questions?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Would the Minister please advise on the number of meat inspectors in the province of Ontario?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I am speaking entirely from memory here. I believe I answered that question during the estimates. If I recall correctly it was 120 with a group of about 30 in training now.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister is probably aware of the great confusion in New York state where they have taken over the statewide administration of the inspection of meat. Could the Minister advise how many meat processing plants we have here in Ontario and, as in New York state, are we understaffed in the number of inspectors we have? Are they overworked; are we short of inspectors?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of the matter concerning New York state. I do know that the federal government in Washington passed a federal bill implementing meat inspection across the United States in the various states of the union. Some of the states have chosen to provide their own meat inspection, I believe; others are negotiating with the federal government to provide the meat inspection through The Department of Agriculture.

We in Ontario attempted at one time to arrange an agreement with the federal government at Ottawa to provide meat inspection, but it just did not work out satisfactorily and we decided to provide it ourselves. We have done this on an orderly basis and all of the plants in Ontario in a line from Hastings county through Victoria-Haliburton west are now covered by inspection. These are the red meat plants. The poultry plants are not all covered yet.

The group of inspectors now being trained will cover all of the red meat processing plants in eastern Ontario and we will then attempt to provide inspection for all pountry plants in Ontario. We hope to have it all done by the first of the year. That is our target date.

Mr. Sargent: Thanks. I will send the Minister this news release. He can check it then.

A question to the Prime Minister. Would the Premier please advise what amount of moneys were paid to the Ports of Call restaurant concession at Expo last year?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I answered this question very completely in a reply to the question of the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha). I think it is in *Hansard* on March 27.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Mines. Is the Minister aware that the Dravo Developing Company and the MacIsaac Mining Company, both involved in standard mining operations, have very poor accident records and are both without mine rescue crews?

If the Minister is aware of the situation, would he see to it that these companies train men in mine rescue work immediately, and provide them with the proper equipment so that they are in a position to handle emergencies which may arise from time to time?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I suppose technically I could say the answer to question one is yes, and the answer to question two is no; but I think

the House deserves a fuller explanation than that.

The question though, I think, does create the wrong impression when it mentions that these two companies are involved in standard mining operations. Now my understanding is that they are part of a group in this industry that is known as development contractors.

Certainly the accident rate in the contracting end of the industry is causing this government and this Minister a lot of concern. It has been the subject of a few rough remarks and a few speeches I made myself, just lately, about it.

But it has been the policy of the government to provide mine rescue training at a mine after it goes into production. These people are contractors. They work in producing mines, or mines currently under development, and the government does insist that mine rescue training and mine rescue equipment be available in these instances at the hands of the mining company itself. Therefore, in these cases, we feel that the mine rescue training and the equipment is there at the hands of the parent company.

But in respect of the whole contracting element in the mining industry, I would invite submissions both within and without the industry, and within and without this Legislature, to help us solve a very serious problem at the moment.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management: How many tank cars of gasoline were transported to Timmins by the ONR in the month of April?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, the number of tank cars transporting gasoline to Timmins for the month of April was 44.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Reform Institutions.

Has the Minister investigated charges made to him last week by matron Shirley H. of the Don jail? If so, will the Minister reveal the results of his investigation to the House?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Perhaps before the Minister answers I might explain that when this question was submitted to me originally, it was so close, in my opinion, to the question submitted on June 3, I believe, by the member, that I questioned it. Rather than engage in any prolonged discussion with him, I allowed it to be placed as it is now.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Thank you for allowing me, Mr. Speaker, to handle it. You are quite right, Mr. Speaker. The answer to the first question is, "Yes they have investigated." The answer to the second question is, "No," and for the reasons which I explained to the House yesterday.

The matters are so inconsequential and minor in nature, and as they deal entirely with internal administration, it would not be worthwhile, in my opinion, to waste the valuable time of the hon. members of this House by discussing the matter here.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister allow a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, no.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I must point out to you the Minister is not helping by refusing to give information to the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member can address the chair on a matter of order, a matter of personal privilege or ask a question.

Mr. Shulman: A question for the Minister of Education. Has The Department of Education investigated the conduct and operation of the Nipissing central school board as requested by parents of the pupils; and will the Minister give further consideration to the matter in the light of the further charges made in a petition presented to him this week?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the source of the member's information. I can only say that I have had no petition presented by the parents of the Nipissing central school board.

Mr. Shulman: I will send it across to the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Is the Minister aware that Ontario Hydro is hiring students from other parts of the province while denying work to those in northern Ontario? Why are local students not given preference? Will the Minister instruct Ontario Hydro to give

priority to northern Ontario students who have fewer opportunities to secure summer employment than those in southern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the hon. member asked this question of Hydro officials at the committee this morning, and had it answered at that time.

Mr. Stokes: If I might ask a supplementary? Could I have the assurance of the Minister that priority will be given to students of northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I would have to discuss this with officials of Hydro and, as I have said earlier, they were at committee all morning and I have not had a chance to speak to them, but I understood that all students in the province of Ontario were given equal opportunity, and that Hydro did not choose northern or southern or eastern Ontario. I think that this has been happening for quite a number of years.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: Mr. Chairman, I have the answer to the fifth part of question 604 asked by the hon. leader of the Opposition. Yes, our engineers are continually in contact with the contractor and are taking every measure to ensure completion as soon as possible.

We are optimistic about meeting the July 1 date, as mentioned in the answers to part two of this question.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 20th order, House in committee of supply, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
(Continued)

On vote 507:

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks today to item 11 of vote 507, having to do with the expenses of the committee on the aims and objectives of education in the schools of Ontario. The House has been given a good many remarks of a concrete and incisive nature.

If I may indulge myself and the House, I should like to range out on the objectives of education in the province as I see it, and to make a few remarks along these lines. After all, the Minister is spending $1 billion, and I thought I might be able to get in two cents' worth.

This the most amorphous of departments. The criticism that could be levelled at it is precisely that because of the indeterminaation of education—what is education? What is it all about? What are you supposed to be doing? Why are you spending all that money? The critique that I hear from the public and in the salons and saloons of this province is that you are going about in all directions, that total intellectual confusion reigns in the department. You do not really know what you are doing. You do not know what direction education is to take, you work on an *ad hoc* basis from day to day.

You erect schools. You are so busy training teachers and filling seats that you have not got time to sit back and look at what your ultimate objectives are. The difficulty about education is, of course, that there is no such thing. Education is not an object; it is a method whereby we convey certain attitudes, facts, points of view, relations of life to the last baby born. Therefore, it is a traditional thing, and it rides on the basis of tradition.

The word tradition itself should be enough to warn us about education because out of the Latin tradition also comes treason, and you can do as much harm as good. It is a two-edged sword, this business. You can reduce the stature of human beings, or you can give them scope and amplitude and bring them into their own. I suspect that you do as much to diminish as you do to cause growth. The master of those who know, as he was called for 15 centuries in our civilization—but no longer—said that all men were possessed by one fundamental drive—curiosity.

It was not sex in those days, you know, it was the desire for knowledge. The problems that arise out of the desire to know and the eternal human curiosity are two-fold. One is the ability to distinguish between what is worth learning and what is not. You know, if I may quote from Chesterton a couple of lines:

> There are things you need know of
> Though you live and die in vain.
> There are some more sick of pleasure
> Than you are sick of pain.
> There's a game of April fool
> That is played behind the door,
> The fool remains forever,
> And the April comes no more.

The second thing about education, and I think a lot of people—including some from that department—labour through missing it, is that not everything can be taught. As a matter of fact, it may come down to this—the only, or the most important, things worth knowing cannot be taught. The schools cannot teach it, and no formal procedure has ever been invented. I am thinking about normal states.

You can teach the intellectual foundations of the morality but you cannot teach people to be moral human beings. There is no way but through experience and the deep lessons of life, which education can only garner from and not directly affect, whereby human beings can come into self-determination. I think also of the gifts of intuition and love. particularly with respect to intuition. Rising out of that I say: Look at the paucity, in this province, of genius. Where do you produce people of first rate merit? Where are our writers? Where are our intellectual giants? Have we ever produced a philosopher? What happens with this whole school system? Where is the generation of genius, in other words, in your system? Do not tell me that your system in schools cannot be expected to induce states of mind of this high quality. I think that it may be just a talisman of the opposite; that your schools suppress and inhibit and so turn awry human purposes that any potential genius is thwarted in the bud.

The other thing is this business of intuition. What we try to instill through an intellectual process, through the processes of education, is insight; education can clear the ground so they may grow. It cannot instill them but it can prevent blockages and surmount the barricades in the path of an intuitus—"a looking into". The whole of contemporary education seems to me to be largely directed to encourage a "looking about" or "at", rather than into a looking into. Never in any generation were so many things taught to so many people and so little actually offered in the way of understanding human minds. The Kennedy situation is a reflection of the total abysmal depth of loss in this realm.

This is a projection of the state of mind of the whole society in which we all share. And to that measure! It is an indictment of your system of education, and of systems of education as they operate on this continent. Education on one side of the fence is a call and on the other side of the fence is a passion. So far as it is a call, test what I have to say against what actually goes on in the province.

An education, if it was to be worthy of the name, would break down men's prejudices. The whole reason for the teaching of history, which you touched on the other day in the debate, and no doubt we will come back to it; and which you have somewhat abnegated, is the business of allowing people, through sheer imagination and through a sympathy, to enter into the lives of earlier people.

The reason that you do that is to have them live lives other than their own, to get them outside the confining cocoon of their own time and their own civilization, to take them into earlier times when men had different modes of living. Where some of them were more refined than what we are now—the 17th century; where the sense of interrelationship of citizens was far more profound than we enjoy at the present time; the cities of Greece; and where a sense of rapport with your immediate relations—as in the civilization of China—and a sense of reverence for the dead and the hovering presence of those who have passed before us and left their mark on us. How many generations may pass again through us as with the Persians? All this sort of thing is not given any great credence.

Education means to educe, to lead you out of, to lead someone out of themselves, which is the only way in which they will ever arrive, by a paradox, back into themselves.

The proper education would be such as to range beyond contemporary norms to do this deliberately and critically. The truly educated man would be like a man from Cassiopeia or out of the distant Arcturus, who would visit us as a stranger. He would not only be completely at home where he was born and where he was educated, he would also be a stranger in our midst. He would look at things with a cold eye, he would be able to judge them from enormous distance. The business of establishing distance, of getting away from the acceptable, of being able to make a critique of that which is offered in a spoon—that is the business of education, and that you do not do.

They are confined here; they accept the norms. You have a system rooted in complacency and passivity and this is driven home by the very structure which you have erected. It may be inevitable, I do not know, I hope not. If it is inevitable then the whole system will stand prejudged and will not produce the fruits that are supposed to be garnered from it.

The second thing I want to mention is that education is a passion. This seems to me to be the very core of the whole thing. One who has never experienced—let us put it another way. The chief way in which men find pleasure, of course, is in sexual activity. But there is a form of pleasure, a form of delight, something that can make one's hair stand on end or sweat come out, and that is called learning.

Some time late at night, when a new thought or the interrelationship of many thoughts dawn on a man for the first time, and the logical sequence of ideas hits you, and you make intellectual discoveries, there is nothing, there is nothing that lights up the mind more. It causes a sense of life and the things that are worth while, and that we are ploughing ahead. That is the affirmation of existence itself, and the true meaning of life—the delectation of intelligence—the passion of intellegence that is the theme that is fundamentally missing.

You do not light the flame. If you do, it is usually in spite of yourselves. It is because students with a natural law, with an intellectual impetus and drive that is generated out of their marrow opposing most of the incursions of this system, rise up against it. This is happening throughout your system and you know it. You get the constant rebel, these are the brightest students, because they have that fundamental feeling for the thing. They know what it is for the mind to light up. Most people go through their whole lives without ever the bulb coming on.

It is a strange thing that, for all your education, that simple first thing in education never happens to them. The job of your teachers is to ignite that flame. The whole teaching art is dedicated to that one thing, to set that spark glowing. If a system, in its doldrums and in its backwardness, is unable to set that spark in a sufficient number of cases, then again it stands self-condemned. Looking at your system I see very little sign of any sparks being lighted.

What it comes to, then, in this regard, is that I see the educational system here, not wholly, but by and large, killing in human beings a great deal—most of the curiosity that they otherwise as children have, and naturally as human beings have. So far as the imagination is concerned, where does your system do anything to stimulate the powers? You kill the emotional life, you kill the life of curiosity, and you kill the life of the imagination. We will come to the intelligence in a moment.

So far as imagination is concerned, for instance, I notice with my children coming home that they remember very little poetry. There is not too much generated in the way of a ranging out in sheer fancifulness—the business of erecting dreams, if you will, and coloured webs, which is the chief function of something that is not really an animal. Animals do not dream—human beings do. And that dereliction from the schools is no longer placing emphasis upon poetry.

May I tell you a story? Once I knew an old Indian sage; his name was Annda Coomaraswamy. He had written a great deal, this man. He was at the museum of Oriental art in Boston, Massachusetts. He was a very elderly man when I visited him while I was in the army, and one of his chief doctrines has to do with memory—and this is again where you are deficient—in terms of memory itself.

He said, "cannot a man remember?" He said,

> That which a man knows, he knows by heart. If he does not know it by heart, or in his heart, he does not know it at all. All the bookishness, all the stuff on the shelves, have no value whatsoever, unless it somehow impinges and is a vital part of the living life of the one who pretends to know the things in the book.

This is Indian wisdom and there is a great deal of truth to it. You give very little cognizance to it, because the whole tendency in contemporary education is against the storage house of memory. This is supposed to be rote learning. It is not necessarily that at all—it is the memory of the race of man. If something was done to stimulate the memories, to teach—

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): You do not agree with your colleague from Peterborough—

Mr. Lawlor: I make my own speeches.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Do not interrupt. This is a magnificent speech. Listen to it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am listening very carefully, but I am confused by the position.

Mr. Lawlor: Anyway, I have said that there are two kinds of Eros. There is the one that we all know about and there is the divine Eros, of which none of us know very much about. And I was saying that intelligence is not something abstract, aloof, cold and removed from everyday life. Quite the contrary, for Plato—and this is the chief educator of western civilization, and you remember Whitehead used to say about him,

"all human thinking is a footnote to Plato." There is a good deal of truth to that.

For Plato it was an Eros, intelligence was a passion, it was a love, it was something that caught our minds and drove us onward; made us want to know more. This again, I repeat, I see no signs of you stimulating or bringing to pass. For all your money, whatever you do, it makes very little difference if you do not do that, because that is what it is all about. That is why you are spending so much money, except if we come to a second position which you may or may not hold.

There are two chief fallacies in contemporary education. One is to ignore ends, the ends and objectives of which I am speaking, in preference to the means, the means being the whole apparatus, all that machinery that you have generated and at which you keep toiling away day and night.

I would like to quote just briefly from Jacques Maritain, and recommend his book "Education at the Crossroads," the finest single little book on educational thinking that I have had the pleasure to see. I have seen Whitehead's book and a number of others, but nothing touches this one if you want the overall view of education.

You may not agree necessarily—he is, perhaps, too intellectualist in the good sense—there are other senses, as he points out, in which intellectualism may be wrong.

In other words, he says that the chief function of education is to train the mind and that education can only secondarily, and in an oblique way, have very much to do with the training of the will. That is, to make us better people, to make us better in our relationships both with ourselves and with other people. He says this is something that education may attempt to do by outlining a certain position but that it cannot really teach it.

If you remember, that is where Socrates spent his whole time; he said, "Can virtue be taught?" and he came to the conclusion that it could not be taught, in the last analysis. It is induced by other means, by example and by a sense of the heroic and by setting up models.

Again, it seems to me that in our sophistication, there is a failure in our schools to set before our younger people models of heroism. Put sanctity, if you will, on one side in terms of virtue and being able to suffer and willing to do so, and on the other side sheer courage and heroic action. I do not think these models are given proper place any longer in our school system. Therefore, the kids have all their anti-heroes and their anti-heroes breed bloodshed in our streets. Maritain says:

> The means are not bad, on the contrary, they are generally much better than those of the old pedagogy. The misfortune is they are precisely so good that we lose sight of the end, hence the surprising weakness of education today, which recedes from our attachment to the very perfection of our modern educational means and methods and our failure to bend them towards the end. The child is so well tested and observed, his needs are so well detailed, his psychology is so clearly cut out, the methods of making it easy for him every way perfected, that the end of all these commendable improvements, the purposes of this have been forgotten or disregarded.

The second aspect – and it is connected with the means-end relationship but has more to do with the substance of the matter—is that unlike the Greeks who had education for the elite, and unlike medieval times where the education, because of sociological conditions was largely in the hands of the clergy, we have entered into an age of science.

And the problem is not only that but also that we are in an age of democracy where we have equality of opportunity, or the recognition of the dignity of each man, and of his right to the development of the fullness of his capacity. All these things we have foremost in my mind, so we can no longer have the elitism or the patrician period of education of the Greeks or the classical times down to our own time. We have launched in a new direction.

But the worshipping of science, the importation of scientific methodology and techniques into the heart of the education betrays the human spirit. Science has to do with bread, and man does not live by bread alone. One recognizes the necessity for technique and for technological improvement in training and skills and what-not, and it may be truly educational, even there the light bulbs may go on if it is taught properly and if they see the interlinking of purposes ranging out beyond the very restrictive nature of their subject.

But I see newspaper articles some years ago, Mr. Chairman, in which the hon. Minister was depicted as a pussycat and the pussycats around the province of Ontario and throughout this country are those who are

rendering our educational system questionable. I do not so accuse him on this occasion; I am interested in his comments, however, as to just what kind of a pussycat he may be.

By a pussycat, we mean one who has turned the whole of the educational system into a technological direction. Let us face it. Education and universal compulsory education did not come by chance; it came of necessity out of the 19th century, not because the vested interest – though they wanted to improve the quality of human lives –not at all. It was for two reasons: One of them was to teach them the basic literacy which was necessary for industrial process.

And they made it compulsory when they found this literacy was crucial to the earnings of profits and to keep the whole system in operation. And so it grew, and that is the chief purpose. The second thing is to keep them off the streets. You did not want too much of a glut on the labour market, you want even less of a glut now; *ergo* the extension of the educational system.

The thing is not dedicated to the lighting of lamps on the hillside, or articulating of Aristeides or one of the orations of Cicero, not in the least. Here and there it may be done; you may throw a sop to the intellectuals, to the professors of philosophy hidden in the back corners of the university.

The chief job in the central core of the whole apparatus, in divorce from—and this is where I object—the overall necessary liberalizing tendencies which will support our democracy, if it is to be supported at all, lies in technological skills, in scientific learning, and in this particular kind of reductionism whereby if man is compartmentalized, if he is made into a pure and simple specialist, if he is a form of department store performing a particular task, then this external statistical classifitory reductionist concept of man can only lead to a complete disappearance of humanism and to barbarism. The Romans were fairly barbaric; they were great engineers, and they made very little contribution to the overall life of civilization. They borrowed from whatever the Greeks had to give them in that particular regard.

You are still, I say, under the bane of John Dewey and that particular kind of a thing. Dewey is no longer very much spoken about, he is a little old hat, I suppose; nevertheless, education as a process of adaptation to society, as an adjustment to other human beings, to a style of life, so to speak, that sort of thing, still continues and it very presently permeates your particular system—the particular adaptation that you are trying to make is again to industry and to the benefits that may be derived to the economic structure from this particular end. Now, everyone has to work, no one denies that, but the problem is in the streaming that you are doing, in the growth of community colleges which would seem to have no liberalizing influence offered internally within them at all.

I know of one case where Johnny McDonough teaches a little philosophy over in one of your colleges there. He is the one who wrote the play about Charbonneau. How does it operate? You make typists and legal stenographers, I notice, you have people who are very adept in laboratories, but where is the dimension, where are the possibilities for the future of ourselves and for the ideals and for the real living realities we want to live with in a society, politically and otherwise? You produce political morons in the schools, they do not even know which way to vote. I find that particularly aggravating.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: In any event, I want to refer to an article written some years ago in *Time* magazine, talking about John Dewey:

> The Deweyites thus transform conditioning techniques into ends in themselves. Teachers' colleges assume the dignity of lamaseries. Teachers were denied the chance of learning more about their subjects in favour of compulsory education courses and how to teach them. Within the schools, discipline gave way to increasingly dubious forms of group persuasion.

It goes on in that vein and it says:

> With Dewey's world so demonstrably in tatters, one might think the educationists would run up the white flag.
>
> Far from it! Entrenched in public school administrations they defend with the adhesiveness of a band of brothers, every article of their gobbledygook canons.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Perhaps I am wrong, Mr. Chairman, but as I interpret this philosophy over the years, I think the member is giving exactly the opposite approach he took.

But go ahead, I am interested. I think it is very entertaining.

Mr. Lawlor: I am accusing the department and the Minister of being insouciant with respect to the role of curiosity, and killing it in the kids. I have said that the imaginative life is pretty well abnegated in favour

of a sheer learning of techniques. I have said that the memory faculty in man is not being in any way stimulated in your schools.

I say there is too great an alliance upon external aids, and that they do not say that the only thing a man really knows is what he can remember, that in particular is lost. This is because of specialization and you have —and this form of specialization has the effect of dehumanizing the human being. You are on the road to specialization. You no doubt might believe that this is inevitable, as I said earlier, that we cannot help ourselves in the diversification of knowledge that is coming about.

I suspect that if that is the case then what you really must do is reverse some of the pattern, that for the earlier parts of the school year and as long as possible into their 13th, 14th and later years, you must liberalize the aid given on overall concepts and making it—bringing them into the whole vista of civilization, giving them as much general knowledge as you possibly can and not just information—because, thereafter, if they fall into the trench of specialization they are cut off, and cannot speak intelligently on any other subject in which they are unable to form judgments either about themselves or about the affairs in their community in any perceptive way. This is a striking feature when one is sitting among scientists of an evening—their sheer inability to relate, to have knowledge about and to form judgments on matters of general human affairs and deportment. These are the things that deeply disturb me within the present system.

I have one final word to say, and that is that schooling, of course, is only the smallest part of education. Apart from there being many things that you cannot teach at all and, perhaps the most important thing, the educational process is fundamentally an adult process, where we come back on ourselves, where we can look at ourselves and try to see ourselves as others see us; that goes on all our lives. The mentality that has been built up in our country is that they are darn glad to leave school, to get away from it all, that the particular disciplines which are onerous and not liberating are to be escaped from at the earliest possible time. Therefore, after they leave, they no longer want to subject themselves or open themselves at all to the continuing process of enlightenment—the sheer joy of learning things.

You have created that. There is something wrong when that happens. Therefore, perhaps greater emphasis could be given to the ongoing role of the adult educational sphere. You are going to have to do it in due course, anyway.

Mr. Chairman, my remarks have been rather abstract and wandering. On a later occasion I trust I shall bring them down to earth and give them greater concretion. Nevertheless, as I said at the beginning, no department offers a greater scope for an analysis and for remarks touching what it is supposed to be all about. If the remarks that I have made today are of any assistance to the Minister in his directions and the purposes of his department, then I would be deeply gratified.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Chairman, the aim of education in Ontario, in my opinion, is still to help young people learn by doing, prepare them for a productive and gratifying life by also instilling in them an appreciation of moral value and raising their self-esteem.

With the increase in drop-out of students in our schools, the increase of narcotics in our schools and increase of juvenile delinquency and problems of crime in Ontario, many of the young people are not standing up or living up to social responsibility.

The time is now for religious education in the public schools. History is being taught in the schools, and the Bible is the oldest history book. We must find a solution to the problem that faces Ontario and other provinces throughout Canada. Too many of our young children do not have the opportunity for guidance enjoyed by other children. All children should have a good basic set of moral standards and values. With the system in Ontario of senior and elementary public schools, with the television and other forms of communication in the spare periods that the students would have and with the consent of the parents, religion with its different faiths can be taught in our schools.

I am sure many churches would send well qualified persons to assist in religious education in our schools. I have one other question, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister. I want to know what you are doing with religious education in our schools today?

The second one: How many children are under the influence of tranquilizers in our schools today?

An hon member: How many teachers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not really anticipate the hon. member is serious in his second question; that is, if he expects that I will have any knowledge as to what children turn to tranquilizers in the school system and as far as the first part of his remarks are concerned: This is one of the great difficulties for a Minister of Education in this province who—I am reminded quite frequently by the hon. leader of the Opposition—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): There was no such difficulty before.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, it has given me difficulty. I can recall certain speeches made in this Legislature with respect to the religious instructions in schools whereby—

Mr. Nixon: I can recall a discussion three years ago.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is correct, sir, but my recollection is that the leader of the Opposition very strenuously urged that there not be religious instruction in the schools of this province. This is my recollection and this is what makes it difficult for me. I can recall members in the other group and perhaps the hon. member who just spoke for Lakeshore would not agree either.

Mr. Nixon: You were asked what you were doing about it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, no. He has not asked me. He is telling me we should have it. That is what he said.

Mr. Nixon: What are you going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am telling him because he was not here to hear your—

Mr. Nixon: Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the leader of the Opposition is endeavouring, perhaps, to cover up the fact that he had made a speech in this House very strenuously suggesting that we eliminate religious instruction in the school system. The hon. member for Welland South is now suggesting that we do it. I am not quarrelling at all, but I just say it makes it very difficult for anybody administering educational affairs when, from a group of individuals represented by your leader, I get a conflicting point of view.

Mr. Nixon: You have picked the easiest way.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all. I—

Mr. Nixon: Certainly, you have set it on a shelf for years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we have not and we are not going to until the report comes in, and the hon. member is fully aware of this. But I do not even know when the report comes in. I hope it will be this fall and I think this is a reasonable expectation. But I am really very intrigued by the remarks from the member for Welland South, because in my view they are somewhat contradictory to the position that your leader took a couple of years ago.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into a contentious question here, but as you know new blood comes into this House with new ideas.

I asked a question on tranquilizers that the youngsters are perhaps using today. And the reason I raised this question, I have dealt with this problem myself, very close to me, and dealt with it. It was the problem of a child who did not want to go to school. One of the problems was the child did not like the new mathematics and apparently this had created a problem with this child. He refused to go to school.

Upon investigation with the medical doctor, I found that there were about seven or eight other persons who had come to his attention. In fact, he had a couple of children in hospitals to make a study test on it. I was a little bit puzzled about his remarks that the trend in school today is too much pressure on our youngsters. Perhaps we should have a study on the tranquilizers used by the young children today in our schools.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I think this would be an appropriate opportunity, if you will permit me, to make some comments on the committee that is paid for under this vote—item 12, $12,000—which is going to continue the work of the committee on religious education in the public schools, now going into its fourth year.

The Minister and the administration were most fortunate in acquiring the services of a great Canadian, John Keiller Mackay, to be chairman of this committee. His responsibilities have been very heavy in many fields of community work and government work, and it is unfortunate in my view that the committee has not brought forth some recommendations that the government might act on before now.

The Minister is well aware of the problems that were evident in many parts of Ontario before the committee was set up, and it was his natural reaction to such a problem that he put it on the shelf for three years, so that any particular difficulties have been maintained and have become worse over the years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not think so.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, that is so.

A good many of the municipalities in this province are responding to the directives of this department that they must have religious education, unless they pass a special resolution that will remove them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is left to a resolution of the board.

Mr. Nixon: It is a part of the curriculum that they can opt out of by resolution.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right—a resolution of the board.

Mr. Nixon: Not except by resolution. And it was the leadership of George Drew back in 1944 that imposed this on the province. It was not the sort of evolution—that has come down to us over the number of years that we have had a developing school system.

Now you can look back at the debates in this House at that time if you want verification of that point of view, but I want to bring this particularly to the Minister's attention—that there is no doubt in my mind that there can be useful, modern instruction on morality and religion.

But the Minister should be well aware that there are municipalities in this province, and I happen to live in one, that purchased religious education from a group of people who come from outside of Canada, and look on their attendance in Ontario as if they were missionaries, and that they are over here to save us from some fate that we are not clever enough to be aware of ourselves.

The Minister knows very well that the ministerial associations and Protestant ministers in general take part in this responsibility when asked, and if they are able to do so, but I am informing him that there are these people from outside our own jurisdiction who are not acquainted, nor familiar with our background.

They are not knowledgeable of our form of education system, and they are giving religious instruction here, in my view, of a rather narrow approach to the meaning of life and our appreciation of those forces beyond normal ken. Now I believe that it is a serious matter.

We have gone for three years and more since this was raised in the Legislature, and since the government undertook to finance a Royal commission to advise them in this matter, we have still had no report and no action. The Minister, if he chooses, can say that the Liberal Party is divided on that.

This, of course, means nothing at all. The hon. member is expressing his own views.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite right!

Mr. Nixon: And he is a very thoughtful member and has every right to do so.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite right!

Mr. Nixon: And believe me, that is far better than the reaction that the government takes, which is to put it up on the shelf and forget about it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, let us be relatively accurate if we can. Not only was there no attempt to put it up on the shelf—

I think there was general concensus, as I recall the discussion at the time, and here the hon. member in the many other areas is saying we do not have enough research consultations studies. The next day, of course, when it suits his purposes it should be a Ministerial decision.

Mr. Nixon: A misleading and weak argument.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You know after 24 hours' study; completely inconsistent!

Mr. Nixon: You have shirked your responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not a shirking of responsibility at all; it is a genuine attempt to make a valid decision with the assistance of some very intelligent people.

Mr. Nixon: No doubt about the ability of those people.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will tell you something about the people that is also relevant but perhaps it is not known to the hon. member.

First, the committee started this work in February of 1966, and if my mathematics are correct, and I am not using the new math, that is two years and some three months ago. We are—

Mr. Nixon: What was the date of the appointment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not recall the date of the appointment. It was some time in the fall, I believe, of 1965, and they started their studies in February of 1966. I anticipate their report this fall, but we have had two problems with the committee and I think the hon. member must know this.

Mr. Nixon: You admit the committee was appointed in 1965!

If they were appointed in 1965, we are now financing into their fourth year.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well I know; but Mr. Chairman, he said that we were going into the fourth year of their study.

Mr. Nixon: Well, we will look it up!

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are talking about only the year.

Mr. Nixon: Look it up. It is the truth. We are talking about this vote of $12,000 which will finance them into their fourth year.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It will finance them, I think, into September or October of 1968. These funds will not go into 1969.

Mr. Nixon: These votes go on into 1969—read the front cover.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right. I am saying to the hon. member that money will be spent in 1968.

Mr. Nixon: Well, do not give me the new math argument, it is four years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not, and I should point out to the hon. member that we have had two problems, and they are very sorrowful problems with the committee.

One of the senior members, Mr. Jeanneret, passed on during the course of the activities of the committee, and we were fortunate enough in getting his son, Dr. Jeanneret to replace him, but there was some interruption in the continuity of the committee. Mr. Martin, the representative from the Roman Catholic faith who was also a member of the committee, of course, we had similar difficulties unfortunately, and Mr. Forestall was once again appointed to replace Mr. Martin, and these are the two events Mr. Chairman. I know the hon. leader of the Opposition is really a very understanding individual on most occasions.

Mr. Nixon: You try me at times.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it is only fair to state, or to understand, that no committee of this, shall we say, structure with a relatively limited number of people, when you have two very—

Mr. Nixon: How many are on the committee?

Hon. Mr. Davis: His honour J. Keiller Mackay, Dr. Mary Hinnis, Mr. Forestall, Dr. Jeanneret, his honour Judge Waisberg and John White—

Mr. Nixon: Are you suggesting that they should start fresh?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, but I am saying that it requires a period of time to aquaint the new members on an issue that is as difficult and complex as this, and it did not happen at the same time. These deaths occurred unfortunately—and I think it was only natural to understand that this has prolonged the work of the committee. I think it is also fair to state that if we really want to get involved in this process and endeavour to get some form of consensus, that public hearings are a necessary part of their work, the public hearings went far beyond what I think the chairman had originally anticipated.

There were many briefs—individuals who wished to appear—and this also prolongs the work of the committee. Now, I know the hon. member would, perhaps, say we do not need these hearings, we do not need this public involvement, but this was the decision of the chairman of the committee, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that one must respect his point of view, in the way he wishes to conduct this study.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Chairman I would like to ask a number of perhaps shorter questions. I hope.

In view of the fact—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Shorter answers too.

Mr. Pitman: In view of the philosophy expounded by the Minister regarding decentralization. I am wondering what future this holds for the curriculum section. To what extent will local larger units particularly be able to create their own curriculum? To what extent will they be bound by a curriculum which is coming from the centre?

I know you have indicated, at least the Minister indicated, Mr. Chairman, that the curriculum would be issued through rather vague directives, and more specific directives

which have come in the past from the department.

I am trying very hard to see a plan or a pattern here, and I am wondering how you can decentralize your curriculum if you are going to have a centralized impetus in relation to educational television, for example.

Also, I am wondering also how you are going to deal with the problem of a mobile population, where people are moving from one jurisdiction to another, rather rapidly.

My answer is, of course, if you have the right kind of educational system where information gathering is not so important, then this is not such a real problem; and if you have an ungraded system students can, in a sense, get into the level which they find themselves on each individual subject, and I am wondering, in the present situation, as to what the Minister has planned to do in this area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I say this is what once again causes some difficulties for those responsible in education from time to time. You have the point of view being expressed by the member for Peterborough that we are moving away from the point of, shall we say, accumulation of factual material, the question of memorization. We are moving to an era hopefully where the school system will be involved in developing the thinking processes of the young people, and, as I say, it brings into a little bit of conflict, though not in total, the views of the member for Lakeshore where the question of memorization and a certain amount of factual information also is, I guess, part of one's attitude towards life. It is part of the education—I find just a little bit of conflict here, in their outlook.

Mr. Pitman: Not really!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I see. Anyway, as I say, I find it just a shade confusing, but I say to the hon. member that, of course, the overall policy of the department will be to determine the broad general outlines of the curriculum in course of structure and then the details hopefully over a period of years as the local boards obtain more expertise and qualified personnel who will develop details of and approaches to the curriculum, within their own environment.

This to me is very basic and you will not achieve this in the first two or three years of operation of the divisional boards. It will take a period of time. But as I see curriculum, and I think this is a response to the changes that are taking place in society, we do not want to become rigid in a curriculum approach; we want to set very broad general objectives, and we leave it up to individual schools and school systems to adapt this to them.

There is no conflict with respect to ETV whatsoever. ETV, in my view is an educational resource. It is like a textbook, in that you can turn it off if you do not want it, for one thing, and it is not to be a situation where one can develop curriculum based exclusively on ETV. No one anticipates this. It is a supplementary or additional educational resource that is available to the system. Now, that is a long answer to what was a relatively short question.

Mr. Pitman: A further question on this. It would seem to me that if you are going to have this tremendous variety of curriculum, how is this going to affect the textbook publishers? Have you been in consultation with them? I think that they are a respectable group of people.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They certainly are. I agree with you.

Mr. Pitman: I see no reason why the department would be reluctant to have some type of consultation, or use the views of the textbook publishers on this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not objecting to this at all. I do not know how I can best get this message across. Perhaps I had better take the hon. member for Peterborough on a two or three week tour of the department and let him live in some of the offices, and see how many consultations go on. I think that it is fair to state that there are great consultations with the publishing industry. I cannot determine here how the flexibility and change is going to involve the textbook publishers over a period of years, and none can determine this.

Surely the hon. member is not suggesting to me that, as Minister of Education, we retard, or make our curriculum rigid to accommodate the book publishers? This cannot be done. They have got to adapt to the changes that are taking place and, in fact, in many instances, they are giving some leadership in this matter, as the hon. member well knows.

Sure we want to involve everyone in the process as best we can and, in the final analysis, someone has to make some decision and someone has to provide the leadership. If it is necessary, and society is changing,

and if knowledge is changing and you have to update or alter curriculum, surely this is our responsibility to do this? I can rest assured that if we were not doing it, this would be one of the first complaints that the hon. member would have.

Mr. Pitman: Will there be authorized texts?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I anticipate that there will be authorized texts, but I also anticipate—and, you know, you are asking me to look well ahead, and I do not have a crystal ball, and there are days when I wish I did. I think that there will be larger numbers of, not necessarily texts, but reference books. I do not think that there is any question of that. There has to be.

Mr. Pitman: Well, how will ungraded schools relate to the admission to university? For example, students who are going through ungraded high schools, may end up with what we today would regard as a very strange selection of subjects and a very strange selection of levels in these subjects.

Have you been in consultation with the university as to how their policy of admission is going to be affected by this kind of development?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we do not have a system of ungraded secondary schools in the province of Ontario. We have six or seven experimental situations, and obviously we do not know the impact of this. We are encouraged.

Mr. Pitman: You expect more this year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I expect that there will be more next year.

Mr. Chairman, I think that we would be really abdicating our responsibility if we were to, every time a decision had to be made and certain progress made, if we bogged down and said, "Well, maybe we had better not do it because of a possible—" and I emphasize possible, because I think that the member for Peterborough raises problems that may never occur. Certainly we should endeavour to think of them, but—

Mr. Pitman: We raise them so that you can deal with them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is fine. But I have great confidence in the university community to adjust to whatever changes take place in the secondary school system. And why should they not? Surely they have great expertise and competence? Surely they can adjust to these situations?

Mr. Pitman: Could I ask a further question in relation to this particular estimate?

It seems to me that in this estimate we would expect to see an estimate of a committee of a post-secondary, which was announced last year.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It comes under The Department of University Affairs.

Mr. Pitman: It will be under that department?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to vote 9 scholarships to residents of Ontario, for study outside of Ontario. The vote here is only for a total of $10,000. Are there provisions for scholarships to students for study beyond our bounds in some other vote?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is the regular scholarship programme. I believe that there are some four awarded every year for study outside the province, and these are to teachers. These other student awards are under University Affairs.

Mr. B. Newman: Are there no specific scholarships to students studying outside of Ontario, other than here? The others are simply awards?

Hon. Mr. Davis: As far as this department is concerned.

Mr. B. Newman: Then may I suggest to the Minister that he seriously consider making scholarships available to Ontario students for study in other jurisdictions?

It is much cheaper for us to provide the student with a scholarship, than to provide space in a university in the province of Ontario. He can attend any one of the universities in the state of Michigan, or New York, or many of the universities in the United States, at less cost to the taxpayer than studying in a Canadian university.

Living, as I do, in a border town, we find that thousands of our students attend universities just across the river. In fact, Wayne state university has over 400 Windsorites attending. Were the province to attempt to provide facilities for those residents of Windsor attending schools in Detroit and environs, you would need another university roughly the size of the University of Windsor.

Mr. Chairman, why not provide some type of scholarships to outstanding students who cannot get the course that they want in an Ontario university, but can in a university outside our jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to become rigid at all, with respect to the items that we discuss, but I think that discussions of this kind should really come under The Department of University Affairs. I only point out that this—I am not saying that it is not a problem, but one must recognize that probably—certainly from an academic level of grade 13—we have close to the same number of students from outside Ontario moving into Ontario universities as those who are seeking education outside our own province. I mean there is a levelling factor.

I emphasize that this would be from an academic level of grade 13; it may not apply down to the grade 12 level, where we have a number of Ontario students as you say, going to Wayne, Detroit, and some down into the Maritimes. This is where comparison becomes difficult, but I think that this would be more appropriate under University Affairs.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the reason why I asked it now is I asked where I could find it elsewhere. This is the only vote under which I could find it, so I asked it here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is student awards vote, which we can discuss—

Mr. B. Newman: This is a different thing, between student awards and scholarships now.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, pursuing the matter brought up by the member for Peterborough a little further, regarding the decentralization of curriculum to the county level, and the decrease in departmental supervision.

Would the Minister then visualize after, say, four or five years, an accrediting of our educational system on a county basis and, if this should develop, would he feel that this is an objectionable situation? What are his feelings on this?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just expressed a personal point of view here, Mr. Chairman. I would like to stay away from a system of accreditation if at all possible, and I think that we can. I think that the accreditation, as it exists in some jurisdictions, is really not truly representative of the situation as it exists in those jurisdictions. Personally, I am not enthusiastic about accreditation of individual schools or county systems if we can avoid them, and I think that we can.

Mr. Good: You do not feel that this will be a natural development of the county divisional boards?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, not at all.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: The curriculum division only extends to the end of the secondary school, at the present time. Perhaps I might bring to the Minister's attention a problem which already exists, in view of his comments that I am always dealing with problems which do not exist as yet. This will be a change.

One of the problems that seems to be is that of integrating the curriculum of the secondary school with that of the colleges of applied art and technology. I think that this is particularly true in the areas such as computer science. Now, I am wondering just what degree of integration there is in the curriculum branch of The Department of Education dealing with secondary schools and the various colleges of applied arts and technology. This problem seems to exist already.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has selected a special area where the complexity of the problem is more obvious than I think it would be in most other subject areas. I would suggest—

Mr. Pitman: I cannot win!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —I would suggest, too, that the same problem relates to the relationship between secondary and university. Surely you are not suggesting an integration of curriculum between those areas of education?

I think there has to be a knowledge, obviously, within the community college system of what is being taught in the secondary schools and vice versa. I am not sure that we should be looking forward to a complete integration of curriculum necessarily. Because, once again, you are going to be dealing with the needs of students who will not necessarily attend either a community college or a university. We have a basic responsibility to these people.

Obviously, in the field of computer science, the hon. member is not going to get me involved in just what the position is today of the secondary schools and the community

colleges and what it would be with respect to courses even two years from now. It is one of the very difficult areas and he well knows it.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, may I just ask one more question on this vote? I notice that the registrar is involved in this particular vote. It would seem to me that, with the grade 13 disappearing, now the role of the registrar will be somewhat less—will be limited, to some extent.

I am wondering in what particular area—I notice it is the registrar who issues the letters of standing and letters of permission. We have, of course, from the report from last year, the number of letters of standing, which I think were 1,074—sorry, 1965-1966—were 1,074 elementary schools, an increase of 176 over the previous year, and also the letters of standing secondary schools; 265 were instituted and 146 were granted.

Could the Minister give me the numbers that now exist for the previous year? Letters of permission issued to uncertified persons in 1965-1966 totalled 3,312, and I wondering whether this has increased. I think that this at least is one measure by which we can gauge the effectiveness of The Department of Education in securing qualified teachers for the classrooms in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Would this not be vote 509?

Mr. Pitman: It is under the registrar; the registrar issues these certificates.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the secondary school letters of permission, the total is 2,332. This is for the school year 1967-1968. Of this, 280 of the above 2,332 attended Ontario secondary school teacher training courses but they failed to qualify for certificates. The total does not include 326—282 of these are teaching in academic schools, 44 in vocational schools, who are fully qualified to teach general academic subjects but for whom special subject approvals were issued to permit them to act as vice-principals and principals and teachers of special subjects.

With respect to the elementary area: Using just totals again, in the English public schools—1,078, in the English Roman Catholic separate schools—1,083, and the bilingual schools—295, for a total of 2456.

Mr. Pitman: That is almost double what they were.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, because we are not using quite the same figures. These sub-totals include people with some professional training and these are the holders of expired Ontario third class certificates. I have not got the breakdown exactly in the same way as the hon. member has asked the question. I will get for him the figures as he has asked the question. My breakdown is somewhat different. I think he will find that the figures are not substantially different from last year.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps before we proceed, the Chairman could just take a moment to extend a welcome to the students in the east gallery. These students with us today are pupils of the Linwood public school of Linwood, Ontario, and we welcome them to the galleries today.

Vote 507. The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he could clarify briefly item number 14 in vote 507—educational services for the handicapped, for whom no other provision can be made.

Secondly, I would like to ask him how he finds out who these handicapped people are and what type of evaluation he does to determine their handicap.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the evaluation is made through the special education branch and on some occasions, of course, they bring in medical personnel to assist in the evaluation. This sum is set aside for a limited number of children who go right outside the province of Ontario for special educational service and we pay the fees. They are, of course, young people for whom there is just no comparable course available in this province, and the number varies from year to year.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to follow this up, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister tell us what types of handicaps these are and why there is no adequate provision in the Ontario education system for these children with these special types of handicaps?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am just going to pick two or three. There are young children, for instance, who are blind and speak French and we have two or three attending the facility in Montreal. We have one or two children at the Perkins school for the blind in Watertown, Massachusetts, and the Davidson school in Atlanta, Georgia. These are very specialized institutions and we

just do not have comparable programmes here in the province.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, would I be correct in saying that if anyone writes me a letter saying that they cannot find an institution in this province for the types of education they think their children might need, I should write directly to the Minister and inform him?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, if you would. I just want to make it clear that this does not say that there are institutions elsewhere that would be suitable. There are perhaps certain situations for which there is not a physical facility available even in the United States. But if the hon. member has a particular problem and he wishes us to take a look at it, we can, and will.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in listening to the Minister when he mentioned the fact that objectives in the curriculum are clearly defined. After seven or eight years of trying to find out what was required, for example, in the English literature outlines, I still have not come up with anything that is very tangible.

When I got new teachers in, I always made a point of finding out if they knew what the aims in English literature were; whether it was simply for appreciation or what not, particularly with the grades from 4 to 8. It is spelled out a little more clearly from kindergarten to grade 3. However, I still have not found anything really concrete for the teachers in this particular field.

I could also go on to the subject of composition and again there is a great deal there, but it says very little. As I have said earlier, in questioning new teachers I found they are very hazy on what they should actually be attempting to achieve, particularly in these two fields. Mathematics and so on are somewhat better.

Another point I would like to make concerns the great mass of new P1J1's that have come in the last year and a half to two years. In working with the teachers on the new approach mathematics I found it rather strange that even the inspectors were not aware that P1J1 was an addition to the little grade course of study. They thought it was something by itself at first. It was a whole new curriculum. I think that the instructions that are coming should be spelled out much more clearly, because this is definitely what happened in new-approach mathematics. They at first thought it was a whole new course of study for mathematics.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring up the problem of the private business schools or business colleges, as they are referred to. I originally asked the Minister whether we could discuss it under the main office vote and he suggested this vote.

The business colleges or business schools are running into a real difficulty today as a result of the growing emphasis on business and commerce in secondary schools. They find the community colleges running in competition with their one, two and three year courses in commercial education. Likewise, they find competition from the vocational training programme, that is programme 5.

They readily understand that all these programmes, the three I have mentioned, are necessary and are forward steps in the development of education in the province. However, in spite of all that, Mr. Chairman, the business colleges do perform a public service and do fill a gap that is missing in our educational system. They are able to attract students—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would not want to interrupt this: I know the hon. member is anxious to give us his views on private schools. I am just not sure how this is related to the function of the department because we are not taking any position contrary to them. Is it in the form of a question or is the hon. member wanting to make a speech in support of the private commercial schools?

Mr. B. Newman: If the Minister will just listen, he will find out what I am trying to get at. It is not lengthy, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know, I am not saying it is, I am just wondering how relevant it is to the estimates.

Mr. B. Newman: It has to do with the department. If I complete my remarks the Minister will find where his department is the drawback as far as the private business school is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are not the drawback.

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, you hinder their progress—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, we do not.

Mr. B. Newman: —through the development or even—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say to the hon. member we do not.

Mr. B. Newman: May I point out to the Minister where he is. The private business colleges can come along and attract students and they can have them for either long periods of time or short periods. They can provide refresher courses which are not available in our present school system; they can provide them at any time. They are able to provide short courses in typing only—just the one subject—in bookkeeping, in shorthand, and you cannot get any of these in our present educational system.

However, when it comes to them attempting to sell their commodity, their product, their type of course, they run into problems with The Department of Education. They are prohibited from competing with your present educational system in their advertising. They wish to come along and state publicly that they have courses in which they can teach all of these skills, like shorthand, typing, bookkeeping, and that not only can a degree of proficiency be achieved by attending these business colleges, but the length of time in which they can achieve this. Your department forbids the private business college from explaining this in their advertising. The private business college is not allowed to come along and state that the course can be completed in three months or six months, because that competes against your other educational system.

I have a communication from the department on that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What does the member mean by a prohibition of advertising?

Mr. B. Newman: You just do not allow them to come along and state in their advertising that they can compete successfully against your other types of education—against your junior colleges and against your high school commercial courses.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Show me the correspondence and then we can understand it.

Mr. B. Newman: The business college is a legitimate operation and should be allowed to advertise its wares, just as any other business, even as the community college does—and the community colleges are advertising all the time.

Why are there restrictions on advertising when it comes to a business college? Why can they not advertise and sell their wares on a commercial basis? And why can they not come along and try to entice the individual to take the course in their institution, rather than having to go into a community college, if he so wishes?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give me the correspondence—I think the policy is that a private business school, or a private school that is, in fact, not inspected by the department in an academic way, cannot advertise that they can grant a secondary school graduation diploma. I think this is understandable, but I still do not quite understand the point being made by the hon. member.

We have had many delegations from the private business schools. There is no question about it, they have difficulties as the programme in the high schools is expanding, as the programmes in the colleges of applied arts and technology—these programmes are expanding, and are encroaching on what has been the traditional area of involvement of the private business school. There is no question about this.

Is the hon. member suggesting that the high schools and the community colleges should not be doing this?

Mr. B. Newman: Not in the least.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the member would send me the correspondence which indicates that they are being restricted from outlining just what courses they have available, then I shall be quite prepared to pursue it from there.

Mr. B. Newman: I will just read the one paragraph from the letter from the department and that is:

> Your suggested mode of advertising could not be considered by this office—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, but what is the suggested mode?

Mr. B. Newman: I will continue:

> To begin with, it is speculative and open to argument. There is also reasonable doubt that you could compete on an even footing with the college of applied arts and technology.

They are not attempting to compete. They are simply trying to come along and sell one subject, two subjects, or three subjects on a short-term basis or a long-term basis, but the department forbids them to advertise this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What is the ad they wanted to put in?

Mr. B. Newman: They have submitted the ad to the department and it was turned down. I do not happen to have the ad here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I think it is really very relevant to the correspondence. If the ad says, "we will offer a course comparable to the course at the St. Clair college of applied arts and technology," and if in fact it is not comparable, then is this a proper form of advertising for people who might be interested?

Mr. B. Newman: I would agree with the Minister completely, if that were the case. But, where they come along and say that "we can complete a course within a six-week period of time, or a 12-week period, whereas for this amount of dollars, were you to take that course at, say, St. Clair college, it may take you one, two, or three years." Why should they not be allowed to advertise this?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not saying they should not be, I think it depends on the kind of ad they put in. Give me the ad and I will have a look at it.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to follow through on what the hon. member had to say on the question of private schools. He did say that they hinder development and are being hindered by the government.

I think what needs to be done in the province of Ontario in relationship, particularly, to some of these correspondence courses and these private schools, is that we need some kind of a consumer protection bureau for those people. Maybe I should use a better term. But some of these private schools get their hooks into people and there is no way they can get off the hook and they have to continue paying.

I want to make this point—that there are some people who attempt to upgrade their education and they submit to a contract, I recognize that. Then they find that they are not on a sound financial basis or are not able to complete the course. When they try to get out of the course, even with due notice, they are not allowed to. In other words, they have to pay, even though they do not get the product.

It would appear to me, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, that the government should set something up to give these people some protection, as they do to someone who signs a contract and has a couple of days to opt out of that contract. I think, in this regard, if there is something that the private schools or these correspondence schools do not agree with, I think they bring a lot of it upon themselves, in not letting people opt out of these contracts.

As long as the schools are going to continue to insist that people continue with their courses, then I think that the public pressure is going to continue to the point that you are going to have to take some action to give these people the protection they need, so that they can opt out of these private courses.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I am very much aware of the Minister's interest in history and I thought I might raise at this time the subject of the sesquicentennial of George Brown, the 150th anniversary of his birth in 1968. The Minister has previously announced that he will follow through with his programme that started before Centennial year in making appropriate books relating to this man available to top students—and, I would presume, school libraries—as he did for John A. Macdonald.

I do not want to enter into any controversy about this, but I can say—and I think the Minister will agree with me on this—that George Brown was one of the greatest politicians that Ontario has ever produced and that, as a Father of Confederation, he had a part to play that in many ways was unequalled. He also had a strength of personality that is an interesting sidelight to the details of history that surround him.

I wonder if the Minister can tell us if the government—and surely the administration would be apprised by the Minister of Education in this—if the government has any plan to mark this event during the year. If there is going to be any particular programme or emphasis available through the school system. And, in general, what way we are going to use the event as a method of developing more of the interest in history that both the Minister and the other members of the House wish for our young people.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I believe —the Minister is not here—the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) might have at this point, although I do not think any details are finalized, an indication of the government's plans with respect to an appropriate observance of George Brown's contribution to this province and to the country.

As far as this department is concerned, we will be doing as we did for Sir John A. We will be distributing to the schools system a

set—I guess there are two volumes—to be presented—they will probabily go out in July or August to be presented to students elected by the principal or the senior staff members in the secondary schools in a manner comparable to that which we did with Sir John A. Macdonald.

Vote 507 agreed to.

On vote 508:

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I have read with interest the many statements of the Minister concerning the implication of educational television, particularly in *Hansard* over the past three years, and also his statement, of course, in the Legislature this year. Another interesting statement was to the broadcasting executives society on March 7, 1968, and more particularly, another source of information on the Minister's views are found in the brief he submitted to the standing committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts of the House of Commons of the federal government.

In addition, there is information in the minutes of that committee's meeting for Tuesday, February 27, 1968, during which the Minister was extensively questioned and where he made some fairly extensive answers. So I would like to say that I have followed this matter quite carefully. I have discussed it also with my leader, and I would like to discuss a few points relating to the subject.

I would first of all like to say that I share the Minister's concern that ETV takes its proper and necessary place in the education of Ontario students in Ontario. My remarks refer particularly to in-school educational television. I accept—and I have down here, admired, but I struck it out and put in "accept"—I do accept the way in which the Minister has been pushing for this in order to get this very necessary tool of education properly functioning in the province.

So my remarks are not negative, they are positive, but I have my doubts about certain aspects of the Minister's policies in this area. I particularly have a very deep concern about the question of who ought to control the production of ETV programmes; who ought to control the actual content, both of the series of educational television taped, or video taped if you like, as well as the content of particular tapes.

Now I have stated my view on this particular aspect of educational television in this province at quite some length in my maiden speech in this Legislature on February 29, 1968, pages 335-340. It was my sole concern in those remarks. Unfortunately, I do not believe the Minister was here at that time —unfortunate because I will have to refresh his memory to some extent although much more briefly than I did on that occasion.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can assure the hon. member I am reasonably familiar with what was said on that occasion but if you would like to refresh my memory, do so.

Mr. T. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will certainly make it much briefer than that 40-minute speech. I think these remarks, which are partly from my remarks in the Legislature, plus certain additions, might preface the concern I have in this matter, Mr. Chairman.

There is not a home in this province where television has not done its share of shaping all of us by its power alone, without the authority of education behind it. Television has the power to present to you an image that has every appearance of truth, but the authority of education can insist that it is true.

The two questions then become: Who assumes this power? Who commands this authority? We must remember that the most compelling authority young children can give to a statement of opinion for belief is simply to be able to say, "I was there." Television can take them there. And the central question which I raise in this House once again, Mr. Chairman, is this.

Will the Minister of Education of this province be allowed to persist in government control of an instrument that combines the power of television and the authority of education? Textbooks can be taken home; they can be read by parents; they can be examined by school boards, and rejected if they are found to be propagandistic, or otherwise objectionable.

But educational television programmes now in use in this province are not subject to this kind of public and open scrutiny. Their images flash on the screen and they are gone, leaving their impact where it cannot be examined or repudiated.

Everybody agreed many years ago that the state, the government, ought not to be writing textbooks. Yet the present government is writing and producing school television programmes and getting away with it. In the next five years, this massive medium of educational television will grow—and I

must underline—must grow, into an agency that will shape the ability, dedication and integrity of millions of maturing citizens of this province.

Whichever political party forms the government of this province in the years ahead, they must remove the control of educational television from the Minister of Education. Some sort of independent commission, or as the Minister says, authority, must interpose a barrier between his views, the views of a politician, and what actually is carried on television to assist in education in this province. In most countries on the European continent, "the broadcasting organization rather than the state education authorities is ultimately responsible for producing in-school services".

The broadcasting organizations in democratic countries such as France, West Germany, and Belgium, "normally are not subject to direct government supervision; that is, once the government has laid down basic policies it usually allows the broadcasting organization much initiative and freedom". Those references are directly to educational in-school television. The quotations are from a book entitled "Radio and Television Broadcasting on the European Continent," by Burton Paulu, 1967—pages 58 and 165.

This means that in these democratic countries, in-school educational television programmes are not directly produced, not controlled, by a department of government. This is in sharp contrast with what is today taking place in Ontario. The existence of this potential abuse of fundamental principle of a free society has had, and is having, I believe, an unfortunate effect on the development of educational television in Ontario.

The Department of Education is aware of the danger to which it is exposed, its creativity and initiative in ETV is stifled. It would take only one clear-cut abuse to blow up in public, to set educational television in this province back yet another decade.

The inherent conflict of interest must be removed by the imposition of an effective, independent barrier in which the people of Ontario have sufficient trust.

With those opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, which were written by myself I would like now to try to support the point of view I am taking by referring the Minister to other sources which make this same point; in other words to back up my point of view with the point of view of people in this province and in Canada.

I have first of all a submission by the Canadian teachers' federation to the standing committee on broadcasting films and assistance to the arts, dated February 27, 1968, and I shall refer briefly to direct quotations on several of the pages.

And on page 1, quote:

> We wish to make it very clear at the outset on what basis we approach the committee. Our claim to expertise is not in the area of broadcasting technology, but in the teaching and learning activities of the classroom.
>
> Because we are teachers, our primary concern is with those broadcasts, especially television broadcasts, which are intended for students in elementary and secondary schools and their teachers.

Then the Canadian teachers' federation goes on a bit further and says that one of the major aspects of their concern is the following, in their brief it is listed as subsection (a):

> The effectiveness of the arrangements for production, distribution and control of educational broadcasts.

And that is their centre of concern.

Another labelled subsection (c) states this:

> Policy decisions affecting the educational usefulness of broadcasting should not be taken at any level without the involvement of the teaching profession.

That is another point they make. Then, Mr. Chairman, on page 4, the Canadian teachers' federation states this:

> Great importance attaches to the co-ordinating and licensing agency. We consider it highly desirable that powers of regulation and control in this field be wielded by a body created specifically for the purpose of regulating broadcasting—

And this is what I wish to emphasize, Mr. Chairman.

> —and not granted to bodies which are subject to political direction in their day to day activities.
>
> Control of broadcasting, in other words, is not a proper function of government at any level. It should be the function of a public body specifically constituted for this purpose on the authority of the Parliament of Canada.

The point I wish to draw out of that quotation is with respect to the question of government control of programming, in particular whether it is the federal government or whether it is the provincial government.

On page 9 of the same brief, Mr. Chairman, the Canadian teachers' federation states this:

> Broadcast facilities capable of providing maximum coverage, developed and maintained with due consideration to the relative merits of the various methods of distribution now available or under development—

And I underline this.

> —and controlled by an agency which is neither dependent on commercial support nor subject to direct political control.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, on page 10 the Canadian teachers' federation says this:

> We are not particularly concerned whether the agency controlling broadcast facilities for ETV is a division of the CBC or an independent authority, It must have sound financial support, with no commercial overtones; and it must be free, within the broad limits of the public interest as determined by Parliament, from political control or interference.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I take great pains to make those direct quotations is to show that I am concerned with an issue. It is not simply, you might say, an image. It is a fundamental issue, which we must consider in this Legislature.

Another much shorter quotation to support my point of view is from Lawrence H. Rogers II, who is the president of the Taft Broadcasting Company in the United States. It is an address entitled "The Fifth Freedom," and he made this short remark before the Canadian club, and the Canadian broadcast executive society on November 6, 1967.

I would like to state there is much I find objectionable in this particular address, but I think the following quotation underlines the point.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am glad you did not ask me what I thought!

Mr. T. Reid: Well, the quotation near the end suits my purposes, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do not quote some of the rest of it.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Rogers is referring to the experience in the United States and relating this to educational television in Canada, and here is what he says:

> We are both at the same stage of development. First steps have been taken to provide a national ETV service.

Here I skip a few lines, then he says:

> Both these noble instruments will become tools of government propaganda, and a decade ahead of 1984, unless the vigilance of the people prevents it. The vigilance of the people, expressed through the votes of their MP's can keep this awesome weapon out of the hands of a power-hungry government.

He refers to central government. I continue quoting:

> But only if the people are continually alerted to the dangers by the media themselves. Nonsense, you might say, our tradition of the free press will guarantee us against this. Or the first amendment in the bill of rights will prevent any such subversion of democracy in the United States.

But, he adds, pointing to his Canadian audience, "don't take this for granted." And he meant, do not take it for granted in Canada. I must admit that is not as good a piece of evidence as the first quotation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I agree to that!

Mr. T. Reid: Finally, I would like to try to put a hammerlock on the Minister by referring to an article published by Arthur Knowles, who is presently the director, instructional aid resources, at York University. He was, I believe, closely associated with META and perhaps with the establishment of educational television in this province.

I believe this is an article that appeared in *Continuous Learning*, published by the adult education association: the Minister is undoubtedly aware of it. Here is what Arthur Knowles has to say, Mr. Chairman, and he is a person who is very knowledgable in this area.

He starts off by saying we must be very careful about the relationship of government power and programming of education on television. And then, and I quote:

> Because of the implications for increased power and authority on the part of The Ontario Department of Education, any proposal related to the growth of a communications system, whether operated by government or business, which involves the possibility that by 1974, 33 education television stations would be operating in this province, should be scrutinized with great care.

This is what I am attempting to do at this time, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Knowles continues as follows:

> Educational television consists of more than school broadcasts. The Ontario Department of Education plans to offer both day time school broadcasts and night time TV aimed at viewers, broadly defined as adult education. And if the role of the department in relation to classroom TV for elementary and secondary schools is open to question, it is even more questionable in regard to adult education.

I do not wish to get into adult education at all at this time. I want to remain on the estimate. Mr. Knowles continues:

> The proposal to establish 33 educational television stations in Ontario to be operated by The Department of Education raises a crucial issue about the real functions and authority of local boards of education, and universities, community colleges and other educational interests operating throughout the province in the local communities. Will local boards of education be required to telecast classroom programmes in their schools? What local option will be permitted?
>
> Will the local boards of education, for example, be assisted to produce and broadcast programmes that have significance for their community but that do not have value elsewhere? What body will, in fact, establish the programming policy of each of the 33 stations? Will it be representative in each community of the various educational institutions?
>
> What effect will the operation of an ETV system whose programmes are centrally decided and controlled have on the average classroom teacher? Will teachers, and principals be permitted an effective voice in deciding how TV will be employed in their classrooms?
>
> These questions should be of overriding concern to the citizens of Ontario. The airwaves should be available in Ontario communities to any and all legitimate educational interests, without—

And I underline this.

> —without the possibility of a veto being imposed now or at some future date by an official of The Department of Education.
>
> In addition to the potential conflict with the long standing roles and functions of local boards of education, it is even more important that universities and other institutions of learning should have available opportunities to express their educational needs and interest through television without being restricted in content or ideas by government regulations.

And skipping a large chunk, Mr. Knowles says this in concluding:

> It will be too late to develop a programme policy after the transmitters have been erected and stations are operating and staffed by Ontario government civil servants.
>
> The proposed ETV system in Ontario should permit and stimulate community and citizen participation in programme decisions affecting their community. There is little hope for change in this state of affairs if the assumption continues to be that good ETV can only come from being despots—Ministers of Education—dispensing programmes to a populace too undiscriminating to recognize opportunities for choice, or too lazy to choose if it does recognize them. There is an opportunity, as ETV develops, to create a system which can help to remove the heavy hand of the educational civil servant from the controls, to be transformed into a system designed for the maximum development of individual interests and needs.
>
> There is a real danger—continues Mr. Knowles—in an educational TV empire whose productions and programmes emanate from a "flagship" station in Toronto. On the other hand, if the total resources of experienced ETV bodies such as META, the universities, the teachers, other institutions and individuals were to be employed now, a genuine revolution in communication could take place:

Finally, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Knowles concludes:

> Of course, this raises another question—what is the definition of education held by the Ontario government? Is education designed to maintain and establish on a firmer foundation the existing system, giving support to the existing values that operate in the society? Or is the educational system designed to create the potential and the capacity for change, not only in the individual but in the society? If it is indeed the latter, The Ontario Department of Education would be wise to consider enlisting all of the citizens of Ontario in its approach to the development of ETV, a medium which can be perhaps the most

significant and revolutionary agency affecting our society.

Mr. Chairman, I stated my views briefly on this. I have tried to back up my views with a few expert opinions in this area. Now I would like to turn directly to what the Minister has said. I know the Minister is concerned with this problem and I think we must know his answers to some very specific questions.

The Minister stated in this House, on February 16, 1968, the following comments concerning the establishment of an authority of ETV in Ontario. I would like to quote directly so the members of this House have the exact context of his words, before I put the questions to him.

The Minister said this:

> As a result of our experience we will establish an authority for educational broadcasting in Ontario. This authority would be a board responsible to the Minister and through him, to the Legislature, for the direction and administration of educational broadcasting in Ontario. The board's membership will include representation appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in council from groups such as school board trustees, universities, teachers, adult education association linking schools to parents and homes.

I was very pleased when the Minister made that statement because it makes it possible to move into what I consider to be a proper independent educational television authority.

The questions I have for the Minister and comments are these. I think these questions are most important because they are the key to an examination of this general statement of policy by the government of this province. This is where we get into, if you like, the guts of decision making. The key questions are the following:

First—what is the authority of this authority? What is it to control?

Now as the Minister of Education stated, in his Ottawa submission on page 7: "The extent and nature of that control should be clearly defined." The Minister has made that statement.

Mr. Chairman, I agree completely that we must clarify exactly what we mean by this authority in its terms of reference, and so forth.

The forthcoming legislation—and I would assume it would be legislation—establishing this authority must have some very specific references in it. It must be most explicit concerning the authority and control of this board, particularly with respect to its relation to the educational television branch of The Department of Education.

Now the Minister of Education's statement to this Legislature on February 26, included this statement: "The board's membership will include representation appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council."

I am very pleased that the Minister has left the door open, at least, for some members of the board to get on that board without being appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council. The question of how people get on that educational television authority or board is critical to a clear understanding of the degree of autonomy and responsibility of the ETV authority in this province.

Another type of question which we must have answers to, I think, Mr. Chairman, before we approve the $6 million worth of estimates is this—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I want to interrupt here because we are really talking about two separate situations, I suggest, with respect. I did not interrupt earlier because I guess these observations will be made, whether they are made now or on introduction of the bill. But I think the hon. member is getting into a discussion of a proposed bill.

We are voting estimates here for the ETV branch, which is an established branch within the department, which will carry on with or without the bill, certainly for the balance of this fiscal year. I am just wondering whether we want to get into a debate on what may or may not be in the bill prior to its introduction here in the Legislature.

I wonder whether you want to relate the debate on this particular vote to the ETV authority, because I am not in a position to tell the House the details of that legislation until it is introduced. That is the only point I would like to make. I do not mind listening to or discussing it twice, but I just do not think there is any point in doing it.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister has raised an important point. I am not arguing for consistency here and I am not saying that now is the time to discuss it. But I am saying, as in other aspects of education, we have really discussed in detail the whole question of policy. We have been hanging policy discussions on the estimates.

I realize that this is at the wish of the chair and I am really not too sure whether I should stop here, having recorded my concern on this and wait for the new bill to come in. If the questions I am asking the Minister cannot be answered at this time—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is the point. I am quite prepared to get into, shall we say, a discussion of ETV but I really think we are going to repeat it when we get into a debate on the actual bill itself. I think that we might confine our discussions—and perhaps they could be relatively brief—to the aspects of the existing operation.

As I said in my statement and as I have said for the past year or so, we are at a beginning stage. We are just not at a point to make certain final decisions or at least, we have not been. We are much closer now, because we just did not know what position we had with respect to your federal friends as far as transmissions are concerned.

I think this is really highly relevant; we believe we have accepted basically the position of the white paper presented to the federal Parliament with respect to the division of responsibility. That is, the federal jurisdiction responsible for transmission and the provincial jurisdiction, whether it be the authority —whatever agency is basically responsible for production in the educational content. I just think it is quite relevant that we keep this in mind.

I do not mind debating it twice, but I just do not see any purpose in doing it twice, that is all.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just comment on this because we are—

Mr. Chairman: If the member would just state his questions briefly and simply and allow the Minister an opportunity to answer them accordingly, if they are relevant to the vote.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, yes, Mr. Chairman. I will certainly do this on your ruling.

I would just like to make one point very clear, because the Minister and I are engaged in a slight debate on some fundamental points.

It is this. The Minister stated that one reason he might not be able to be as clear on the nature of this authority now as he will be later on, when the arrangements between the federal and provincial governments come—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I said I cannot be, now, today. As I said, I could not have been a year ago. We are much closer now to our determination with the federal authorities. I am in a position when the bill is introduced to be specific with respect to the proposed authority for this province.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, this is a small point. I am simply talking about the provincial issue of who controls the programming of ETV, and I see now a discussion of something different from what I am essentially worried about, but we might leave that. Can I just say to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that the question and recommendations that I have made concerning the educational authority posed by the Minister are contained in *Hansard* of February 29, 1968, particularly on pages 339, and 340. I would like to refer the Minister to those questions and ideas which I expressed there, and hope that some of them would be incorporated into the legislation when it comes through.

Mr. Chairman, the specific question that I would like to ask the Minister is: When is that statute establishing this authority going to come before this House? Or do I simply have to go out and make my speeches to chambers of commerce and other people?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would not like to tax the hon. member, particularly between now and the 25th with having to make speeches outside of this Legislature. I am sure that he wants to confine all his time here. I would hope that it would be here very shortly. In that the Ottawa member did refer to certain other authorities with respect to his own submissions, I would just like to read a letter, and I will not read the whole letter, because the second paragraph really does not relate to this afternoon's discussion and it might be misinterpreted:

> I want to express my personal and warm congratulations on the nature of your proposals on ETV to the provincial House and to the parliamentary committee on broadcasting as quoted in the press. And I believe that your announced approach is an excellent one, assuring as it will the support and participation of many educational levels and institutions and agencies in Ontario.
>
> While there may be some disagreement on details, I believe that you have embodied in your proposals some important principles with which we agree.

And the author of the very kind letter is the author of the same article that the hon. member referred to, and who is now a colleague of his at the university of York. I am just a little curious as to whether Arthur wrote that article prior to the statement in the House, because we are really only talking about five regional centres, not 33, and there have been quite a few changes since

that article was written. I am just wondering if Mr. Knowles was still associated with META at that particular moment.

I should also point out that while the hon. member can read into his own position some supporting material, there is a fair amount of support for the position, and perhaps we are not that far apart in principle with respect to the position taken by the department before the committee in Ottawa, and in the presentation that I made here to the Legislature. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we may not completely agree on all details of the legislation when it was introduced, but I think that there will be some broad areas of agreement at least.

Mr. T. Reid: I think that this is very helpful in clarifying what the Minister intends to do and in having a record of it in *Hansard*. I understand that the legislation pertaining to this authority will not come to this House before September.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I did not mention September at all. I said very shortly. I said that I did not want the hon. member wasting his energies between now and the 25th, speaking to chambers of commerce and what have you. I thought that you might have some other creative activities that you would like to spend time on.

Mr. T. Reid: I would just like to know when that legislation is coming in?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I said very shortly, and it is on the order paper.

Mr. T. Reid: Will that be referred to the education committee?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would think without any question.

Mr. T. Reid: Wonderful!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Your leader wants a lot of work for the education committee, and I will try to do my best.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering when the education committee might have a non-civil servant as a secretary. Why could we not have a clerk of the House as a secretary?

Hon. Mr. Davis: My only observation is that he is a very fine secretary. I have great confidence in the secretary of the committee. I do not know how relevant it is but—

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn then to specific questions relating to the estimates. What has been, and what is the relationship in the television branch between the money spent on programme planning in the last two years, in programme broadcast, and lastly, programme evaluation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I will endeavour to get this for the hon. member. It will mean a breakdown and it will mean perhaps three or four days to get the exact figures relating to production, planning, and evaluation of programmes.

Mr. T. Reid: The three areas, Mr. Chairman, were programme planning, production broadcast, and programme evaluation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I think that we can reach some common definition so that we will understand one another, but it will take some digging to do this.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, the second question is, what are the results of the evaluation programme of the department in (a) teacher acceptance of programmes, (b) pupil acceptance of programmes, (c) production improvement?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think that it is really a shade early to get any reaction other than that we have received from the profession, from the students, which at this point has been really very encouraging. I cannot give it to the hon. member on a straight statistical basis, and I do not think that we can until we really get into a comprehensive approach to transmission here in this province. As I say, I am somewhat prejudiced, but the response that we have received or that the branch has received from the profession and the schools has been quite enthusiastic, to the extent really that we have had a very excellent response from outside the province.

As I indicated to the leader of the Opposition last year in discussing this, and we were really pioneering at that point, we have had response from some schools in the state of New York, and we have had a great deal of interest very recently in many of the programmes that we have produced here, to make them available for distribution in jurisdictions outside the province of Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: You were pioneering as far as Ontario goes. You are far behind many jurisdictions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is right. Oh, no, I recall, Mr. Chairman—I do not want to get into this. I am on second reading of the bill.

The position taken by the leader of the Opposition four years ago was that he wanted the Minister of Education—not an independent authority, not the CBC—but the Minister of Education to establish a provincial network of television for oral French. I think it was four years ago.

Mr. Nixon: You are still saying that you cannot teach oral French.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not say that. I said that we cannot have it on a compulsory basis, because we do not have sufficient teachers.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, do I understand from the Minister that he has evaluated his own programmes himself, and therefore is not supplying—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, no. I am not competent to evaluate my—

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister might give a very competent evaluation of his own remarks. He lets us know what they are all the time.

Do we have a system for evaluation of ETV programmes in this province by the department itself—of its own programmes? The results would be very questionable.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I agree. The Ontario institute is doing an evaluation for us as well. We do not rely on the Minister doing his own evaluation, I can assure you. I quite honestly have not seen all the programmes, I must be frank, I have not, but they are pretty good.

Mr. T. Reid: I think that is very helpful to know, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has OISE to do that evaluation. I hope that some of these evaluations would be made available to this House in time to discuss the legislation setting up the authority. I think that this would be very helpful.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think that you will find this quite positive.

Mr. T. Reid: Another question, Mr. Chairman. What provisions are being made to ensure teachers' rights in educational television in the same way that performers' rights are now protected in commercial television?

Hon. Mr. Davis: They have the same protection.

Mr. T. Reid: Next question, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to answer as many questions as I can. It is just regrettable in a way that if there were a series of questions relating to this topic, and most of them were relevantly non-controversial, I might have had some of the information right here for him today, because I get the impression that these have been prepared for a day or so.

Mr. T. Reid: Oh, no, I am just thinking on my feet!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, I know, I am sure you are.

Mr. Nixon: Are you suggesting he should send his questions to you before they are asked?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I just want to be helpful and get the answer as quickly—

Mr. Nixon: Oh, you are being very helpful.

Mr. T. Reid: I like prying them out.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. T. Reid: I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that in the light of what the Minister has said, that he might provide answers to the questions that I put to him on February 29, when he was not here. The next question is—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have them ready.

Mr. T. Reid: Why in the light of the Minister's statement of his intention to widen the involvement of ETV decision making, was the council on ETV virtually abandoned two and half years ago?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Because it did not fit into the long term plans of the development of ETV here in the province. The authority will fill in what perhaps the council was performing a year and a half ago.

Mr. T. Reid: What the Minister really means is that the council was causing him some trouble so he did away with it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No trouble whatsoever.

Mr. T. Reid: Why did you disband it? Outside advice, independent advice?

Hon. Mr Davis: This was not the effective way of bringing it about.

Mr. T. Reid: It did not agree with your ideas?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I did not present any ideas.

Mr. T. Reid: Oh, well, who did then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not present any.

Mr. T. Reid: The Minister has very subtle ways of presenting—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I have not.

Mr. T. Reid: We will get to that in University Affairs.

The next question, Mr. Chairman. There are two originating curriculum bodies now in The Department of Education, one the curriculum division and the other on educational television. Why has this been allowed to happen, since some two years ago the Minister announced that one of its principal strengths was that the content control of in-school programmes was the responsibility of the curriculum division, instead of people who know production?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, of course, structures change as we make progress. There is still a very close relationship between the curriculum division and the ETV branch, but from a structural and administrative point of view and an educational point of view, it was felt advisable to do the work within the ETV branch itself. There is a very close relationship between the two branches of the department.

Mr. T. Reid: Could I ask the Minister if the personnel policies in hiring were adhered to in the hiring of all the people now working in the ETV branch of his department?

Hon. Mr. Davis: What personnel policies?

Mr. T. Reid: Is there not—do you not have a civil service hiring policy? Are those positions advertised?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would think the majority of them were advertised.

Mr. T. Reid: The majority? How about them all?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, no, they do not advertise them all.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, there are certain levels, surely?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I believe the majority of them were and these would be at the level set by the civil service commission. But every government department also has the right to take people on as casual employees.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, how casual is a two-year employee?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Depending on your definition of "casual."

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, right, I suggest that a person who has been here for two years is not a casual employee; he is sneaking in the back door.

The next question, Mr. Chairman. How many of the programmes of the department, in the past two years, have been broadcast in response to, and especially for, a region or locality in the province? In other words, is the Minister responding to local demand, or is he still running things centrally from his big bureaucracy?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there are some 35 committees relating to the ETV branch developing programme ideas and these represent all areas or regions of the province. To determine just which one on that committee, or the 35 committees, and how you respond to a particular geographic region, I cannot say for the hon. member. But there is representation from all regions of the province on the 35 groups that are, shall we say, suggesting the programming. I surely would think this is a form of response to the regions.

But, Mr. Chairman, it should also be pointed out that we are not in a position yet —and I do not want to get into a somewhat partisan situation here this afternoon—but the reason we are not—

Mr. T. Reid: I am talking about programming!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, it does relate to programmes, because we are very limited in production and transmission. We cannot respond to the total needs of the regions, or the geographic areas of the province, because we are not in a position to transmit.

The reason we are not in a position to transmit is because we have had a very questionable response by the federal authorities, and this fact is well known by the member.

Mr. T. Reid: Could I ask the Minister how many programmes have been produced by the government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Some 415.

Mr. T. Reid: How many regions are there in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who knows? You define "region" for me.

Mr. T. Reid: Take the six regions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, we take ten.

Mr. T. Reid: Okay, what is the distribution of programmes based on recommendations from the regions? You take ten? Thank you. That is the answer I want. So you had 400 programmes, ten regions; did each region initiate ten programmes? Where was the local participation the Minister talks so much about?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the committees are made up of personnel who are representative of the various areas—

Mr. T. Reid: Are they elected?

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are not elected.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Perhaps the member would direct his questions to the Minister through the Chairman, in an orderly fashion.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are asked to serve in the same way as our curriculum committees.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, we will get into that in another area, Mr. Chairman.

My final question—well, two short questions. Why was the name of Ontario educational television changed from the Ontario television system to the Ontario Department of Education television system? Is there anything in this nomenclature at all?

It used to be called, I understand—and the Minister will correct me if I am wrong—it used to be called Ontario educational television system. It is now called the Ontario Department of Education television system. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would suggest to the person who is doing the research—who, perhaps, was at one time associated with the branch, I do not know. Perhaps he should dig into the names that were used more carefully. I do not recall the first name used, but I shall check it. I would have thought the hon. member himself would have found this out before he asked the question.

I will look into it, but I do not recall that first name. I do not think it is relevant.

Mr. T. Reid: It is relevant. You come to this House and say you are going to have an authority to have a buffer between the government and educational programming. Before that happens, he changes the name of Ontario ETV to The Department of Education television system. That to me reflects something.

My final question, Mr. Chairman, is this—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member has a suspicious mind.

Mr. T. Reid: With this government, one has to have a suspicious mind.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, not at all, not at all.

Mr. T. Reid: Which section of the TV branch, under this particular estimate, Mr. Chairman—how do they decide which programmes are to be selected or rejected for broadcast for each subject, organization, institution? What criteria do you have?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, a portion of it is done through consultation with the people in curriculum. This is how a good portion of the decision is made, through these committees; that is what the committees are for.

Mr. T. Reid: I understand, Mr. Chairman, the head man in the department's curriculum division has final editing power over the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, he does not.

Mr. T. Reid: Oh, I thought we were talking about education. Surely the top man in your curriculum division should have the final say over editing and not a production man?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, it is not a production man, but the personnel are in the ETV branch of the department. We have people qualified, in spite of what—well, I will not get into that aspect of it—on the source of some of your information—but this is the answer.

Interjections by hon. members:

Mr. T. Reid: The information I have is from no one who works for the government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am just looking at one or two of the questions that were on the order paper, and it gave me a little concern. All right, go ahead.

Mr. T. Reid: My source of information is a good source, but it is no one related to or employed by this government. Okay?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was thinking of someone that is part of your own organization.

Mr. T. Reid: He is not a government civil servant. Okay? And it is not that person.

Mr. Chairman, I am finished, thank you.

Mr. Martel: Just one point, to the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, on the people who are involved in the actual presentation of material for children.

As we are all well aware, children are used to watching TV that has very livewire personalities, and so on. This is no reflection on the teaching ability of the gentlemen who produced or taught the new approach mathematics lessons, but the very fact that they were not real livewires became a real drawback to the children. They are not eager to watch it, because they are used to the livewire personalities they see on television night after night.

I am just wondering if the department is giving any consideration to trying to find personnel who have this sort of ability, beyond just being a teacher; to make it real for the children in comparison to what they see regularly.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, here, once again, I have some of my problems, because members of your own profession very strongly represents to the branch and to me every time I discuss it with them, "You should really have a practising classroom teacher involved because they can do it best."

I think one could fairly state that we are trying to achieve a balance, and we do have professional people employed. We have not taken anybody from "Gunsmoke", or "Batman", or anybody at this level yet, but there are professionals employed in the productions of ETV branch, no question about that. As I say, there are still many in the teaching profession who say to me, "You know, these should be teachers." I think there is a place for the professional and the practising teacher, but obviously—

Mr. Nixon: You have lots of livewire teachers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Lots of livewire teachers. In spite of what the member for Sudbury East said, there are lots of livewire teachers, and some of them can do it very well.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I might be able to leave the area of the television authority due the fact it looks like this matter will be coming down in legislation?

I would like to comment on a statement which the Minister made just a few minutes ago under another item. I think it reveals something about the whole concept of educational television which worries me, in view of the fact that educational television is going to be one of the most important forms of transmitting experience to young people which perhaps we will have in this province.

There are two aspects to it. The first one is that I think we must not treat educational television as simply another form of textbook. I think that is the term the Minister used. He compared it to a textbook, another resource—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, yes, it is a resource, but I do not know that you can compare it to a textbook.

Mr. Pitman: I do not feel that this is really taking full comprehension of what educational television actually represents in terms of a medium. Now I am not going to start quoting Marshall McLuhan, but indeed the medium is the message in this situation.

Perhaps I might give you an indication of this by what I suspect, what I hope, is going on in every classroom in this province which has a television set. I would hope that the whole curriculum for today in the schools of Ontario is that of having a television set on and finding out something about human motivation; something about race relations; something about the federal system of government in the United States; something about elections; really something about the whole human predicament.

That is what I mean by television having an impact which makes it more than just a different "resource." It makes it a different kind of medium, and I think this is one of the reasons why the member for Scarborough is concerned about the authority.

In a sense television can, I think, have an impact upon individuals, certainly upon a young individual, which is far beyond anything which a book, or a film, or filmstrip can have. It is present knowledge; it is present experience; it is involvement. And I just cannot, as yet, have any assurance that The Department of Education has recognized the full impact of this, in its treatment of educational television as a resource for the curriculum.

I cannot see, for example, simply seeing a topic here and a topic there being thrown out or a particular aspect of the curriculum being used for educational television and then going back to books or some other media. I think there has to be a whole philosophic approach to this problem of educational television which I have not yet seen come out

of The Department of Education. I am concerned, if this much money is going to be spent, that there be some very in-depth thinking about how this is going to be done.

I am concerned as well—to come back again to the problem of decentralization—if these programmes are going to be produced at the centre, particularly if they are going to be sent out at particular hours of the day, and the whole timetable of the school is going to revolve around this, then really we are on a treadmill—well, the Minister is shaking his head. May I say then, that I hope the Minister has a full grant programme ready to provide the boards of education across this province with the hardware that they need so they can tape these programmes that are being transmitted by the Minister—excuse me, by the Minister's authority.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You will offend the hon. member for Scarborough East, now be careful.

Mr. Pitman: I hope that they will provide grants for the hardware to provide for the storage of these tapes—a central location of the board. Provide for the tables to send them out to the schools where the teachers need them, and a good deal of freedom in the use of these materials.

Up until now there are no grants for any of these things except TV sets, and I think I asked a question a few weeks ago and the Minister indicated that they were working on this.

I think that if the teachers and the school boards are going to be prepared for the use of this media, then as I say, I hope that there is a whole series of conferences and various ways of recognizing the in-depth philosophic aspect to this whole use of educational television. I repeat, this can be the most important development in terms of adult education, in terms of creating the kind of creative mind. It is the most important development in terms of all the exciting things which have been suggested in the Minister's speech. I think that this medium can do a great many of these things in a way that no other medium can.

I would suggest even the question of family life, which has already been discussed, can be done through educational television in a way perhaps that no other medium can do it. One of things which I am sure all of the members of this House are obsessed with right now in this day is the kind of sick society which has produced the tragedy which took place in the last couple of days in the United States. This society triggers off people who are emotionally disturbed and I suggest that preventive efforts in treating emotional instability—these can be done through educational television.

As I say, so far all I have seen is television as an appendage—a replacement for parts of textbooks. So far all I have seen is an attempt to fit educational television into the traditional flow of curriculum. So far I have even heard people talking about the use of educational television to provide for examinations, for heaven's sake. This is ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not know who you have been listening to. You have not heard that from the department.

Mr. Pitman: No, I have heard it from people involved in educational television who are not associated with the department, but who are very close to the department.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh yes, but you have not heard that from the department.

Mr. Pitman: This is something which very much worries me and I would like to hear the Minister's thoughts on this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We feel the same way—it is not related to that at all. Not at all.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 508? The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. member for Peterborough said he would like to hear from the Minister on those things, so perhaps—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I got the last one and I just say there is no discussion of discrimination and so on.

Mr. Nixon: Right. I want to make just a few comments on educational television.

The Minister no doubt is aware that it was discussed in this House even before he was Minister. I well remember his predecessor, and even the Minister, in his early years in this responsibility, reacting to the suggestions as if they were a gimmick.

We know that the administration has come forward some considerable degree since then. I remember the speeches that the Minister referred to, rather casually, a few moments ago, when I said that the Minister should set up an educational television network in which, among other things, conversational or oral French could be a subject. I still think that that is a very valid suggestion.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the record will bear me out that, when legislation was provided for educational television, our major objection was that it was under the direction

of the Minister and that nobody was interposed—

Hon. Mr. Davis: There was no legislation.

Mr. Nixon: Well, the discussion at that time—

Hon. Mr. Davis: But there has never been any legislation.

Mr. Nixon: When it first appeared as a separate section of the estimates there was this discussion, so I do not want the record to show that the Minister has, in any way, been commenting about something I might have said in the past out of context and in that way misleading those who would peruse his words very carefully at some future date.

I want to ask the Minister, however, what the involvement of the department is in the experimental systems that are planned and are in the process of being set up in both London and Ottawa. I asked the Minister—at least the question was asked in my name of the Minister two or three weeks ago—that the system in London, which is based on what the experts call a 2,500 mega-hertz system. As I understand it, this is very close to being a closed circuit system and cannot be picked up by any receivers other than those that are specially modified or built.

This must surely qualify for some sort of a grant. I believe it is an interesting development, and one that may make some changes necessary in the basic philosophy of the Minister's proposed authority. This authority, I suppose, would have jurisdiction over the county school boards in their individual efforts to provide educational television while they are waiting for the difficulties that are holding up the provincial effort to be ironed out.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, our involvement with respect to the 2,500 mega-hertz system in London—which, I believe, in this instance is a three-channel system, although I believe they do go to 12 channels. The department was asked as to its reaction to it and, of course, we raised no objection in that it fits in completely.

Our approach to ETV takes into account the 2,500 mega-hertz system which is, shall we say, a relatively new piece of technology available to it. We are taking into account the possibility of satellite transmission and so on. Our whole concept is based on the inevitability of certain technological change, no question about that, and we did not object as far as the federal jurisdiction was concerned with the issuance of the licence to the London board.

We have not as yet gone into the position of paying grants from the department *per se*, although I believe there was some federal assistance with respect to the equipment and money, but I am not sure of this. But we are not paying out grants, as a department, to this type of operation at this point.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister knows that I am quite interested in the way the programme or the establishment is going ahead in London, and particularly over the necessity of having as open a bid as possible for the provision of this equipment. I did not realize that there were no funds in this estimate, or comparable estimates, for that purpose. Yet it appears that in the future, and in the $5.8 million that we are asked to vote, that some of these funds will be spent in payment of favourable contracts to provide some of the equipment that we will need.

Is it the custom of the federal Department of Transport to require the specification of individual pieces of equipment, rather than the equipment or its equivalent, in the calling of tenders for broadcasting apparatus?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, as I understand the practice of the federal agency, it does not require, as suggested in the leader of the Opposition's press release—I read it—that public tendering must precede the submission of a licence application to The Department of Transport. I do not believe this is, in fact, the case.

If the equipment by the successful bidder is different from that listed in the technical brief, the licensee may go back to The Department of Transport and request permission to substitute, provided that the equipment, so designated, can obtain The Department of Transport's acceptance. In other words, you do not have to tender. You go for the licence, based on some technical information and equipment, and if you want to make a substitution you go back to The Department of Transport to obtain information. This is as I understand the procedure.

Mr. Nixon: I think that one of the difficulties in the whole matter, and there is more than one difficulty.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is relatively complicated.

Mr. Nixon: Yes. That difficulty is that technology is progressing so quickly that it lies largely on American research, or perhaps research in Europe, to have the equipment

that is reasonably in the vanguard. That is the most advanced and the most technical perfection. In many ways it really excludes industry from competing, since our lines of equipment are usually directed toward apparatus that has a larger sale, that meets a larger part of the market here.

I can see that there will be a tendency to buy most of the equipment through American firms or Canadian firms that deal only in importing this equipment. I suppose we have to have the best, but I think that the method of tendering should emphasize the possibility of Canadian development that would be brought about simply to provide expanding needs that the Minister's branch can envisage for this year and the year after.

I believe in his testimony in Ottawa, if that is what it should be called, he said that we expect to spend $5 million this year, and this will rise to $10 million in the subsequent years.

I believe now that the federal government has a commitment to move ahead with the facilities that the Ontario branch feels necessary to transmit its programme on an educational network in the province. What is the Minister's understanding there? Has he been following releases from the Prime Minister of Canada's office in recent weeks? Or is he basing his decision on simply the information that has come to him through more official channels?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am subject to correction here, but really we must wait. We are optimistic that we are going to get some form of commitment from the federal agency, whatever agency it may be. As I understand it we still have to await the report. I do not know what happens—there will have to be a new committee, I guess, of Parliament appointed to consider the legislation, because the bill, I guess dies with the dissolution of Parliament.

Mr. Nixon: I think the commitment, as I understood it, if you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, was that this would be an item of priority.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, but it still has to have legislation, as I understand it, and legislation —who knows, when the present leader of the Opposition forms the government on June 26, when he plans to call the next sitting of the federal—

Mr. Nixon: We are talking about the Minister's friends now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would think that this happens. I am very optimistic about it going through. I read Mr. Stanfield's speech about ETV a day or so ago. I was really quite impressed. Oh, yes, I read it. I am just not in a position to tell the hon. member. I do not know what happens on June 25 or thereafter. We have to wait for this legislation.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter in the yellow book of information that the Minister provided. I do not think it is necessary to turn that up, but as I understood it, he was saying that the emphasis so far was at the elementary level, and the time-tabling structure made it particularly difficult at the secondary level to use educational television under the facilities that we now have.

He indicated that certain technological breaks-through would improve this. What about the restructuring of the time-table at the secondary level to make educational television more usable? I think this has got to be one of the biggest problems that the branch is going to face—that the programmes are going to be in the ether, but nobody is going to be watching them because of the timetable structure in the secondary schools.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is obviously one of the problems, and I will send this—I will get copies for the hon. member. It does not relate specifically to ETV but it is the whole concept that you were referring to earlier of ungraded, or an individualized, approach at the secondary level. I think we can do a great deal with time-tabling, but one of the obvious solutions will be with the development of the divisional boards, where they need the provision of video tape recorders to make the programmes available at the hour that suits the individual teacher. This is technically possible, and this is how we see it being handled.

Mr. Pitman: When will the grants be coming?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The grants are being considered, Mr. Chairman. I know the hon. member is anxious to get a commitment for so many dollars on a video tape recorder. I cannot really help him with that here today.

Mr. Nixon: This has got to be the solution so that a teacher of history or science or language can schedule a programme for the next day and, by touching a button, have a programme appear on the screen in the teaching situation.

This sounds pretty advanced, and yet I believe it is quite capable of achieving this. But I hardly see the funds here that are going to achieve this, if the same funds are going to be used to provide the basic programme content and the five television mobiles that are going around the province selling the programme to those who are less enthusiastic than those of us in this House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is the problem we are in—we do not know how much capital we will, in fact, be investing this year, because we do not know yet what the time factor is. This amount relates basically to the production and transmission of the programmes. It does not relate to whatever capital we may have to expend for provincial production facilities until we have our position clarified with Ottawa.

Mr. Nixon: Does it cost you anything to transmit the programme?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, yes, we are paying fees to the private broadcasters who are in the process of negotiation with the CBC as for next year. It has not been finalized yet. About $250,000.

Mr. Nixon: Who builds the transmission facilities? I assume that it will be the federal government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And we hope at no cost to the province.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister must have some idea as to what the bill will be that will be met by the taxpayers. What is the estimate for a fully-established educational television network?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I really cannot give a complete estimate here. Our own estimate for capital expenditure, say in the first full year after transmission facilities are available to us, would be in the neighbourhood of $45 million. There will be a like sum, I think, for two years thereafter to build up the basic core facility.

Mr. Nixon: I do not know whether you are talking—I am talking about setting up the transmission facilities. If the government of Canada, in fact, decides they will do it, as I trust they will—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I cannot give the hon. member a figure on this because we just do not know what approach they are going to take to the—

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but it would be similar to the one that you had before, surely, where you had the lovely map with the television towers, and the little jagged lines coming out. Do you remember that one? A very good map. I would think if they were going to blanket the province of Ontario with educational television facilities, it would have to be something like that. What was your estimate of cost?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, once again we still do not know what the plans of the federal government will be, but a transmitter is in the neighbourhood of $400,000 to $500,000, and it depends on the approach that they take. If they go to a 33-transmitter structure, then this is $16 million. If they can do it through, shall we say, five regional transmitters, then we are talking something less. We just do not know at what rate they may do this. But if you could do it on the basis, say, of cost per transmitter it would be in the neighbourhood of $.5 million per transmitter.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 508. The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, this might be a point of personal privilege. I was wondering if it is possible to strike from *Hansard* the references the Minister and I made to where my source of information came from? The remarks as recorded in *Hansard* point very specifically to the individual as one who works in this building. I assure the Minister that my source of information did not come from anyone in this building. It came from a person who lives miles from here and I just do not think that should be in *Hansard.*

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite right.

Mr. Chairman: Everything—

Mr. T. Reid: The Minister agreed with me that these remarks should be stricken from *Hansard.*

Mr. Chairman: Well, the Chairman would suggest that in the opinion of the chair, based on information related to me, I doubt very much that the remarks can be stricken from *Hansard.*

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I was going to make that point. Nothing can be struck from *Hansard.*

Mr. Nixon: I think, Mr. Chairman, what my hon. frend is suggesting is that the position be made clear in the record as it now is.

An hon. member: Right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, may I clarify it from my point of view. I made a reference to an individual who is part of the leader of the Opposition's research staff, who has taken a particular interest in ETV and also in information systems. We have discussed some of these items and this is my only reference: whether he is a civil servant. I understand he was a member of the leader of the Opposition's staff, and he has taken an interest in ETV.

Mr. Nixon: He did not do the research.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. T. Reid: I would just like to state that no person in this area supplied me with my information. I have been operating as an independent operator.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I guess he has been supplying it to the leader of the Opposition —very good material some of it.

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, but the questions I raised are pretty darn embarrassing to you and they did not come from him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They were not embarrassing to me at all.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): You have spoiled your position, that's what—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not embarrassing at all.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: You had a good point up to that moment.

Mr. Chairman: I think the records will now show the correct situation.

Vote 508 agreed to.

On vote 509:

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, this is a wide-ranging bit I have to say about teacher education in the elementary system. We have a saying on the first day of school that you take the new teacher down to the classroom and shove her in, you quickly close the door and hope for the best. On the other side of the door is the teacher, who is suffering a traumatic experience simply because of the inadequacy of the training that the teachers receive in the teachers' colleges of Ontario. I want to elaborate upon some of these, where we are failing the teachers and where, as a result, we are failing the students of Ontario.

One of the first things I feel that should be stressed heavily is a great variety of pedagogical methodology. In other words, Mr. Chairman, we should be providing a great variety of teaching, with grouping upgraded systems and individualized work in the whole sphere of teaching. Really, we just cater to one group in the class make-up.

We apparently cater to the average student and this is the way it is taught in teacher's college. I do not think it is much different now than it was when I was there and that was not very long ago. Because in talking to four former students of mine, who have just graduated from teachers' college, they felt as I did when I graduated from teachers' college, that what I took I could have taken in approximately six weeks because there was so much missing.

I think we have to get away from teaching this one group. There are great reports in the newspapers of this going on; unfortunately, no one is being trained to do it. I came out of teachers' college to teach three groups in one subject, and to be able to prepare seat work and so on for these three groups was completely foreign as it was to most other teachers and as it is today.

To talk about upgrading systems, teachers are not getting any of this in teachers' college—or a very, very small smattering of it—and then we are going in and we are trying and we are experimenting with children and the children suffer. I think it is high time that if we are going to go to ungraded, if we are going to go to individualized work, that we get serious about it in the teachers' colleges.

Another area that is extremely weak in the teachers' colleges is note making. There is absolutely next to nothing when it comes to note making in the teachers' colleges of Ontario. If you can get an essay note down and a point form note, this is about the sum total of what teachers' colleges are offering. And yet, in the school I was at, we were able to draft 18 pages of different types of note making. I am not asking you to accept mine, but it should be part of the curriculum in teachers' colleges so that the teachers have a great variety of presentations and a great variety of ways that students can chart notes and a whole variety of methods other than just simply essay or point form.

Another grave weakness in the teachers' colleges is the testing programme. I cannot recall taking anything with respect to setting up testing in any field. Whether it was history, English, mathematics—you name it—we were taught absolutely nothing. As a

result, you go into the schools today where the teacher is making examinations or tests, and they are so terribly easy, they are virtually useless; on the other hand, they make them so difficult that most students fail them. I think that there has to be a great deal done in this particular area.

Another area that I believe should be dropped out of teachers' colleges is teaching fact in science or teaching fact in history and so on. I am not talking about the two-year programme, which is non-existent or going out. But I am talking about teaching science fact at the grade 2 or 3 level and asking examinations on what a tuber is, of a person who is at teachers' college, which is virtually useless.

The other main concern I have in teacher training is the tremendous change that is needed in the courses offered in child psychology. There is so very little, and if we are to do a job of teaching children, then we must have a tremendous lot more in the courses in the teachers' colleges to enable the graduates to assist and understand the children when they go into a classroom.

I think that from my opening remarks these are the reasons why teachers are going in unprepared. They do not get enough methodology; they do not get enough on note making; they do not get enough on testing or do not get enough on psychology. Consequently, they are ill-prepared to do the job that is necessary if we are going to have successful students going into the high school.

I hope the Minister does not think I am simply trying to tear it apart. I am trying to be most helpful. These are the areas I have tremendous difficulty in as a teacher and as a principal. I had to do a tremendous amount of work with my staffs in order to help them in these areas.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 509. The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a number of questions in regard to the development of teacher training. Perhaps I might just preface my remarks by reminding the Minister it is one of the most important votes in this entire estimate. Essentially, no matter what we talk about in relation to all the various media and all the various hardware of education, the success of education and the success of our whole system depends on the individual teacher before a class—any relationship between that class and the teacher.

I think that probably one of the most valuable documents that has been brought to light in this province is the report of the Minister's committee on the training of elementary school teachers. I do not think anything more needs to be said on that. I noticed that just a few weeks ago, the Toronto school trustee, Mr. Ross, suggested that Ontario is turning out ill-prepared teachers who must be retrained by local boards and referred to this "Mickey Mouse teacher training."

I do not associate myself with that remark—I do not think it is "Mickey Mouse teacher training", but the Minister's committee did reveal a number of areas, particularly in the area of securing maturity. I think that this word maturity comes up again and again in this document. What I really would like to know, perhaps in a number of areas, is where are we going in solving this problem? The Minister's committee, of course, suggested that teacher training should move to the campuses of the various universities across the province. This has already been done at Lakehead and the University of Ottawa.

I noticed in the yellow book which accompanied the Minister's remarks the other night, he suggested there were two or three other universities who were now ready to include teacher training, or teacher education would be better terminology, within the spectrum of their university offerings. I am wondering just which universities these are and what is the timetable for bringing teacher training into the university campuses across the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, obviously there will have to be a staggered timetable. You cannot bring them all in at the same time or you would have great difficulty with the teacher flow. I cannot give the hon. member a specific answer because there are a series of meetings coming up in the next two to three weeks with various representatives from the universities that will give us, I think, a very clear indication of the timetabling. Our own intention as a department is to move as rapidly as we can to the integration of the teachers' colleges with the universities, and quite obviously this will be done in those areas where the colleges are preferably geographically located either on, or close to a university campus. This, I think, is the obvious place to begin and this means, of course, that Laurentian, the Lakehead, Brock—those are the three—

Mr. B. Newman: Do you have any plans for Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Windsor is not perhaps as difficult a problem because it is not geographically that far away from the University of Windsor campus. But I cannot set out any timetabling as to the specific institutions until these meetings are concluded over the next, I think, roughly two, perhaps three weeks, but this is the overall policy of the department. There is no question about this.

Mr. Pitman: Is it assumed in the Minister's mind that these will take place two or three this year, and perhaps two or three the following year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Right. It has to be staggered, it cannot happen all in one year.

Mr. Pitman: I was wondering if this, at least in part, is because of the tremendous expense which will be involved.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Part of it is related to economics and if you move to a two-year programme, say at all teachers' colleges in one single year, that means that you are a full year without any elementary school teachers moving into the system. This would, I think, create a situation that could not be acceptable so it would have to be staggered over a period of years. Part of it is economics, part of it is just straight practical problems.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, well this has been a feeling I have had that—and this problem of priority comes up again—I know the Minister is involved in a massive expansion of facilities through the colleges of applied arts and technology and the tremendous demands from the universities, and I was wondering whether it might not be something worth considering just what priority teacher training should have. I would suggest to the Minister that this should be one of the major priorities.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We think it is the highest priority.

Mr. Pitman: Fine. I wonder if I could ask the Minister some questions about the feelings of the university presidents—I think it has been communicated to the Minister. Has the Minister been able to overcome the problem of the admission? I think the feeling of university presidents was that admissions should be the same for the art students and for the teacher trainees—those who are receiving teacher education.

Now I think the Minister said in his remarks that he was hoping to bring that up to 55 per cent and then to 60 per cent by 1971, I think it was. The question I really wanted to ask is this. As I pointed out to you the other night, and I do not want to get into this question again, the meaning of 60 per cent no longer holds really the same kind of meaning as it did before. What I am asking is: Will those who are being brought into the universities for elementary school training have the same qualifications? We may very well find that with the change in the system in grade 13, we will have many more people with 60 per cent and possibly the whole university system will have to put up its admission requirement and that the universities and the department will feel that 65 per cent under the new system would be a more accurate configuration in terms of deciding who should be best at a university and that 55 per cent and 60 per cent at a college of applied arts and technology. I do not know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think it is fair to say that I just hate quoting the committee of presidents because I am not sure that I should, but my reaction to their reaction—put it this way—is that they are, in principle, now very much in favour of helping with this, shall we say, integration of teacher education in the universities.

Mr. Pitman: I hope the Minister is right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I think they are in favour of it. We run into certain practical problems, one being the question of admission, the other being the question of the number of courses to be related to, shall we say, the universities' responsibility and the number that should be directed basically to teachers' education. These are some of the areas that have yet to be resolved. This is why I say until we finalize the meetings over the next three weeks, I cannot tell you just what institutions and what will be the policy, but my reaction is that they are really trying to be helpful. There are some very real problems yet to be resolved.

I should also point out that the question of admission, too, is one of these things that is hard to predict. We are saying that by 1970 we probably will have a sufficient flow of young people interested in the teaching profession that the 60 per cent is within reach, but I think we must also look at—and this once again is taking maybe an optimistic or positive approach—once it is moved into the university environment and it is moving towards a form of degree situation for an individual, perhaps this in itself will attract

more people and the question of 60 per cent will not be as relevant either.

In other words, what I am trying to say, is that I think there will be more young people interested in the teaching profession when it becomes part of the university environment. I am maybe a shade optimistic but I think this could be the case.

Mr. Pitman: I hope the Minister is right but what I am worried about is that you suggest that until these conversations are over with, we do not know what the policy is, but surely the policy must be the same for all universities in terms of the general areas.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is why I say we are meeting with the sub-committee and the committee of presidents. We recognize there has to be some uniformity of policy and this is why I cannot say what it is on this particular occasion because we have not finalized these discussions with the universities.

Mr. Pitman: Perhaps the Minister could just nod his head as to whether he has agreed that capital progress will be completely sopported by The Department of Education. That is, can universities expect it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, we are. As far as the capital provision facilities, the universities have made a point that this should be a responsibility of the department and we have accepted this point of view.

Mr. Pitman: Also last night I mentioned the whole question—

Hon. Mr. Davis: But they will be financed through The Department of University Affairs.

Mr. Pitman: Just on that remark is the hope that they may transfer this question of teacher training over to The Department of University Affairs?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I do not think this is relevant. I think they are transferring it over to the universities. It is not a question of an interdepartmental transfer really in the long run.

Mr. Pitman: Well, I think the presidents' feeling was that if teachers in training were to feel completely a part of the university setting, I think this is what the report wishes. I think what most of the universities wish to do is to do exactly what the Minister's committee has suggested and that is to make a teacher, an individual, involved in teacher education, a full person within the faculty of arts and science so they will not face secondary status. They have a full status as a member of the university and a member of the faculty of arts and science. I think this may be very important as to just where teacher education is placed in the Minister's departmental responsibilities. I am wondering—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it must be kept in mind that my own view is that teachers' certification has to lie, of course, with The Department of Education. You may physically transfer, in the estimates, in areas of responsibility, shall we say, to the universities and University Affairs Department, the question of certification—and I think the report recommends this.

Mr. Pitman: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That certification must remain with The Department of Education.

Mr. Pitman: I do not think that universities ever suggested at any point that they wished to take over certification.

Mr. Nixon: They have not any more right to certify than the Minister. The teachers' professional organization might have.

Mr. Pitman: They would wish, at least, particularly if they have to go over the educational process within the universities.

Mr. Nixon: Yes.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask, too, the whole question of research. I think the only way that education is going to receive proper status at any universities is if we can associate a degree of research. Now there is some feeling, I think, on the part of university people that with the establishment of the Ontario institute for studies in education there might very well be an overabundance, an overemphasis, and perhaps an overconcentration of research in that institute, and that teacher education will then no longer be able to achieve status in the individual university.

Last night I suggested the possibility of setting up research and development centres in each of the universities.

I know one of the things that the Minister gets very concerned about—and rightly so—is that a great deal of the research that goes on is (a) irrelevant and (b) is sometimes simply repetitive. I am with the Minister on this point of trying to cut down the costs by having some degree of inter-relationship of the universities in this area of educational research, and I am wondering if you would not

be able to give status to the education department or the educational personnel in each university by giving each university some hope that educational research will be encouraged within that university setting.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think this is an item that might be discussed under university affairs. I am not even sure that we can come to any conclusion on it. It has been brought to my attention, I will put it this way, that several of the universities would like to get involved in the field of educational research.

The Ontario institute for studies in education is presently doing this. They have an agreement with, I believe, three of our teachers' colleges, incidentally, in some form of research—London, Stratford, and I forget the third, but it does not matter, and of course they have the agreement with the Ontario college of education here in Toronto, the affiliation with the University of Toronto and they can, under their charter, affiliate or least agree to enter into an agreement with any other university with respect to research or graduate work in the field of education.

Perhaps this is the way to develop an approach across the province, but I think it is a shade premature to be saying that every university that has a faculty of education or a teachers' college integrated into it will have a massive programme of educational research thereto.

Mr. Pitman: Would the Minister be able to sort the relationship with the teaching staffs of the teachers' colleges—will be able to find within the university—

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is one of the areas that we still have to resolve, and one of the reasons for the meetings in the next two or three weeks.

Mr. Pitman: I must have misunderstood the Minister. These meetings are with the committee of the presidents; they are not with the three universities?

Hon. Mr. Davis: With the sub-committee of the committee of presidents, which are representative of the universities so we can have an overall policy. We are also meeting with the Ontario faculty association of university professors to have some discussion there, perhaps of an informal nature on the subject too.

Mr. Pitman: One of the problems I think of integrating teacher training into the university is that the teachers' colleges have a system whereby students go from certain areas to a particular teachers' college. I think this is going to be a very serious problem in view of the fact that it is expected that universities should attract people from all over the province—all across the nation, if possible. There should not be a localization of university students, in that sense.

I am wondering if there has been any resolution of that problem in terms of teacher education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have not really adhered rigidly to this policy, Mr. Chairman. I think it is something that from a practical standpoint will work itself out. As I have said before, the hon. member for Peterborough has been able to identify problems for us—most of them we have understood—it would be very helpful if he would start proposing some of the solutions. This is one of our difficulties. We know most of the problems. It is finding the solutions to them, and we do not have solutions to all of them.

Mr. Pitman: Would the Minister recognize that it is his responsibility to deal with the problems?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh yes, and we work at it; and find some solutions, sometimes.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 509; leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: In the Minister's comments a few moments ago, he stressed again, as he did last year, the need to retain the power to certificate teachers in his own hands. Under the gentle administrations of the department over the past few years, we have come through a change in certification amounting to four categories, at least, in both elementary and secondary levels and some other changes. In my view we have been unnecessarily restricted.

I do not believe that we have recognized teaching training, and that is really what it has to be called, the way it has been carried out in years gone by. It has been brought to us from other jurisdictions. It has always been the feeling that if an immigrant or a person who has come to Ontario from another jurisdiction did not undergo the rigours of our own training course, then anything he had had previously was valueless. We might, possibly if we needed the teacher badly enough, give him a letter of permission with all of the downgrading associated with that. A letter of standing which has a different connotation

would have been a better response, but even that has been inadequate.

I have always felt under the Minister's ministrations that the teaching profession has been more of a closed shop than it should have been. Those people that we need to come into our teaching system, our school system, are not having the opportunities that, in my view, should have been extended to them.

Of course, we are going very far afield, indeed, to meet the teaching needs in this province. Missions from cities and school boards and groups of school boards have gone to Australia and New Zealand and Great Britain; Minister's emissaries have gone to France, so we are beating the bushes all over the world to get the teachers that we require.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Should you use the word emissaries? I am just wondering, for the constitution.

Mr. Nixon: Who paid their expenses?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I guess we did. I do not know.

Mr. Nixon: Did you get federal approval?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: Then it is all right if we call them emissaries with federal approval. We will not give you any trouble. I do feel that we have been needlessly restrictive and parochial in applying particular requirements that have come down to us through the college of education and through the Minister's responsibility for certification. I feel, beyond this as well, that the need to have certain courses before a teacher was recognized as a specialist in a certain field, has distorted the approach to specialization. A Ph.D in chemistry could not be designated a specialist in science or even in chemistry until recently, because of the need for a broader background.

I feel that this has been an inadequate approach, as has been the attitude that graduates from certain degrees, like archeology or philosophy, have not had an entrance into the teaching profession that would recognize the special skills they have. I do not agree with the Minister that it is essential that he retain in his hands the power to grant a certificate to a teacher.

I reject the suggestion that the university should be given this, but I would draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) does not feel that it is his responsibility to licence doctors. The Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) certainly does not take it upon himself to call student lawyers to the bar and grant them the right to practice in Ontario. A good deal has been said about the need for improving the professional attitudes in the teaching profession. I think we cannot call it a profession unless the teachers band together and their own organization takes responsibility for their own actions.

Naturally, The Department of Education would have some supervision. It might act in this regard as a resource centre. It might act as an ombudsman for anybody who felt that the teachers' professional organization was not acting in fairness and justice. I feel sure that if the Minister were to look at the report authored by Mr. McRuer he would find ample justification for granting under suitable legislation to a properly established teachers' professional organization the right to grant certification, and to police and patrol and develop professionally and otherwise the attitudes of the teachers of the province. I do not agree with the Minister at all that it is essential for the control of the system that he retain in his own hands the requirements that certificates be authorized by himself. Do you want to say anything about that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have already expressed—

Mr. Nixon: All right. The point that I want to raise—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just on the one point in respect of flexibility, or shall we say that we have been a shade rigid? I think, Mr. Chairman, I would tend to agree with the leader of the Opposition in this regard. I think this would be fair. Just a shade, to the extent that we have had people now looking at some of the special education facilities in the U.S.A. where people have been going to courses. We are going to be accepting them or their courses for certification here, because they have facilities. This might even happen in the state of Michigan, but I am not sure—so that people who have obtained some certificate will be given credit or recognition for special education in this province.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, there is another attitude that I think is associated with the shade of rigidity that the Minister has admitted he might be guilty of.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not say I am guilty of it.

Mr. Nixon: While we do have—you sign the paper, do you not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do, indeed.

Mr. Nixon: I have got one signed by your predecessor.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Have you?

Mr. Nixon: I value it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do you need it updated or anything?

Mr. Nixon: I am afraid I might have to have it adjusted some time. But rigidity also comes into the four categories that have been established in recent years. There is a tendency to think that now that we have made this advance, we can forget about any future developments. It has been said in this debate already that teachers should not have to spend their valuable professional time drawing straight lines in square attendance boxes, and matters of that type, selling insurance to the students and selling football tickets and that kind of thing.

This is surely an exaggeration, but the Minister would agree that there is a very real and growing place for non-professional people in the teaching situation. I think that our colleges of applied arts and technology might very well be brought into play here in providing those people with the kind of educational background that will permit them to take a useful operative role in the teaching situation—in the laboratories and the libraries, and in the classrooms assisting in the work that accompanies education day by day. It would not be necessary to call them junior teachers or anything like that.

There should be some sort of category that is related to the professionalism of the fully-trained teacher so that we can expand the use of these people with special abilities. I think this is something that would fit into the general flexibility that seems to be the theme of this debate. It is one that we might investigate and move forward at a rate more rapid than has been evidenced in the past.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we are in the process of exploring very many of these thoughts right now.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 509; the member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister would comment on the situation which will exist if teachers' colleges are brought into the university sphere? Will teachers in training, or being educated, be receiving free tuition within the system?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, that has not been determined; we have not reached this point yet.

I am just speaking, again, of my own initial reaction, and it is that probably that they should be treated the same as other students at the institution. They can be charged fees, and then receive some sort of additional bursary, or something from the department, if they are going into teacher education. But, as the hon. member just remarked, we do not want them treated as different students on campus.

Mr. Pitman: Would the Minister consider that he should perhaps move the other way—that is, to stop charging fees from the students at the university?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, I knew that was coming.

Mr. Pitman: There would be an equality in that direction, rather than the one that you have suggested.

I wonder if the Minister has received any official reaction, either from Australia, where I understand that teachers are being recruited, or from Great Britain, where they have been recruited with some success over the past year? Has there been any official reaction to this? Also, whether the Minister does not see some real danger of Commonwealth breakdown if he continues to this kind of full-scale effort to draw teachers from all over the world?

Would it not be a more "positive"—to use the Minister's favourite word—approach to spend more time in recruiting Canadian young people into the profession? Provide the means by which they get there, and raise the status of the profession to an extent so that this problem of recruitment would not be quite so serious?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think that it is obvious that if we can educate more teachers here, then this eliminates the problem, and we are coming much more close. I think that it should be apparent that I am not referring now to Australia, but there are a number of people in the United Kingdom who are not recruited *per se*, but who wish to come here to teach—there are a number each year. I think that we are reaching a point at the elementary level, perhaps in the next year or so, where part of this problem will disappear.

I think that I can say that, in an official way, I have not had any communiqué from

Australia saying that we are robbing them of their teachers. They may have registered some protest—not with respect to the teachers, but with the way that it was done, I do not know—with the federal government.

I do not recall any official communication coming to me from, say, the Prime Minister of Australia.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring this up under this estimate. I do not know whether the Minister would like to discuss it elsewhere.

Some time previously both the leader of the Opposition and myself brought to the Minister's attention the possibility of saving a great deal of educational money by co-operative advertising. Has the Minister taken this under consideration? Have the officials of the department taken it under consideration? Have there been any study papers? Have business institutes been brought into the question?

In other words, here are thousands of dollars of money for education going right down the advertising drain. This, I do not think, either raises the level of education or is of advantage to the teachers or the pupils of Ontario. What would the Minister have to say?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think that my answer was, on that occasion, when it was raised by the leader of the Opposition, and I think that it still applies now, that we will await the experience of the new divisional boards for a year and just see if this still remains a problem.

You are only going to have in the public school area roughly 100 boards advertising. Obviously this will decrease very substantially the amount of advertising that must be done.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Chairman, regarding the Hamilton teachers' college. Knowing that the McMaster medical school is to take over the site on which the Hamilton teachers' college is located, what plans are being contemplated by The Department of Education for the new facilities for the Hamilton teachers' college, and—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there have been discussions with McMaster University with respect to the site of the teachers' college, but we have not finalized any agreements.

It would appear as though the university will give us, in exchange for the site where the present teachers' college is located, a comparable site perhaps closer to the main centre of the university, because it will obviously be one of those integrated with the university programme. The teachers' college will not be a college, *per se*, in a few years, but it will be part of the university environment.

We do not anticipate any trouble working out an arrangement with McMaster.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question or two to the hon. Minister concerning summer courses. Will summer courses continue to be given in the ensuing years, or is this the final year for teacher training at summer school?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would identify what he means by summer courses. If he means the traditional summer courses, with respect to secondary school training, the bulk of these will disappear. This is the last year for entrance to the two-year summer course programme.

As I said in my announcement a few weeks ago, there will be exceptions to this. There will be some people who are mature students —if we can use this term—and they will be admitted into a form of summer course programme, but the majority of them will have to go through the whole route. The last students to enter will be entering in a few weeks.

Mr. T. P. Reid: But the operating courses will continue?

Hon. Mr. Davis: They will continue both at the secondary and the elementary level.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I would like to make a few comments on that if I may:

Mr. Chairman, I have just returned from my riding, and I had occasion over the weekend to talk to a number of teachers. They brought up a very valid point, I believe, concerning the expense and the time spent in travelling down to Toronto and elsewhere for summer courses.

We have, as you know, the Lakehead University, and it seems to be as quick to give certain summer school courses for high school teachers in northwestern Ontario. I am thinking specifically of courses in the commercial field. There is an obvious shortage of commercial teachers across the province, and we have a number of very competent people

now teaching in northwestern Ontario who, I am sure, would be very competent to give such summer school courses at Lakehead University.

At the moment they have an elementary teachers' course at the Lakehead University, but we are not, at the moment, training high school teachers. Am I correct in assuming that, within the next few years, as we were talking earlier, the secondary school level teacher training will be phased in at the Lakehead? Mr. Minister, would you answer that before I continue?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are in the process of resolving problems with respect to the existing teachers' college at the Lakehead. I would not want to say, at this point, what will happen specifically, with respect to secondary school education at the Lakehead, although I think that there is some logic in the hon. member's assumption.

Mr. T. P. Reid: May I just make one or two more comments?

I would like to point out that teacher recruitment in northern Ontario is somewhat difficult. If it were possible for us to train people, or give them their teacher training, in the north, whether they come from northwestern Ontario originally, or from other spots, I am sure that once they were there, they would see what the north is, and what it has to offer them. Perhaps then it might be much easier to hire teachers for the north and for northwestern Ontario.

I would just like to ask one question then. Will the Minister give consideration for summer school courses for secondary school teachers specifically in the commercial field?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will certainly take a look at it. I think the decision, of course, must be related to the number of students—teachers rather—who would be in a position to participate. I am not sure we could have any decision for this coming summer, but we will certainly take a look at it for next year.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 509; the member for Port Arthur.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): I hasten to rise in support of the remarks of my colleague from Rainy River, because I had intended on rising on the very same matter.

Most of the teachers I have spoken to, in the Port Arthur and Fort William area, have given me the same problem. I would hope that the Minister will look at the human elements that are involved here. First, 900 miles is a long distance. The courses are usually right in the middle of summer—the first of July to the middle of August. Most of these young teachers have to leave their families and there is considerable expense involved.

The Minister himself, in his opening remarks to the House, and I will just quote a part of it, said:

> Facilities of such qualities should not sit idle and should, in fact, be used around the clock if necessary. Where programmes are in demand by citizens who work during the hours allocated to daytime courses, I would suggest that the school boards should give a high priority to making maximum use of school facilities for all citizens.

We have a large number of beautiful institutions that lie idle all year round in the Lakehead area—well, through summer, I am sorry. And we do have some very qualified people, very expert people, and it seems rather foolish. But on the other hand, it seems very logical that these people should be able to organize into courses and teach one another right there at the Lakehead.

They could be with their families and they could enjoy the best weather that we ever get at the Lakehead, during the period of July 1 to the middle of August, and I think that the Minister should do more than just give this serious consideration. I think he should move on it and do it.

It is the major complaint of teachers in the Lakehead area—and I do not like to see our teachers come down here to Toronto where the school board authorities in this area can get a good look at what we have got and sort of woo them away. I think this happens a bit too often. I would rather keep them up there at the Lakehead. They are happy there. Why expose them to too much affluence and opportunity down here? We have enough difficulty as it is to get these people there in the first place.

So it is logical and extremely sensible to have these summer courses there. I know a friend who will be leaving his family on July 1 for six full weeks; he has to leave his wife and daughter up there at the Lakehead while he comes down here and sweats through a summer course. This is because he is a very ambitious boy and wants to get ahead. But why should he have to go through all of that trouble?

This is the province of progress, of opportunity and this is the golden haired department of them all, and I have an awful lot of respect for the Minister and for a lot of his programmes. I do not think his department will really have too much difficulty in getting

the summer course organized for the Lakehead. I suggest that he ask the teachers at the Lakehead to come up with a proposal, to recommend to his department and I bet it will not take them very long. Thank you very much.

Mr. Pitman: One of the things that bothers me, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that I think we realize now that teacher education is going to extend over a longer period. We are going to have to continue teachers' colleges over a longer period and I suspect—and I am not trying to be suspicious—that this will probably be more than three, four or five years.

May I say just in passing that I have seen more new bright ideas in the teachers' colleges, at least the one in Peterborough, since they decided they were going to phase them out, than I saw in all the many, many years before. You know, suddenly all this freedom and what is almost an orgy of progress—

An hon. member: In teachers' colleges?

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is saying the teachers' colleges are 100 per cent better now than they were three years ago.

Mr. Nixon: He is saying orgies.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am going to get that in writing.

Mr. Pitman: I must say to the Minister that I might embarrass him if I indicate what I thought about them a couple of years ago.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know what you thought about them a couple of years ago.

Mr. Pitman: But the point on which I am trying to get some clarification is, what about the people who are in the teachers' colleges now; it seems to me that they are going to be hung up. Is there no way that we can get some planned programme to take over one by one, so that both the universities and the teachers' colleges will know when it is going to take place? So that these programmes can be planned within these.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is exactly what we are attempting to do right now.

Mr. Pitman: This is what will happen within the next few weeks.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is what we are hoping to resolve over the next few weeks, and we have made a lot of progress.

Mr. Pitman: The other question I have—I will try and get this over, if the Minister, with the permission of the colleagues on this side, wishes to get this vote through.

I see one item here which really does bother me. It is under professional development — advisory services for beginning teachers, $8,000. Now I am sure that $8,000 does not represent any figure at all. You could not even send a postcard to the new teachers for $8,000 and I am wondering what you mean by advisory services to young teachers—beginning teachers?

This, I suggest, should be a major responsibility of this department, particularly if you have a large number of new teachers coming into the profession each year and particularly in view of the greater complexity of teaching with all the new media. What do you mean by $8,000 to advisory services to beginning teachers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this, I think, is an item in the vote that will tend to disappear. It has only been used in very limited ways for some teachers in very isolated situations where they have needed some assistance. Normally, the advisory services to the beginning teachers would be done, say, by the local boards or by our own staff. But there have been some instances where we have needed additional funds for this type of service. I think with the consolidation and with the alteration in teacher education itself that this item will probably disappear in a very short period of time.

Vote 509 agreed to.

It being 6 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 110



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, June 6, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 6, 1968

Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, concluded 4061

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 4097

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
(Concluded)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 510. The member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to spoil the game, but I would like to say a word or two on some items under this vote. I would particularly like to say something about the school for the deaf. This is the one in Belleville, Mr. Chairman.

This is, I think, a direct responsibility of the Minister. This is one of the few schools that he does operate. I would like to read just a line or two from a report from this school. It is describing a couple of the local children who happened to be attending this school:

> Jeanie can lie in her bed and kick two other 12-year-olds simply by swivelling her hips and Anna would find it difficult to walk between the 16 beds in Jeanie's drab institutional bedroom in Ontario's school for the deaf at Belleville. But Jeanie is fortunate, she does not have to sleep in the bed a roommate of hers has which sticks out into the hallway. There are two dormitories and 16 girls in each, on her floor. At the end of the corridor, two dormitories are empty. Because Jeanie was born deaf, she has to attend the school.

And it goes on to describe the situation for other people who are in this school. But, here is one thing which I think is rather serious.

> Jeanie and Gordon take physical education classes in a gymnasium built for temporary use during the second world war. Beams holding up the roof are cracked, split and rotten. The physical education office has a wind gauge. It is a wind speed indicator put there by The Department of Public Works. Red tape on it reads, red line, danger zone, evacuate all personnel when gusting at 25 to 30 miles an hour.
>
> "I hate the wind," says E. H. J. Bryant, the assistant dean of residence and the supervisor of physical education, "because it is up to me to decide when it is dangerous." Jeanie's foster parents and Gordon's parents hate it too.

Now, I have travelled across this province a good deal, Mr. Chairman, and I have visited many of the beautiful schools that have been built in this province over the past number of years, and some of the more impressive aspects of the schools are the gymnasiums, and I cannot for the life of me, in view of the priorities which have been established by this Minister, understand how a situation like this can exist in a school for young people who happen to be deprived, in so many ways, simply because they are deaf. I will say no more on that matter. I hope that the Minister can indicate that something very different is going to take place in the very near future, both for the sake of the parents of these young people and for the sake of the young people themselves.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I think I can tell the hon. member that we anticipate calling tenders for the construction of the physical education facility at the school for the deaf in Belleville, in 1968.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 510. The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I do not have to bring this to the attention of the hon. Minister, I am certainly sure he is aware of the recommendation of the select committee on youth concerning recreation, dealing with more staff, lay and professional leaders, instructors, and so on. There are eight different recommendations. I ask the Minister what action he plans on taking on these specific recommendations.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I cannot deal with the specific recommendations, necessarily. I think it is quite relevant that the hon. member read—perhaps he has already—the announcement that we were going to combine the youth and the community programmes branch into a combined organization to deal with problems, not only of

youth, but related to recreation. And, of course, part of their task will be to relate what recommenadtions are appropriate in the youth committee report in the field of recreation. It will be under the auspices, I think almost completely—there will be a few exceptions—of this new branch of the department.

Mr. B. Newman: Very good, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The new organization took effect as of June 1.

Mr. B. Newman: Very good. I hope that you follow recommendation 118 which specifically asks that uniform standards be set for recreation staff.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will take this as an indication of the member's interest. Also, I should point out to the member that we think there will, perhaps, be seven colleges this fall—community colleges—offering programmes for recreational leaders.

Mr. B. Newman: I am sure of that, Mr. Chairman, because they tried to set one up in my own community.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you going to go on staff?

Mr. B. Newman: No, I am not interested in that. I am interested in being here—with me on that side and you on this side.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Under recreational admission, why do you include mathematics as being one of the subjects?

Hon. Mr. Davis: In what?

Mr. Sargent: Recreation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not quite understand the question. Is the hon. member asking why a person needs some ability in math to be enrolled in a course in recreation in one of the colleges? Well, Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak for the entrance requirements of each college, but I would assume it is because they have set certain minimum entrance requirements, and mathematics happens to be one of them. I do not know that one could say that you have to be a specialist in math to be a recreation director, but I would think that it is an indication of one's general knowledge, is it not? I think there has to be some background for it, and I would think math is reasonably relevant.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 510. The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: In this past debate, we have heard a great deal about emotionally disturbed children. I have, here, a letter from the Ontario association for attendance counselling services, which has been presented to the Minister, in which it suggests, along with the report of the select committee on youth, that The Department of Education take over the responsibility for these young people. I think, in view of the action that has already been taken in the bill which gives the responsibility for retarded children to the county boards, that this is an indication that a new direction is likely to take place in this area. I would certainly hope so. I am not going to repeat what I have already said about this. I would simply like to ask the Minister to indicate some of his thinking, and some of the thinking of his department, in relation to this matter.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I have made several statements on this subject over the past two years. The thinking of the department really is, basically, that we feel the majority of emotionally disturbed children should be educated in the regular school environment, if possible. We think this is the best approach, and this is why we have developed a special grant structure for the emotionally disturbed. It is in the special grant section, and why we are developing an increasing number of courses for our teachers to deal with this particular kind of student. And this is the way we feel it should be dealt with—on a general basis, recognizing that through the programme of The Department of Health, in which The Department of Education is very directly involved, that there will always be some of these young people who will be given a special kind of assistance. This is one of the reasons in the philosophy behind the white paper, and the plans announced by my colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), and the approach, on an interdepartmental basis, to whatever percentage of the total group will be required to have this special type of treatment. In general, we hope to look after the bulk of the students within, shall we say, the responsibilities of the divisional boards. The grant regulations reflect this.

Mr. Pitman: What is the grant for psychologists? That is, how much of a grant is given to a particular board who hire a psychologist?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, we do not pay psychologists. We pay a special rate of grants to the boards where they have classes for emotionally disturbed children. This is how we pay the additional funds to the board.

Mr. Pitman: I see. I was wondering if—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The same way as perceptually handicapped, and the whole area of the handicapped child.

Mr. Pitman: Could the Minister indicate how many teachers are taking these courses? I think that many of us have indicated that a preventative service can, perhaps, take place in a classroom and, it seems to me, that this is an extremely important area. I am wondering how many teachers actually are taking courses which would enable them to identify emotionally disturbed children; at least, to some extent, diagnose the difficulties that the child is hampered by and be able to see the degree of emotional disturbance; to see whether this child should be sent to one of the diagnostic or to one of the special centres that The Department of Health and the Minister of Health is concerned with, or whether he should remain in the regular programme or in a special class in that particular school.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have been altering, as the hon. member, perhaps, is aware, the programme at the teachers' colleges to endeavour to give the teachers a greater insight, if possible, into some of these problems. Yet, I cannot say to the hon. member, that this type of training will, in itself, be sufficient for identification in all cases. Obviously, it is going to take a co-ordinated approach, involving the medical people, in making this type of determination. I am not sure, in many cases, that a teacher would be completely competent to make this identification. This is why the proposal of the regional diagnostic centres, so that the teachers, if they have any idea that this child may require special treatment at the school, can refer to the centre for some form of diagnosis.

Mr. Pitman: Well are there any summer courses being provided for teachers who are already in the field?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh yes. There are summer courses now for teachers who are dealing with special education, which involves the perceptually handicapped, the neurologically impaired, as well as the emotionally disturbed; and there are a number of summer courses now relating to the field of special education, and we shall have more.

Mr. Pitman: I am trying to specifically identify emotionally disturbed because, perhaps of the events of the day on which the debate is going on. I really do feel, that in some way, emotionally disturbed individuals are triggered off by the kind of society we have, and the kind of society we do not wish to have. I would suggest that, in many, many cases, the ills that we face in this society are a result of our not having dealt with this problem.

I am just wondering, if the Minister could give any idea as to how many teachers, in the classrooms in Ontario, would have had a specific course which enabled them to understand and, at least to some degree, recognize more dangerous aspects of emotional disturbance in the young people?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure how I could go about getting this figure for the hon. member. What I shall endeavour to do is to get for him, say over the past three or four years, the number of teachers who have gone through these special summer courses. I think I can get this figure for him.

Mr. Pitman: Fine.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Halton West.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Mr. Chairman, just a word regarding the school for the deaf in Milton. We have heard some criticism of the one in Belleville.

I think it would be appropriate for me to make a remark regarding this school, mainly because it is new. It has magnificent facilities now, and I believe they have a complete programme for these unfortunate children from grades 1 to 12.

All special facilities and equipment that is needed for this type of special education is available at Milton. I am not trying to sound like the president of the local junior chamber of commerce, but I think that this can be expected some day in Belleville.

There are at least two Olympic-size swimming pools. There are at least two large gymnasiums, two auditoriums. I think there is every type of facility there for a complete, round education and also to make these children at home. These are boarding schools for these children and I cannot help but feel that when they leave this institution they will

have some advantage of making useful productive citizens.

And also, while I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention the community programmes branch. I believe it is under this particular vote and there are plans and programmes to extend the use of our local school facilities. Certainly the capital costs of schools are very high in this province. The buildings are, for the most part, quite elaborate. Although I think the criticism that we are not using our school facilities particularly, after hours, is at this point, becoming redundant because of the community programmes branch.

For example, in my home town of Burlington, there is an extended programme of arts and crafts, sewing, there are theatre groups, discussion groups and adult instruc-being used enough will be done away with even a local chess club, which uses a classroom once a week and I think that the idea and the plan to use these educational plants by the public is an excellent one.

Now I think next if we will utilize possibly the gymnasiums and even the school grounds themselves a little more—I know this depends a great deal on the local school board and they have to worry about supervision and janitor service and this type of thing—but if the school boards, possibly with some prodding from the department, will use all facilities, all property under their jurisdiction, to have a complete sort of maximum utilization, the criticism that these facilities are not being used enough will be done away with and I think we will have less criticism possibly of the capital costs of these schools.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, since the hon. member has raised the matter of special education for the deaf and the blind, I thought this might be a suitable occasion to follow his lead and draw to the House's attention some of the excellent education that is going on there and the need for expanding facilities.

In quoting from the Minister's additional comments provided at the opening of these estimates, from page 63, he says:

> Residental school for the deaf at Belleville and one for the blind at Brantford have been in use for 98 and 96 years respectively.

And the Minister always speaks the truth in this and he is aware of the fact that the main building, certainly for the education of the blind, is the original building that was built a century ago.

On page 66 of the additional information, the Minister says:

> I am pleased to be able to tell you that planning is in progress for a new senior school and administration building on the campus of the Ontario school for the blind in Brantford.

Now I do not know whether that means that it is going forward this year. Frankly, I doubt it. It has been in the plans for some considerable time and I can certainly tell you, Mr. Chairman, that these facilities could be put to good use by the students who come from all parts of Canada as well as Ontario to receive the kind of education that is most useful to them under those circumstances.

I had the opportunity to visit the school a few months ago and was very much impressed by the interest of the students in the affairs of the community, political and otherwise and I had a great deal of difficulty as a matter of fact, after three hours of visiting classes, in finally taking my leave because their questions were what the Chairman has sometimes called provocative and we had some good discussions.

But I believe the Minister is aware of the need there for the new facilities that he predicts in his remarks and when he says that planning is in progress I am under the impression that the planning has been in progress for some time and that these new facilities are needed now.

The building has been in use for a century and it has stood the test of time obviously very well. I believe we, in this House, would be prepared to support the decision that might be made in conjunction with the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) in the immediate decision to proceed with the construction.

While I am on my feet I think it should be recalled that a year ago we were somewhat critical on this side of the facilities in Belleville; at the school for the deaf. We were informed on good authority that the young people had to vacate the gymnasium if there was a wind of more than 25 miles an hour blowing and it seems that if we are going to continue to be proud of the facilities that we offer for this type of special education then these facilities must, of course, be completely safe and up to date and meeting the needs of the young people concerned.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just for the information of the leader of the Opposition—I can be corrected by my colleague, the Minister of Public Works—but our information is that conceivably the plans could be ready for a tender late in 1968 or perhaps early 1969 for the school for the blind in Brantford—or sooner. I thought that this might be good news for the hon. member. The Minister of Public Works moves very rapidly.

Mr. Nixon: You can do it sooner than late 1968?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East has been trying to get the floor for some time.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I put forward some ideas I thought were needed in the teachers' colleges of Ontario and one of them I mentioned was much greater need for courses in psychology. This relates to the issue raised by my colleague from Peterborough and I would like some comment by the Minister of Education, as to whether they intend to intensify the psychology courses offered at the teachers' colleges. I am not thinking of special summer programmes. I am speaking of the general course throughout the year, so that teachers can detect these children sooner and can assist them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think it is obvious that as we move towards an extended programme of teacher education there will be more time available for psychology and other very basic subjects that are not taught to the degree that they should be right now because of the time limitations. I think the hon. member could anticipate that, as we move to two, three and eventually a four-year programme, there would be more of this in the course. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. Martel: I would just like to ask the Minister if we can raise the questions of high school—colleges at this time. Or shall we wait till vote 518?

Hon. Mr. Davis: If there is a separate vote for the colleges of education—

Mr. Martel: Vote 518.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Vote 518.

Mr. Martel: Fine, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I was more than pleased to hear the comments of the hon. member for Halton West when he made mention of the greater use of school facilities and the fact that sometimes they are not used to the limit to which they could be used. This probably only strengthens my suggestion to the Minister—that of having the boards of education take over the recreation departments in communities. Under the supervision of one body you would have full use of the schools in after-school time. I think it is a very good suggestion, Mr. Chairman, and I think it is worthy of intense study by your department, and I would even suggest implementation.

I could bring to the Minister's attention the other series of suggestions as put forth by the select committee on youth. But rather than read them into the record and prolong the discussion here, I simply would ask the Minister to have his officials give them serious consideration, and at this time I would like to refer to items 7, 8 and 9.

This summer more than any other summer in the past few years it has been most difficult for our high school graduates and our college students to obtain summer employment. I was just wondering if the Minister could not make use of the large numbers of students who cannot find employment and give them some type of programme under either votes 7, 8 or 9 whereby their attendance and the courses that they would take would either provide for them a given amount of dollars in pay, somewhat similar to what the junior rangers receive, or provide them with a scholarship in a university so that they would have that much less to worry about when it comes to financing their education.

Now I know you may come along and say that there are student awards that will take care of the needs of the student. Why not try to have that student earn part of those moneys? I do not know where the work could be provided, maybe you could enlighten us. Possibly the votes that I have mentioned are not the appropriate places, but I know that the youngsters today are having a difficult time and I think that we should do everything we possibly can to see that they can continue their education. I would prefer to see you give them some type of work in some of your programmes rather than simply loaning them the funds and then have a forgiveness feature where they do not have to pay all of the funds back.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am always interested in any suggestion. I am

not sure, from a practical point of view, how one would do what the hon. member is suggesting with respect to votes 7, 8 and 9. The community programme field services division —that is item 9—relates to the continuing programme. It does not relate just to summer months of the community programmes branch, and, of course, 7 and 8 refer to Bark Lake and to Lake Couchiching camps where they have many young people during the summer, but they are there for leadership courses.

Now, they have a limited number of students there for part-time summer help, but the camps are being operated basically to develop leadership courses for the hundreds of students from the secondary school system who spend two, three, and in some cases four weeks there every summer. I have said this before, I wish on occasion some of the members of the House could have an opportunity during the summer months to visit these camps. You cannot help but come away really quite encouraged because of the very high calibre of the young people who are attending, and their real enthusiasm for what they are doing.

It is really a very refreshing experience, but I guess it is too much to anticipate that members of the Legislature could find time to visit some of these installations, but it would be really well worth the visit.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, having visited both of these camps, I know the value of these camps and I speak most highly of them whenever I have the opportunity—especially at the high school level. However, Mr. Chairman, these camps are not used all year round. The college students get out at the first of May, or at the end of April. Possibly you could take them in there and give them two months of training—something that may have some bearing on athletics; or it could be something that may have something to do with social work.

In this way if you took in social work you could also provide, possibly, training and employment for some of the girls so that they could go back into the community and even be of some value on the type of programme we discussed, I think, on the first vote—the early start programme, or whatever it was called. I cannot recall the programme—where we attempt to take the underprivileged and the economically deprived and, by starting them at the three- or four-year age-level, bring them up, so that from possibly two, three or four months of summer vacation, they could eventually go into our school system and be that much better informed.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely would like to see something done by the department, especially in times such as we have now when there are large numbers of our students who cannot get employment. Possibly you could give them employment and training at the same time.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, referring to item 15 in vote 510, pertaining to the Ontario school for the deaf. We have approximately 37 youngsters from the Lakehead area whose parents put them on a train and kiss them goodbye three times a year, and send them down to Belleville. Believe me, there are no real tears in these parents' eyes, because they are sending them on their way for very, very much needed help. I have no hesitation to quote the parents of deaf children in the Lakehead area as saying that the school is a godsend. They do not complain about cramped sleeping quarters or anything else, they are just so happy that it is there.

But there are about a dozen other youngsters there who have not quite reached the school age, and their parents have a very genuine, a sincere concern of the time that is being lost. They feel that surely something could be done for them—for these little children who are starting out with such a handicap in life, before grade 1. And the hon. Minister can correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Chairman, but it is my understanding that they have to wait until age six years before they can get the kind of teaching, and the kind of development, that they need—the kind of help to hear. If this is so, I think that it is about time that the department enter very seriously into the field of special courses or special training for these youngsters who are of preschool age.

Now, perhaps it is just these parents in the Lakehead area who do not have the benefit of preschool-age instruction for their little deaf children, but if that is the case, then it seems to me that the department should be able to make available a teacher for these preschool-age children who cannot come all the way to Belleville.

Mr. Minister, through the Chairman, I would like to have your comments on this, and I have another question after if I may?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we have two people presently on the staff who are, I think, doing something of what the hon. member suggests. They are visiting homes prior to the youngster entering a school, and also involving the parents in, shall we say, programmes that can be helpful. We are

going to extend this complement by an additional four this coming year, and I think we will be able to extend this type of service to the Lakehead. I do not say that this is, you know, a final answer, or a complete answer, but certainly we believe this will be very helpful to the parents and to the children who have this particular problem.

Mr. Knight: Thank you very much. I am very glad to hear that news, and I am sure that these parents will also, Mr. Chairman.

Now this vote also has to do with the select committee on youth, and I do not know if I am out of place here tonight, but inasmuch as the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) is not here, I am sure if he were, he might bring the matter up.

As an alderman in the city of Fort William for the last two years, I have had the privilege of being chairman of the youth committee. We try to involve ourselves with youth. We had a feeling that the summer of 1966 was going to be a long, hot summer from the point of view of youth, and tried to help the youth of the city as much as we could. We wanted to try to head off whatever trouble there might be by expressing some real genuine concern from the top for youth. We became quite active in holding meetings and in trying to correlate the efforts of all youth organizations in social activities throughout the area.

Ultimately, a youth centre was formed. It was nothing to say yippee about, except from the point of view that it was a great success, with the help of certain volunteer people in the community. The youth found a hole in the wall and dressed it up with their own flower decorations on the wall and so forth, and they had quite a swinging centre going there.

As a matter of fact a fellow came up from Texas one time, and I was talking to him there, at the youth centre, and he said: "By George, you know something," he said, "down there we spent $2 million, $2 million, on a spanking new youth centre and we do not draw one-half of the number that you bring into this hole in the wall here." He said: "I have got to hand it to you."

Well, unfortunately, that little den of enthusiasm died last year, and since then the youth of the area have been screaming in various ways—they flooded the Fort William hall a couple of weeks ago to capacity with youngsters pleading for assistance from somewhere to help get their youth centre going again. I later learned that the youth—a certain number of youths—from the city of Port Arthur were trying to get a youth centre going there also. I wonder whether this department, through this particular branch was contemplating any kind of financial assistance or leadership assistance for these youngsters, who seem to be just crying and dying for some kind of youth centre, or social centre? Somewhere to correlate their after-school or after-home activities. I wonder whether there is any way that the youth of the Lakehead could be assisted, by means of a social centre, because I have a feeling that the coming summer might possibly be a long, hot one also, from the point of view of Lakehead youth.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would just communicate this to me very briefly in a letter, we certainly will endeavour to have some personnel visit the Lakehead to meet with some of the youth leaders to see if we can be of any assistance from a leadership standpoint. We have nothing in the estimates for any operating or capital grants for youth programmes in any particular municipality. I think that the hon. member can see the difficulties inherent in this unless it were to be a completely province-wide programme. Certainly we would be quite prepared to have personnel visit the Lakehead and see if they can be of any assistance.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Chairman, I think, speaking to this vote, particularly to items 7 and 8, that the select committee on youth was most impressed with the facilities provided at Lake Couchiching and Bark Lake. So much so, that we felt that there should be other facilities like those provided. As I understand it, just about one student per school throughout the province of Ontario has the opportunity of going to either one of these camps. I would like to draw your attention to recommendation number 112 by the select committee on youth, whereby we have recommended that camps similar to Bark Lake be developed regionally. For example, northwestern Ontario maybe in the Lakehead district, in southern Ontario maybe in the Rideau district of southeast Ontario.

These camps impressed us very much, and I think that the Minister could do a great deal for the young people of this province if he added two or three additional camps as recommended by the select committee on youth. I am wondering if the Minister has any plans in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I guess we have got around to something that has been mentioned by the members of the Opposition from time to time during the last couple of days and that is the question of priority. I think—speaking as the Minister and as far as the officials are concerned, Mr. Chairman—we realize the good job that the existing camps are doing, but we would not object to an additional two or three.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think that we have to recognize the economic limitations. If I had to make the choice of an extension of our programme, say to provide in this year another camp, or do something for the emotionally disturbed or some other aspect of education, this is where the decisions become necessary and difficult.

As far as the overall desirability of extending this type of programme in the province, I am in complete agreement and somewhat prejudiced. I think that the camps do a very excellent job and I wish that there were more youngsters who could participate in the experience.

Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, this may be a suggestion—and I think that this comes from another recommendation of the select committee on youth—that The Department of Lands and Forests recruit young or older high school students or university students in the age bracket of 18 and 19, and give them the job of developing camps such as this. In this way you accomplish two things. You would be giving very worthwhile employment to the young people who need it very badly, and at the same time would be getting facilities that you could use for leadership training when they were completed.

I would hope that, once the amalgamation takes place between the department of youth and the community programme branch, very close liaison would be set up with The Department of Lands and Forests so that you could use their skill and facilities to get some of these facilities that are so badly needed.

While I am on my feet, I might draw your attention to number 4. I understand that in the schools for the blind in Brantfod, education is given up to the grade 12 level. I believe that you also recommended that these facilities be made available so that you could give grade 13 in the school for the blind. I am wondering if this has been done or if the department is planning to do it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I will just check this out, but I believe that we have grade 13 now in the school for the blind.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the debates in the education estimates usually develop into an exercise in debate between the teaching profession and the hon. Minister, and I—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The teaching profession always wins.

Mr. Sargent: They always win, but I have not obtained much education. I am on somewhat bad ground here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh no, you are on par.

Mr. Sargent: I think it is nice to have the views of the taxpayer who is not an egghead type. I say this respectfully, this is a matter of great concern to the average person. There are a few things I think we should ask ourselves, Mr. Chairman, and I say this respectfully. What protection has free enterprise in this province of ours, in the Ontario system of education, whereby the great majority of teachers in our schools are so socialistic, and they continually brainwash our people on the evils of free enterprise and that the socialistic system is the one that they must bring into play?

I think that on behalf of the taxpayer, this is an area, Mr. Chairman, for some policing of the curriculum or the right of teachers to force their views on students. I do not think that this is to be taken lightly. The chairman is trying to find where this comes into the vote, but I am leading up to it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was trying to find it myself.

Mr. Sargent: Sometimes a bit of truth comes from the unknowledgeable people like myself. But there is a great area of concern, as far as I am concerned about socialists forcing their ideas upon my kid. It is becoming more than a joke these days. Most of the teachers are socialists. This is a matter of record amongst people that I have been talking to. I think that there should be something said to the department or boards of education, that there is an area of ethics insofar as what they can lecture them on.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The whole educational system is socialistic.

Mr. Sargent: Now I would suggest that, as a taxpayer, I have a right to say to my board

of education that no one can use the teaching profession as a platform to espouse a doctrine that is aimed at defeating the system that is paying for what we have in this great country. That is what is happening today.

They are all great guys and they will smarten up some time. But maybe in the process, our economy gets bad. The first ones to get elected are the socialists if things get bad. There is an area of concern here. What control do you have over boards of education? Can you instruct them that these things should not happen?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You sound like Allan Lamport.

Mr. Sargent: He is not too bad either.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did you want to make a speech?

Mr. Sargent: I have got further remarks, but I wanted to hear your views on this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but observe the great interest that the leader of the Opposition is taking in this subject, with his smile, and I just wonder if he agrees with everything that the hon. member said?

Mr. Sargent: I do not expect he agrees with me.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I do not think that I agree with the statement that the great majority of teachers in the school system are socialists. I have a very high regard for the teachers of this province, and I think that they are too enlightened to be socialists. Will that do as an answer?

Mr. MacDonald: Some pretty slick verbal skating!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, that is unkind, I should not have said that Mr. Chairman. I do say this. I do not think that anybody—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I sum up my remarks to the hon. member by saying that I do not think that anybody is enthusiastic about teachers proselytizing in the school system with respect to political convictions. I recognize that this may happen in certain situations.

Mr. Chairman, I expect I probably hear more about what goes on in the school system than the hon. member. I hear more complaints probably than the hon. member and while I am sure it does happen from time to time, ask some of the teachers here in the House just how often they think it goes on within the schools. I question whether it is really as rampant as the hon. member would suggest.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your views but it does not have to be very rampant to be serious.

But the thing that is important under this vote, Mr. Chairman, is that the press reports today carried a statement that 100,000 students were out of work for summer employment. I do not know whether we can talk about this, on this vote. It is not the Minister's responsibility to carry them ten months of the year and look after them the other two months too. I do not suggest it is—well it is not working. You see the free enterprise system cannot look after this great work force of 100,000 people who have great potential for our economy. We have a great lot of energy which is not being directed and there is an area of responsibility some place for someone on the Treasury bench to find out the answer. We are talking about Ontario—100,000 students out of work this summer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member. I enjoy his contributions to these debates. I just point out that I really do not know where, in this vote, this discussion would come and I think the hon. member has asked this question of the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) on one or two occasions and there have been some answers to it. I just do not know how much more we can discuss it.

Mr. Sargent: He does not know anything either.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not see any item here in vote 510. I just do not see it.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that with an 800,000 work force that is unemployed and needs money to operate again this year in university and high schools, we could do this. We could give them a summer course in the various trades that they will need in their lifetime, and not all the hocus pocus that they are getting through school now and they will never use. Give them some basic things. Now this is not funny; this is an average guy talking, I believe. Our kids go to school and they get all this jazz they never use anyway, so teach them something in the summer months that they can use in their lifetime. Here we have a work force that we can put to work. You spent $2.5 million the other day on a study

for transportation. You are going to spend another $15 million on studies in this government this year. Any part of that $15 million would be a great boon to these students who need attention, who need to be recognized.

Here we go through these estimates and I do not know what is going on with the Minister, he appears to be knowledgeable. My leader has given you a very good springboard on these estimates. Those things are very important but the basic things that count for people are not listened to, and I think that there is an area of concern, of responsibility, Mr. Chairman, to give these students leadership training courses. You could give them a crash course in psychiatry to work in the—there goes the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman)—he is batting his head again; he does not have an answer; he is no psychiatrist but—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am listening.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you very much.

We would like some jobs for the students. See what you can do.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 510; the member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: I am sorry to end the fun hour, but I wonder if I could ask the Minister one or two things about the shortage of trained teachers in the area for perceptionally handicapped. I was interested in the comment made by the school psychologist—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt and I am prepared to be pretty flexible, but really the question of teacher supply and qualifications of teachers in the area of special education should have come under the teacher education section of the estimates. This relates to special schools and services which we administer as a department. It does not relate to the availability of this vote of teachers within the regular school system, whether for perceptionally handicapped or emotionally disturbed. As I say, I do not want to adhere to any rigid laws but that is where the question should have been asked.

Mr. Pitman: Fine. I wonder if the Minister has any comments to make or any suggestions or any plans in regard to the correspondence courses, which I think do come under this vote. It would seem to me that with the development of educational television there might very well be a tie-in between that and the correspondence courses branch. I would assume that a good deal of the educational television will be concerned with adult education and I am wondering what plans there are for tying-in these two areas.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there is no plan at the moment to tie-in the correspondence courses with, shall we say, courses related to adult education. We are just not in a position to do so this year. We have extended the correspondence courses, and I think there are some 5,000 more students this year taking correspondence courses. As I related to the House last year, we have some experience with senior grade levels with very excellent results. But there is no plan at the moment to relate, shall we say, the correspondence courses and the potential that exists for adult education through ETV.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 510; the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if the community programmes branch is finally geared to work on Indian reserves? There is some delay in the application there. I know that the Minister has expressed his intent for two or three years that the availability of this programme would be extended to Indian reserves. I would like to know if it is now available.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, in the reorganization which is now taking place of the community programmes branch with the youth branch, the establishment will be set up so that they can deal with the situation, in order to develop programmes for the Indian reserves. This is a part of their programme.

Mr. Nixon: Are there any now? Are there any programmes now?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not sure whether there will be any ready for this, shall we say, summer but we hopefully will have some programmes ready by the fall.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 510; the member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if under this vote the education of immigrant children in the English language would come under this?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would think that probably the best vote for that

would be vote 516, the legislative grants, because this is the money that is made available to the local boards for the operation of the classes for the new Canadian children.

Mr. Trotter: Vote 516?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Vote 516, yes.

Vote 510 agreed to.

On vote 511:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I suppose there are two votes that deal with colleges of applied arts and technology. I do not know whether you want to go into them together or what?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think, Mr. Chairman, vote 511 relates to the moneys that are used internally within the operation of the branch and it relates basically to the college programme. But there are other services, and perhaps we could have a discussion of votes 511 and 520 at the same time because they are covering the same general area.

Mr. Nixon: I do not know when you want to do it, now or perhaps at a later time, but I would begin by asking the Minister why, if the colleges are autonomous under their own boards, such an inexpensive branch of his own department is necessary in order to co-ordinate their efforts.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, if you will look at the estimates of The Department of University Affairs you will find a fair sum. We try to keep administration down to look after the administrative details for the universities. I mean there have to be certain functions relating to the payment of grants, assistance in the development of curriculum, the question of approval of architectural design for the colleges themselves, and of course, part of this sum is also used for the programmes with respect to manpower training, our relationship with the federal manpower programme. So this is why this sum is necessary.

Mr. Nixon: You have the duplication of a number of the basic functions of the department. For example, in curriculum and programme, you have a duplication in the educational television branch. Yes, you said this afternoon that you had curriculum people in educating—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have the liaison; we have very close—

Mr. Nixon: Oh yes, liaison, but you indicated that some of the moneys that were being spent went for educational television and were to finance those people who were expert in approving programmes, and that they did not have to go to the curriculum section *per se* of the department. The same is true here, that you have evidently in vote 511 those experts in building design approval, which could very well have come under vote 503. Surely, there is some integration possible here. I agree that it is worthwhile to keep the colleges of applied arts and technology separate as much as possible, but if you want to do that why not put them as true post-secondary institutions in the other department entirely?

Mr. Chairman: Might I ask the Minister before he replies whether it is favourable to him to discuss vote 511 along with 520 at the present time? Does he have to bring new staff to the table or will we proceed?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, we can go ahead, it does not matter.

Mr. Chairman: We will discuss votes 511 and 520 now, together.

Mr. Nixon: I understand. The Minister was about to give, before the Chairman wanted to make his point clear, some information as to why it is necessary to keep the basic functions separate from the rest of The Department of Education for the colleges of applied arts and technology.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, it is purely administrative. There is not a duplication of estimates, there is not a duplication of personnel. In other words, there are so many tasks to be performed. We have people in the school approval section who deal with elementary and secondary physical plant, and we have personnel in the applied arts and technology branch dealing with the college programme. It is not a duplication.

Mr. Nixon: Is that a speciality?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, quite a speciality. When you are dealing with a $12 million or $14 million facility, as will be probably the average cost, it takes some degree of specialization.

Mr. Nixon: Surely the people in the Minister's department who approve building designs at the $3 million to $5 million level could extend themselves to give approval for this sort of building.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But you add personality; you know, it is a straight question of administration, that is all.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but if you have half an acre of personnel and you say, "All right, you people on this side of the building deal only with colleges of applied arts and technology, and the people on the other side of the room deal only with elementary and secondary schools," you are certainly setting up very artificial divisions which surely are uneconomic.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, as I say, this vote also relates to the other vote as administered by this particular branch. We have the training programme, the training-in-industry programme, and the programmes that we operate in conjunction with the federal authorities; these are all administered under this particular vote.

Mr. Nixon: I thought those training-in-industry programmes came under the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales).

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no; they are courses that are given under the direction of The Department of Education within industry that relate to the responsibilities of The Department of Education. And the same in the field of manpower; we have a co-operative agreement with the federal government.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister as far as these two votes are concerned, to what extent the federal government will be picking up a significant amount of the moneys that we are actually approving here tonight or being asked to approve.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure how we could get this figure out of vote 511; I could give him a rough approximation in vote 520.

Mr. Nixon: There are $46 million in all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say of the $45,747,000, probably $22 million—and this is just an approximate figure—when you include the cost of the operation of the Ontario council of regents, I think you would have to take that out; I do not think we are getting any recovery on that.

Mr. Nixon: That is $64,00 right there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right. And I do not believe we are getting anything on item 3, but just generally speaking it is 50 per cent of the operating costs, which would be in the neighbourhood of $22 million to $22.5 million.

Mr. Nixon: The grants of $45 million are operating grants only, and not capital grants, is that so?

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder to what extent additional public funds would be made available through The Department of Public Works for capital requirements?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There will not be funds through The Department of Public Works, Mr. Chairman; the funds will be through the corporation, the capital aid corporation. The schools are being built, the colleges are being built by the board of governors, and we are financing them through the corporation. Of course, there is no recovery from the federal jurisdiction on capital at all.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, that is right. Well, that will be about $174 million or $175 million we are asked to vote in still another vote for the corporation. To what extent would those funds be channelled into community college construction?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the total sum, as the hon. leader says, is about $175 million, and until we have all, shall we say, the submissions from the universities and a more up-to-date figure from the total number of colleges, I cannot give him an exact figure. But I would think that of the $175 million, perhaps $40 million to $45 million—and this is just an approximation—would be available for capital purposes for the college programme.

Mr. Nixon: So this year something close to $100 million—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Between $80 million and $85 million, I think would be very close.

Mr. Nixon: We have $45 million here, and the Minister just said $45 million, so that would be $90 million which is being directed by the Minister to the development of the colleges of applied arts and technology—that most inconvenient name that has been given to these organizations.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I should interject here that the figure I gave of $40 million to $45 million will probably include a sum of between $10 million and $14 million for Ryerson, which is part of the $175 million.

Mr. Nixon: I see. The Minister is probably aware of some complaints that have filtered

through from the staff of the former vocational schools that came under his direct supervision. The staff, as I understand it, were considered civil servants at that time. The transference from the direct supervision of the department to the autonomy of the community college situation has left a few of them stranded by the wayside, and the autonomous boards have not seen fit to renew the contract of everyone who had been employed in the previous circumstances.

Does the Minister have a board of review so that he can assure us that no injustices in this regard have been done? There is one outstanding case the Minster may have heard of that I do not think has to be raised in detail here, and if he is not aware of this single case I would just like to ask it in general.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think I may be aware of the single case, if we are talking about the same case. I do not know—

Mr. Nixon: He is from Algonquin.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I do not recall really any other situation being brought to my attention. I could be wrong in this, but there certainly have been no more major problems as we understand it with the transfer. I guess you would face this situation even if the institutions had remained under departmental supervision or jurisdiction, if, as must happen on occasion, there are teachers or instructors who perhaps are not doing the task, and whether you retain them within the institution. I think really we have been very fortunate in the transfer operation that we have had a minimum of difficulty.

Mr. Nixon: And that difficulty actually has boiled down to only one case?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would not want to be held to that, Mr. Chairman, but I do not think there have been very many, and this is the one that I know of, or at least that has come to my attention.

Mr. Nixon: As I understand it, the civil service association is now the accepted bargaining agent for the teachers or the staff at the colleges of applied arts and technology. I would hope there would be some association with other teachers' organizations so that in the submissions these staffs may make to the Minister from time to time there will be some co-ordination.

But I am concerned as well, as far as these institutions are concerned, with the transfer rights the students should have, in my view, into the regular university stream. With a great deal of reluctance the committee of university presidents have agreed that there would be transference. This was assured by the Minister in his earliest statements about community colleges, although I had some objections at the time because there was not a clear right of transference, but only the need to impress upon the deans and registrars concerned, the individual's ability to take university work.

I feel very strongly that an approach of that type tends to enforce the rules of conformity to an unnecessary degree. I believe very strongly as well that there should be a clear, defined path leading from the community colleges to the regular degree-granting processes of the universities. I am not at all convinced that the university presidents have granted that in their rather reluctant statement of some weeks ago. There is no uniformity in the statement that came forward at that time.

I cannot quote it now—I quoted it in my introductory remarks—but some presidents were looking for high standing in the last year or in the second year of community college work and others were looking for a consistent high standing over the academic career of the student concerned. I hope we can be assured that there will a clear-cut and well-understood path whereby a student can transfer from Ryerson or community colleges in general to a degree-granting institution without the feeling that special favours are being conferred at any level.

This is a situation that has been of some importance since the first announcements about community colleges. The Minister has tried to straddle the fence in this in saying that no student of ability would be denied the right to proceed, and with this statement he has managed to calm the fears of many. I think really in the name of justice, there has to be a clearly defined and well understood path so that a student can elect academic or other courses which are designed and designated as giving access at least to university entrance at an advanced level.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have already made several statements. I thought the hon. member for Peterborough might want to comment on this, then I would say something after he finished.

Mr. Pitman: I would indeed like to comment on this point, and I do not want in any way to seem to be defending the university in this case, but it seems to me that there is a matter which is of some significance in this.

I think that if there is any further link given between the cost of applied arts and technology and the universities, you might very well find a distortion in the programmes of the colleges of applied arts and technology. I think it is not just a matter of giving freedom to the individual student to move from a college of applied arts and technology to a university. I think one also has to make sure that the student can move successfully and effectively from a college of applied arts and technology to a university. Just simply to give a paper qualification to every student who emerges from a second year successfully with a certain percentage, would be a gross injustice if this meant an automatic acceptance into a programme in a university in which the student had absolutely no preparation. If you assume that the individual student—

Mr. Nixon: No one is suggesting that they go into medicine.

Mr. Pitman: I can assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that I am not even speaking of medicine. I am speaking of even far more general arts—general science—I suggested the first year in a college of applied arts and technology might very well not prepare a student for this. I suggest even more that if the college of applied arts and technology distorted its programmes in such a way as to create the impresison that 100 per cent of students were going into the second year of a university, then I think this would be a very unfortunate aspect to these colleges.

I think these colleges have a specific role —a very special role, a very important role, a significant role—in their own area. I would be the first to suggest that the students in the colleges of applied arts and technology should be given every opportunity, and where possible the courses should be provided, but I suggest that this would have to be done without that kind of distortion. So I would hope that the Minister will not take actions which will in some way distort the programmes of the colleges, making them less effective for the 70, 80 perhaps 90 per cent of the students who will be going through them in order to comply with some kind of relationship with the universities.

Mr. Nixon: Before the Minister answers, if Mr. Chairman will permit, I want to make it clear that if the student at the college of applied arts and technology elects to take on specialized courses like advanced paramutual computer work, or something like that, then of course that is his decision. But it seems to me that the decision should be made at the highest level that the community colleges will have a core of liberal arts—in the generally understood meaning of that phrase—that should be a community preparation for a degree-granting institution, and if there is a loss of a year in this regard I think that would be understandable, although regrettable. I do not feel for a moment that every student of a college of applied arts and technology should *per se* have the right to proceed, but there must be in every one of these colleges in my view the true open-ended course that will permit them to continue their education.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I need comment at length. We have discussed this on many occasions, and I must say I was very encouraged by the statement from the committee of presidents several days ago, which I think is a very clear indication not only of their intentions in this regard, but—

Mr. Nixon: I had the feeling you beat it out of them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member really gives me more credit than I deserve—

Mr. Nixon: I give you the credit of a $2 billion budget—

Mr. MacDonald: That is a lot of beating.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, whatever the reason the hon. member has for thinking we did or did not have any hand in it, I only say this, that I was quite encouraged by the position taken by the university presidents. I think this, and I have said this all along, that it is still very difficult to, shall we say, lay out specific guidelines, because the courses themselves in the colleges are still in the formative stage. There has been no opportunity on the part of the universities to evaluate this point on some of the courses being offered—as I have said, and I was delighted to hear the member for Peterborough say, and I have said this many times in the last six or eight months in this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member will recall I completely left my prepared script on that occasion, so he might be able to tell me what I said, and I could not disagree with him. I only say that it is very important that these institutions establish their own identity, their own viability, their own acceptance on the part of the public. I think

this is the basis to the entire programme, and I think the day has come, and I sense this in all the material I read, that not only is there a growing acceptance on the part of the public, but there is a genuine enthusiasm for the role that the colleges may play.

I think we have moved away from the day when people referred to dead-end or terminal institutions. I think that those who have said this in the past are recognizing that this was not a valid description of the concept of these institutions. So I say, Mr. Chairman, I am heartened by two things here tonight; one is, of course, the position taken by the presidents of the universities, and the other is the really constructive approach taken by the leader of the Opposition, recognizing that it is not easy to completely define all of these things at this stage, and of course, by the member for Peterborough who himself suggests that these institutions must have a validity on their own. I could go on all night on the college programme if you like, but I do not intend to.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I had really no great intention of getting into this debate at all until I did recall the Minister's remarks at Seneca College. It is very interesting really to go to one of the ceremonies. I had the privilege of being invited and the privilege of hearing the Minister deliver his off-the-cuff remarks, as he said he threw his notes away.

Mr. Nixon: Did you help cut the ribbon?

Mr. Singer: Oh there was all sorts of pomp and circumstance; you never saw such a thing, you would not believe it. We had on the three-cornered hats and the robes. Oh yes, and they were bowing to each other and people were helping each other on with their hoods.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not have on a hat.

Mr. Singer: Did you not have a hat?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No I did not.

Mr. Singer: And then one of the governors of that particular board—mail-order doctorate, you know the one I am referring to—was most impressive. I am sure that kind of pomp and circumstance impresses the hon. member for Peterborough, who is a member of the staff of one of those colleges, I think it is called Trent, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, that is a university, be very careful—

Mr. Singer: But the impression I came away with, Mr. Chairman, was that they are replacing all of the functions of the university, all of the ceremonial functions. I am sorry my colleague from Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) is not here to explain to me in more flowered language, but he would have been impressed had he been there with me, and watched in this great amphitheatre with the seats built up on the banks and the spotlights focused on to the trading of the three-cornered hats from one to the other, and the placing of robes, and the bowing and the scraping and so on. He would have been duly impressed, as I was, with the idea that here was the acme of performance that any academic organization could supply. In itself the ceremony seemed to be a dead-end. Why go to university? You have much better ceremonies here at these junior colleges.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that I am concerned about, the thing that I am very seriously concerned about, is where the Minister starts in channelling people into these junior colleges. Somewhere along the line the separation between the five-year courses and the four-year courses takes place. And the four-year people have little alternative but to go to these junior colleges. Grudgingly, there has been a very small recognition of the fact that possibly a few of them can get on to the universities. But whether the Minister likes the word "dead-end" or "terminal" or any other descriptive phrase along the same line, the fact is that this seems to be the pattern. And all of the sound and symbols and fury and parading and so on, seems designed to promote this; this is your alternative, and we are going to replace—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you saying that everybody should go to university?

Mr. Singer: No, I am not saying everybody should go to university.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Then what are you after?

Mr. Singer: No, I would be much happier, Mr. Chairman, if I heard some reasonable way in which there could be an analysis of those people who have the ability to go to university. In my experience, and it is very limited; I do not parade as an educationist and I do not parade—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Well, that is fine. That is fine. Okay. I do not pretend at all, Mr. Chairman, to have the great fund of knowledge that the Minister has in this, but I emerged from that ceremony feeling that here was a bunch of absolutely nothing going on, where a group of people were parading around with all

these robes, and making great speeches, and going through great ceremony to replace, in the minds of the students, the equivalent ceremony in university.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The students were not there. This was the installation of the president, as I recall.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I know. Most impressive.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought he made a very excellent speech.

Mr. Singer: I am sure he did, I agree.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And that the chairman of the board of governors did very well.

Mr. Singer: With great respect, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, he made a far better speech than the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sure he did.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but the whole point, insofar as I was concerned, was that this whole ceremony impressed itself on me as being a "dead-end"; that there was no opportunity for 99.9 per cent of those students to emerge from that educational institution into the universities. And there was no encouragement given by the president, and there was no real encouragement given by the Minister. I am not saying that all of those students should be able to, but there should be an opportunity and an encouragement presented, because when you do the separation quite a few years earlier in your secondary institutions, there is no ability from there on in for a pupil to extract himself from them. Now there it is, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister, tonight, despite all he is trying to tell me in speeches, is saying "everyone should not go to university."

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not say that. I said "are you saying everybody should?" that is all I asked.

Mr. Singer: No, but you have not answered the question. Nor has there been, in this vast programme of expenditure, any real answer. And I say that the programme misses something very important in this, and it is time the Minister, through these colleges, began to give some of the answers to those young people who are anxious to be able to remove themselves from this arbitrary streaming that they have been subjected to.

Mr. Nixon: The old-fashioned Robarts plan.

Mr. Singer: Yes, and get themselves back into the university stream if they have the ability and the desire to go on.

Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, maybe I can give a couple of examples that might illustrate the value of these so-called community colleges. This came to me on two occasions, from two different parents who indicated, to me, how pleased they were that there was a college such as this in the Kingston area. And these were students who were in the five-year course who, for various reasons, had become rather disinterested in school. They wanted to drop out of school, and when the college opened last September in Kingston, they enrolled in the college. The parents said to me that you have never seen such a change in the attitude of two young people, anywhere. And I think that this illustrates one of the great contributions that these colleges are providing for our young people in this province. And, as far as I am concerned, the success of St. Lawrence College in Kingston has proved, beyond a doubt, the great value of these colleges of applied arts and technology. I was very heartened to see the statement by the university principals that they were opening the door—not very far mind you—but there were—

Mr. Nixon: A pretty frosty statement that was!

Mr. Apps: That is right, they were opening the doors, to some extent, so that pupils from these colleges could continue on to university. I think you will find, that as these colleges develop, that these doors will be opened wider and wider and, eventually, I believe, that there will be courses developed in the community colleges that will lead directly to universities. I would like to congratulate the Minister on the initiative and the speed in which these colleges have developed. I feel that they are making a great contribution to the young people of this province.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the member for Kingston and the Islands has taken the bait so nicely dangled by the Minister. No one criticized those junior colleges. They are doing a fine job. But, the concern that many of us have is that they are designed to be, and they are continuing to be designed to be, dead-end institutions. The last part of the remarks of the member for Kingston and the Islands saying that the door was open a little bit, he meant there is a tiny crack, maybe visible, and that is all. And some of us would feel much more comforted, if there

was a more authoritative definition of how the door could be pushed wider open. There is nothing, yet, that I have been able to see from my own observations, that indicates this is happening. The thing that I am so concerned about, is that the streaming that takes place as a result of the so-called Robarts plan, takes place and affects youngsters at an age when, perhaps, a great number of mistakes can be made. But once they get streamed, they are facing that dead-end. The junior colleges, while of some substantial help to an awful lot of people in the province and an important part of our educational system, are not the answer. We are losing a great number of people because the door is kept almost tightly closed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But, they are the answer.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on this point, I was wondering, if the member for Kingston and the Islands was aware that this government, and particularly this department, has practically ignored every recommendation made by his committee. It was drawn to my attention on this very subject, having to do with the colleges of applied arts. Now, it was admitted that there was a great need for colleges of applied arts, and nobody on the committee seemed to question it, regardless of their party. This committee made various recommendations, I think about 80 recommendations having to do with education affecting youth, and from what I can gather, nothing under this particular estimate has been done in relation to the committee's recommendations; nor in practically any other government department, because each time this particular matter has come up, I have sent to the library for the committee on youth's report, and I am astonished that of the 276 recommendations made by that committee chairman, the member for Kingston and the Islands, hardly anything has been touched.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): That is not true!

Mr. Trotter: It certainly is true, what I am saying. What I regret most sincerely, on this particular item mentioned, as the member for Downsview has said, are the tremendous dropouts, because the committee on youth drew to the attention of the Legislature, through its report, that we, in this province, fail to give the students who attend the colleges—I think the formal name is applied arts and technology—the same opportunity as they do in other jurisdictions, to continue in their education. I do not intend to belabour this point, Mr. Chairman, but I can refer to page 66 of the report, made by the committee on youth. What I would like to draw to the attention of the committee, Mr. Chairman, while this matter has come up, is that, unfortunately, when these select committees are formed, and they made good reports on this very item—matters worth considering—that it seems to be that the efforts, and the time, and expense of these committees are utterly wasted.

Now, the Minister of this department has had approximately a year and a half to digest what this committee on youth had to say about education. It can be mentioned under many estimates, Mr. Chairman, but because we are on applied arts and technology, I think it is extremely important—this particular item. It could also be discussed, I guess, under the item "estimate on youth," but what concerns me is that this particular committee on youth made an excellent report. It had the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not want to interrupt, but did the hon. member refer me to specific recommendations in the youth committee report?

Mr. Trotter: Yes, on page 66.

Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, I think on a point of order here.

Mr. Trotter: Recommendations 73 to 77.

Mr. Apps: I would like to just go through those recommendations.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Would the member for Kingston and the Islands indicate, to the Chairman, what the point of order is?

Mr. Apps: What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the member for Parkdale has indicated that The Department of Education has not implemented any of the recommendations in this particular section.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Apps: And the point of order is that they have. I am not the champion for The Department of Education any more than anyone else is. But if you would go through those recommendations, you will see that of the five recommendations there are three that have been implemented and half of one of the others. The last one is a study which has been undertaken to determine how many Ontario secondary school students should leave the province for post-secondary education and why.

Mr. Singer: Surely, Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order.

Mr. Apps: I am just trying to point out that of those five recommendations more than half of them have been implemented.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, are you not going to call him to order or is he going to be able to read the whole report?

Mr. Trotter: I would say this, Mr. Chairman, that some of these colleges were begun before this committee on youth was ever formed. As a result, the committee making the recommendations had this to say regarding the colleges of applied arts:

> Many Ontario colleges are finding that numbers of their students are going to American junior colleges for college courses that are not offered near them or cannot be obtained because their passing marks in grade 13 do not make them eligible to attend Ontario universities.

The same problem is still going on and the effort simply has not been made. It has been known for years, even without a committee on youth being formed, that this was a problem in this province. What the committee on youth did was to try to highlight this problem and I point out that the provincial government has not begun to deal with the problem.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But the fact is that the college programme is under way. Let us accept it. It is doing very well in the hon. member's community too.

Mr. B. Newman: It could do a lot better, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Your community is one that is being approved for a larger physical plant as well.

Mr. Nixon: They are meeting in supermarkets now.

Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, the only recommendation of this group here that has not been implemented is the one in which we recommended that there should be an easier path between community colleges and universities. That is the only recommendation in this particular group that has not been implemented. We have discussed that and I have already mentioned the fact that I have been encouraged—whether the members in the Opposition have been encouraged or not I do not know—but I have been encouraged with the attitude of the university presidents who at one time were very inflexible. I think they have now seen the light and are gradually opening the way for this transition to take place.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite right. I would say to the House that in a report of that kind if you are batting four out of five and with some real success in the fifth, Mr. Chairman, I think we have made very real progress.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The Porcupine campus of the northern college of applied arts and technology had this past year, I believe, a very excellent dean, Mr. John McLeod. To my chagrin I read this past week that he was leaving the college and going to pursue further studies. Now I think that the results at that campus this year were very encouraging—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Tell the member for Parkdale so he will know.

Mr. Ferrier: Well we had a dean that was very progressive in his thinking and I think that—

Mr. Nixon: Have you got a new dean coming?

Mr. Ferrier: Well just wait until I make my speech. You can make yours and I will make mine.

I think he accomplished a great deal with those young people, that there was a good rapport. I think the results were very outstanding. They had a year book in the first year of operation, something these other colleges have not had in three years. I think, when we get a progressive educationist like this, that steps should be taken to see that he is still within the system while he is going out for a little more education. I would hate to see us lose progressive educationists like this. I hope the Minister will take steps to see that such people just are not lost in any number at all.

Mr. Chairman: Votes 511 and 520. The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on one or two problems that I see arising in these colleges. First I can say that we are pleased that these colleges have been able to accommodate 15,000 young people who otherwise might not have been in the post-secondary system. However, I am concerned about the future of these colleges in view of what I feel is the rather disturbing lack of status which the staffs of these colleges have. Sometime last summer,

I think, the colleges were declared to be Crown agencies and the employees thus became Crown employees. I think this is an inappropriate status; I think it is inappropriate for people who should be assured of academic freedom. I think it is inappropriate when I think the Minister hopes to see these colleges achieve the status—with a different role—but the same status as other post-secondary institutions such as universities.

Now, as the leader of the Opposition has mentioned, it appears that at present the CSAO is the bargaining agent. I think they are automatically the bargaining agent once the decision is made that they are Crown agencies. I cannot help wondering why some other form of status was not found. It seems to me that in the Minister's comments to the House the other night he mentioned that the Ontario government could have run these colleges as they had previously run the technical institutes, but the hope was that they would be independent, that they would be locally controlled, that there would be a good deal of achievement in terms of local interest. Now I think this is a proper decision. I think it was the right decision. I think it is wholly unfortunate through some legalistic complication that these colleges are declared to be Crown agencies. I think it is unfortunate too that for that reason the employees then find themselves to be virtually Crown employees —not civil servants, I realize, but Crown employees.

I think that this brings up the question, and I know that there was oblique reference tot the individual in, I think, Algonquin College, a Dr. Stenger. There was a great deal of difficulty, and there was a rather oblique reference to the fact that you were sure that was the only case.

I am not so sure that case has been dealt with. What I would like to know from the Minister is just what has happened in relation to Dr. Stenger. Now, the information that I have—and I read simply from documents, not written by Dr. Stenger, but by the Minister—is that the principal of the previous college, had been written by the new principal of the Algonquin Colleges of applied arts and technology. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am appalled at the way in which this man was treated.

Now, I hold no brief for Dr. Stenger as an educationist. I do not know—in fact I am not sure that the Minister or the principal at Algonquin College really know—because as far as I can see no definite charge has been laid against Dr. Stenger at all. What I think has happened is that there was a first class effort to oust Dr. Stenger without any legal right to do so. Then there has been an appalling wastage of public funds to shore up the mistake that was made by that particular board of governors of the college itself, who, I assume, is the responsible agency in this case.

You have a situation whereby the statements and letters of the Minister himself that these employees had guarantees that they were to remain on the staff of Algonquin College, once the eastern Ontario institute of technology disappeared. Then you have an effort to oust Dr. Stenger at the end of May. Then in July there is a return to the old situation, and he is put back on staff. He receives a letter a few months later indicating that he is now to disregard the letter that he received in May and he is back on staff. He arrives at the college and there is no teaching position for him. He does not even have a desk in the college. He is then virtually told that he has the option of accepting a job for four months, and this goes on and on and on. It is indicative that the guarantee of the Minister of Education would be effective for that four-month period. Then he is not given a teaching position, but he is told that he can go and carry on a research project. This project has no meaning whatsoever, that I can find, and he is not even given a desk in the college to carry out the research project. There are not even books in the library to carry out the project. Yet this man is being paid $12,000 a year to do this.

Now, I am putting this forward, and I want to know essentially in the first case, what has been done in relation to this person—because if this could happen to a secondary school teacher, you know that all hell would break loose. The Minister would have a board of reference, there would be all kinds of problems. It could never even happen in the university.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There would not be all kinds of problems because there would be a board of reference and it would be resolved.

I am not familiar with the details of the case, quite frankly Mr. Chairman. I do know of it, and I can tell you this much, that I understand that this is subject to correction and I will endeavour to find out for the hon. member. That Dr. Stenger has had some negotiation in the last few days with the Algonquin board, and apparently has accepted the offer that was made last fall, now I will confirm this for the hon. member. This is just the information that I have here tonight.

Mr. Pitman: As I said, I intend to pursue the matter.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not know what I shall find.

Mr. Pitman: The situation at this point was that he had not been paid since September because he would not sign a letter in which he would have accepted that offer, and that would have been the end of it. I do not know, but I certainly have heard of no change in the situation in the last few days. But I suggest to the Minister that the staffs of these colleges of applied arts and technology will not be able to have the same kind of status until this is resolved.

Now, I brought a matter to the attention of the Minister's department and I was treated most fairly in regard to this matter, but I came to the very serious conclusion that the department itself was in a situation in which it did not want to be. I would hope that this would be resolved. This referred to a Mr. Harold Wilson who wanted to run for political office in the city of Ottawa. So what happened?

He was told that he could have two weeks without pay. Well, I do not care what political party for which he was running, but if he was in a university—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who does he work for, which party was it—

Mr. Pitman: Algonquin College again, and he was running for the New Democratic Party, but this is a completely irrelevant aspect of the matter. If he was running for the Liberals or the Conservatives, I would state his case with the same amount of enthusiasm. The point is that I am sure the Minister has read the resolutions, for example of the University of Toronto, about candidacy for political office, and perhaps he has read the resolutions of other universities. On this matter, the man could have had his holidays and campaigned during his holiday, but this is the offer: two weeks without pay.

I suggest to the Minister—and as I say, it is not because of any illiberal attitude on the part of the Minister I am sure, or on the part of the board of governors, or the part of anyone in his department.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not determine whether he should have two weeks or four weeks.

Mr. Pitman: I realize this, Mr. Chairman. I am not bringing a charge, but I am suggesting—

Mr. Nixon: He used illiberal!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, I see—

Mr. Pitman: Well, I hope that all of this levity does not indicate a lack of concern on the part of the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am totally aware of the point that the hon. member is making, Mr. Chairman—with no levity at all. I know exactly what he is saying.

Mr. Pitman: I do hope that he will bring to some conclusion the status of staff members of the applied arts and technology colleges. They will not be able to perform the kind of function, and they will not have the kind of academic freedom that I am sure the Minister wants them to have as long as they are Crown employees, and in the bind of simply having that kind of status. I hope that the Minister will look into this matter of Dr. Stenger in particular, but I also hope that he can envisage some way of getting around this particular situation.

Mr. B. Newman: I would like to ask the Minister who decides what kind of course will be given at the colleges of arts?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the decision with respect to many of the courses is made by the board and the staff of the institution. Of course, this is subject to general approval of the council of regents as it relates to economics, and, of course there has been, and I think that it is valid, the desire to see that courses in one college—shall we say engineering technology—at the same validity or relevance that would exist in another college. There are two types of levels of courses.

Mr. B. Newman: Between one college of applied arts and technology—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, through the council of regents we know what the other colleges are doing.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the Minister: Is there any course in meat technology being contemplated?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not hear the question.

Mr. B. Newman: Meat technology. The slaughtering, the purchasing and the merchandizing of meat. I have had suggestions concerning this, and requests that such a course be implemented.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will find out. I do not know of any.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask also, on the food service industry, whether there are courses concerning the food service industry? I know that the restaurant and hotel operators in my own community asked that such a course be set up. Now, I know that you do not need a course like that in every community college, but possibly one of them should have some of the courses that I have mentioned.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give the hon. member a complete list, but there are courses of this kind at George Brown College, and, I believe, at Georgian College. Now, there may be one or two others, and I shall find out.

Mr. B. Newman: There is no pamphlet put out at all by the department, listing the various courses available so that a student in the grade 12 programme could check over the list of courses available and then know where he should direct his communication.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there is a pamphlet that has just been made available that I think will accomplish part of this, and, of course, the individual colleges themselves publish their own calendar, which is distributed to the schools which the college generally serves.

Mr. B. Newman: I think that is very good.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think that the pamphlet that has gone out will indicate just what you are interested in, as a student in Windsor getting information about what is happening at Sheridan College in the great town of Brampton, because there may be a course there which is more relevant than in Windsor.

Mr. B. Newman: I think that he could get somewhere in the province of Ontario. May I ask the Minister the status of the college of applied arts and technology in my own community, because, Mr. Chairman, it was originally planned in 1956, and this is 1968. One thing that does sort of disturb me is that you have leased the building, or asked for an extension of the lease on the present facilities, on Mercer Street to 1973, and there is a provision in the lease for another five-year extension. We are afraid that by 1978 we still will not have the facility completed in our community.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the first stage has been approved by the council. I think the first stage is $1.3 million or $1.4 million, I cannot give the hon. member the exact amount. I think if he would check with the chairman of the board he would get some idea of when they might even be having a sod turning ceremony. But it has gone this far—maybe even a ribbon cutting ceremony.

Mr. B. Newman: I would not be disturbed by not being invited. I have never been, so, it does not matter to me.

Mr. Chairman, remember when we commented on buildings erected? You see the buildings have not been erected. One building has been erected and it is only a temporary building in my community. So buildings—plural, have not been erected at all. You will say I am just dealing with the matter of semantics—

Hon. Mr. Davis: You are indeed.

Mr. B. Newman: But you know—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Buildings refer to the total college programme.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, you certainly can stick handle your way around this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not propose to be as academically qualified—

Mr. B. Newman: But you see you cannot put those students in buildings that do not exist in my community. May I suggest to the Minister that he seriously consider the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Tomorrow.

Mr. B. Newman: No, not tomorrow because you know this already—I have been pushing this programme for nine years in this House and I would like to see, before the good Lord takes me away, the college programme completed in my community.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We will build them. I am sure you will.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, we will probably have to build them, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the Minister, in commenting on the difficulty that he had at least in one instance in squaring away the problem of transference of tenure from the vocational schools to the community colleges, said that there would not be this difficulty if there had been some sort of a board of reference.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no I said—

Mr. Nixon: As there would have been in the secondary schools.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Nixon: Well it may possibly be that there will be some other staffing difficulties in the future. They are not his responsibilities admittedly. They are the responsibilities of the autonomist boards, but is he going to give any guidance or any overall structure through which these people can grieve. Will they only be able to grieve through the civil service commission? Or what is the answer to this problem?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, the answer to this problem is that we do not, at this point, have an answer. This is the message that was being given to me by the hon. member for Peterborough and, I assume, from the leader of the Opposition. This is still one of the grey areas. The labour relations board, on the reference of it, determined that these employees were Crown employees or at least Crown agencies—these institutions which, I think, looking at the legislation, might be valid. I would not want to question their decision.

After looking at the legislation, I would say I am not sure we anticipated that this would be the situation and we have to see what is to be done.

Mr. Nixon: Well how are you going to—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We do not know yet.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you would go a little further. You set up 20 colleges—19 colleges. This is very, very good and it seems to me that in many cases you did bring outstanding people into the top echelon of these colleges. But in any enterprise in which you have accomplished this much, you are also going to make some mistakes. The honeymoon will be over very soon and the sorting out will have to begin. There will have to be some way by which justice can be given to those who are going to be removed or demoted or in some way placed in a different situation.

So I suggest to you, even though we have talked about one man, we are in essence talking about a great many others who in future will face this situation.

For one thing, would the Minister not feel far better if these people were being represented by their own faculty association rather than the civil service association?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I would feel better or not. The council of regents may recognize the problem here. They form the committee with the board of governors to see just what is the best way to come to grips with it. They are anxious, we are anxious to have a proper procedure established, to see that a person who is on the faculty of the college is not prejudiced when it comes to a matter of transfer or severance tenure.

We know that this is a problem and we just do not know what the future is at this stage. I think that the solution can and will be found very shortly.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue this briefly. I think most angles of it have been exhausted, but my recollection is that when you set up the colleges of applied arts and technology, the Minister was quite insistent on the fact that these were going to be independent institutions. Indeed, at the same time as he moved to do this, Ryerson was established on an independent basis as evidence of the government's intention and good faith. Last year, the Minister really leaned over backwards to indicate that the council of regents was a separate body. So much so, that it hardly would take recommendations from him for appointments to the board of governors.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Have you anyone on the board?

Mr. MacDonald: I do not think so. None of the independent ones. I was out, incidentally, to the convocation of Humber college and my impression was a distinctly different one from that presented by the hon. member for Downsview. I had the feeling as I listened to the hon. member for Downsview that he went to a performance that he felt was rather empty and aimless and was a little pretentious, but he learned well, because his own comments were magnificently in that category. However, let me get back to what I—

Mr. Nixon: It is a shame that he is not even here. He hardly ever reads *Hansard.*

Mr. MacDonald: No, I want to pick up on the thread of my thought.

The Minister indicated that he wanted to have independent institutions and I have tried to establish that. Now the Minister made a very curious comment a moment ago. He said: "we did not anticipate what happened" when the ruling was made by the labour relations board.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As you say, I did not.

Mr. MacDonald: You did not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, you are just confirming. The Minister's intention was that they should be independent. Now the Minister, in effect, is saying that this government once again has blindly walked into a Crown agency status. It was not your intention but this is what you have come up with. Now it is about time this government were to—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We did not come up with it. It came up because of a decision of the board.

Mr. MacDonald: I know it. But, Mr. Chairman, you are one person I will not have to inform—that the problem with The Crown Agencies Act is that it was passed in the first instance to free certain institutions in the province of Ontario from having to pay certain federal taxes. After it had been passed to achieve this purpose, then some smart lawyers acting on behalf of employees in certain agencies, went to the Ontario labour relations board.

They took a closer look at the Act and concluded these are now Crown agencies of Ontario. While the Minister who passed the Act in the first instance—the hon. Kelso Roberts—said this was not his intention, neither he nor anybody in the government has been willing to go back and amend the Act to achieve your original intention and not the abortion that has emerged.

Now the Minister, once again, says the government has stumbled into the same kind of a position. It was not his intention that these colleges should be Crown agencies, but now a decision has come down from the labour relations board that they are and he is not sure what is going to happen.

Well, let me just endorse and add to the plea of my colleague from Peterborough. I think you are going to have unnecessary, and I am sure when it happens, unwelcomed difficulties in these institutions. If there is one institution in the modern world—I need say no more than to point to this—where there is a ferment in every nation of the world, and if we have not had it to as great an extent in Canada, let us consider ourselves lucky and not provoke it, it is the kind of ferment we have seen in post-secondary institutions.

It seems to me, if you add to the normal ferment of a post-secondary institution, the kind of straitjacket and restrictions that you get in a Crown agency, you are asking for trouble. When you get it do not start to complain at that point. I would suggest that if the Minister did not intend these institutions to be Crown agencies then he should take the necessary steps and statutes to make them independent bodies in effect, to overrule the decision that has come from the Ontario labour relations board.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would only say this. I have enough problems without going looking for them and so I can assure the hon. member I get the point that he is expressing. I just wish he would repeat what he said earlier though about the convocation at Humber college.

Mr. MacDonald: I have no desire to repeat it. If people do not want to be here to hear my gems of wisdom then—

Mr. Singer: You should warn when the next one is coming.

Mr. Chairman: Votes 511 and 520 carried?

Mr. Pitman: No, Mr. Chairman. There are one or two aspects about the colleges of applied arts and technology which bother me as well.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there were two aspects 20 minutes ago. I though we dealt with them.

Mr. Pitman: They keep coming to mind—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh I see—all right.

Mr. Nixon: It is $90 million.

Mr. Pitman: It is a lot of money. I am wondering in view of the fact that we find ourselves, as my leader suggests, in a period of ferment, and when young people are demanding more and more of a part to play in the educational process, it seems to me that the way in which the board—at least the board of governors—has been set up in each of the colleges of applied arts and technology, does not really give very much opportunity for students to take a part. There is no provision. It is therefore student representation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not in the legislation, Mr. Chairman, but if the hon. member wishes to get into this he might canvass what is happening in many of the colleges with respect to the relationship between students, the faculty and the board. I think that several of the colleges have worked out a very acceptable relationship, and I think he might take a look at these, if he has a moment.

Mr. Pitman: I have done that, Mr. Chairman, and I still come with a feeling that at

least some students have suggested they would like to have a place in a formal way on boards of governors, very much as some of the university students feel that they would like to have a place on boards of governors.

I am wondering why it is that, especially in view of the fact that the colleges of applied arts and technology are all so obviously structured from the centre—from the department, that no opportunity was given for students to play a major part in the formal governing bodies of these colleges.

Would the Minister even consider the possibility of encouraging this? They are not entirely independent institutions. I think this has been indicated tonight, and therefore there might still be one last opportunity before the legislation is changed, and they do become independent institutions to deal with that kind of a problem. Perhaps in co-operation with the committee of the presidents of the colleges of applied arts and technology, which may be developing over the next number of months.

One more comment, then. And this is my last problem, I am sure you will be glad to hear.

There is an interesting situation—the hon. member for Downsview brought up—the whole question of the possibility of young people being channelled out of the university to a college of applied arts and technology and not being able to return. Now I think that this matter has shored up. I think that, with the latest statement of the committee of presidents, there is every indication, as there has been in the past. Many Ryerson students have already been accepted into universities, and have done very well in universities.

Now the other problem is this, and I can see that it might very well have financial implications. It is quite obvious that in order to go to a college of applied arts and technology, it is much cheaper. The fees are much lower than that of a university and is there not the possibility that young people will be channelled economically into colleges of applied arts and technology who might otherwise, if the fees had not been so high and particularly if presidents' fees had not been included, have gone to a university? In other words, do you not have any fear that you are getting social classification, or economic classification, through the barrier of a different fee structure and different opportunities? The fact that there are not residential facilities in colleges of applied arts and technology, you may have a channelling, by the problem which was indicated by the member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) last night. In other words because the colleges of applied arts and technology might very well contain people who are not economically able to go to university, though intellectually able to go.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I sometimes think, and I say this in a very kindly fashion, that the member for Peterborough is a bit of a worry. I guess we all are, but I would suggest if this is a problem, that there are only two solutions.

One, raise the fees to the community colleges or (b), lower the fees to the universities. I will not even bother, sir, to ask the hon. member for Peterborough which choice he would make.

Mr. Pitman: It is my job to worry, and your job to know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Thank you.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, before this vote, I cannot let a stray remark from the member for York South go without some sort of comment.

Mr. MacDonald: You swallowed the bait.

Mr. Singer: No, no! This is a different kind of bait. He was talking about how fortunate we are not to have our universities and our educational institutions in ferment. I wonder how he would reconcile that remark with the remarks quoted in the press desk, the other day, made by the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown) who was encouraging—as far as I read it, and, perhaps, a bad paraphrase—the students to arm themselves and march on Queen's Park, and burn it down, to show how unhappy they were.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, in this day and age, when we have so much ferment, I was surprised and shocked that a member of this House would make that kind of an inflammatory speech; and I would like to know how the member for York South can justify that, in line with what he said tonight.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, we have had another magnificent example of the Liberal-Tory coalition. What the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine said was that there is real ferment in our post-secondary institutions. If we have not had as violent manifestations of it, as is the case in the United States, we are fortunate. What I am pleading with this Minister is, that he does not reduce these institutions to Crown agencies, even if he did it unintentionally, so that

he provokes unrest. There is enough ferment as it is, as my colleague from Woodbine pointed out.

Vote 511 agreed to.

On vote 512:

Mr. Nixon: Has it been indicated the youth branch is going to be augmented by the community programmes, or it is going to disappear to augment the community programme? I am not sure which.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, we are accepting the recommendation, another recommendation we have accepted. I wish the member for Parkdale were here so I could remind him of this, of the youth committee, a very excellent recommendation that these two branches of the department be combined, and this is what we have done. Now which branch is going to augment the other, I am not prepared to say, they are being brought together.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but the offer of the recommendation, that I think the member for Kingston and the Islands was referring to, is the elevation of the youth branch into the departmental status. And, I do not suppose you have anything to do with that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I do not, Mr. Chairman. We are bringing the youth branch and the community programmes together, in an operative branch.

Mr. Nixon: Called what?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Youth and recreation; I thought it covered both pretty well.

Mr. Nixon: Are you going to put the fitness programme into that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I think that is where it will eventually go.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, under either vote 512 or 514. I will either talk then or now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let us do vote 514.

Mr. B. Newman: In vote 514. You will get it then.

Vote 512 agreed to.

On vote 513:

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if there is thought of combining libraries to a greater degree with schools, so that we do not have duplication of quite extensive school libraries, and nearby libraries on their own, which the department is assisting, through this provincial library service? What is being done to avoid this duplication and make available, at the same time to pupils, readily available, comprehensive library facilities?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I forget whether it was in book (a) or (b) that I made reference to the situation. Perhaps the hon. member might glance at it. I cannot tell him, from memory, which particular document it was in. I should point out that we have discussed this in the past couple of years, here in the House, with respect to combined facilities. This has been done in some communities, and we have encouraged it, although we have had a report from a Mr. St. John who recommended, very strongly, that they were two separate functions, that is, the public library and school library. I am not sure that I share this point of view necessarily, but this was the recommendation made under this report to the government and to the Ontario library association. As far as we are concerned, Mr. Chairman, we have not, in any way, inhibited a combined development of a library resource. This has happened in several communities and, as we assess the position further, perhaps more of these developments will take place. But, there are two schools of thought, and there are those who feel very strongly that we really are talking about two separate functions. As I have said before, I am not sure, really, that we are.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman I have resurrected from my files, a letter, that I read with some interest. It was dated November 2, 1967, and it was a copy sent to me, directed to the Honourable James A. Noble, Provincial Treasurer, Department of Revenue, Queen's Park, Toronto 5. I guess that refers to the predecessor of the present Provincial Treasurer, the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk. They may have confused his personality with his surname. I do not know, but there is a reference—actually this letter is signed by the director of the board of the Lake Erie regional library system—and I felt that he might have done a little research before he had sent the letter, but he does have in the correspondence, a reference to the Smith committee comments about our present system of library grants. I thought that this would be an appropriate occasion to bring them to the Minister's attention. He is no doubt aware of them. In the Smith committee they refer

to grants to the community for the development of cultural aspects, and, quoting from the Smith report as follows:

> The only sizeable grant, that for public libraries, is marked by a degree of complexity that is out of all proportion to its monetary yield, that in any event mocks the fiscal principles of certainty and simplicity.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think one can say that, to a degree, about the grants to the school boards.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, that is right, and as a matter of fact, the Smith committee goes on to make some comparisons. It says, that while the school grant formula has been simplified, or at least there has been some concern over its simplification, there has been no such concern over the library grants, which have become increasingly complex year by year.

Now there have been a lot of problems with this. Some of the hon. members have brought it to the attention of the Minister and the public servants in the department, the fact that these grants have been difficult to interpret, difficult to administer, and difficult to pay. I wonder if the Minister has some plan to simplify the award of these grants, or is he going to leave it for the select committee on taxation to make some recommendations that might be enacted at a later session?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the select committee on taxation will be dealing with this, and I think it would be premature to indicate what our thinking may be. Obviously, if we can develop a simplified approach to the regulations, we would be delighted to do so, although it is not as simple as it appears on the surface, and I think any judgment on this would wait until the select committee has made its recommendations.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, going back to the libraries, I took a look again at pages 75 to 78—which I presume are the pages in the report that the Minister was referring to—where it discusses the combination of school and public libraries. I did not see any reference nor do I remember any reference to that in his report. I think of the library here in this building being separate on its own from the building itself to a degree. Perhaps if in school design we do have separate entrances, and they are operated under the public libraries system but are closely available to the school, we can satisfy the claims and requirements of people like Mr. St. John, as the Minister mentioned. But I certainly hope that something is done to avoid the duplication of libraries that I have seen right within small communities. It seems to be a wasteful expenditure of money.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I usually have a word or two to say about libraries at this time. I am always under the wrong vote; am I under the wrong vote again?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It all depends on what the words are, Mr. Chairman, I guess. If the hon. member is referring, shall we say, to the total support to the library system which is usually the area he wishes to discuss for a few minutes, it is under vote 516.

Mr. Singer: Vote 516?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Singer: I wanted to talk about that and I wanted to talk about unification and I wanted to talk about a problem in North York. I thought I would make only one library speech instead of two or three.

Mr. Chairman, this whole problem of unification is one that has been brought before the House a number of times. There was an interesting editorial in the *Globe and Mail* this morning that indicated that there were two schools of thought, but probably in the balance there was more sense—that was the opinion at least of the editorial writers about unification. In this day and age of concern about the spiralling costs of education and the possibility about using our educational plant 365 days a year instead of half of that time, surely we should begin to look for ways where we can stop duplicating services. It is true, as some librarians argue, that these kind of libraries serve two different functions. Undoubtedly you need some different types of books, but a lot of the books can be used in common.

But it is just hard for me at least to understand, Mr. Chairman, why we need two sets of space, why we need in our big and elaborate new school buildings a substantial portion of them set aside for library services which are used only during the school opening hours and those facilities are denied to the public during the rest of the time. The public makes use of public library facilities during evening hours, during weekends, during the summer time and so on, but these facilities are only available to a small group of the community, the student group and only during school hours.

In addition, we have the problem of staff and the problem of supplying staff for libraries.

It seems a shame that we have to tie up a substantial portion of our teaching staff in being librarians.

Hon. Mr. Davis: First of all, I think it is important that you have a qualified librarian in the school environment.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I do not disagree with that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I mean, you are not—

Mr. Singer: No, but you are duplicating them. You have a qualified librarian in the school environment who could as well be a teacher or who could as well be a librarian, so in fact she is a part-time librarian in the school environment. The library has qualified librarians, not enough of them but you have some, who are full-time librarians within the public environment. We are not making full use of our talent and we are not making full use of our facilities. The result is both systems are starved—the school library system to a lesser extent, because we have reached the stage where nothing is too good for our public schools and the money keeps on pouring in, and our public library systems get into great difficulty.

The situation in North York this year is most indicative of that. For some reason, best known I suppose to the North York council, they did not like the budget that the library board put forward so they chopped a big chunk off and the library board said to them: "Well, if that is what you are going to do and we can't go on with our programme, we are unfortunately going to have to delay the opening of two or three buildings that we have ready to open because we cannot stock them and we cannot staff them and we are going to have to take our bookmobiles off the road." Those were the preliminary skirmishes. Whether they resolved this thing or not has not been featured in the press as lively as the skirmishes were.

But surely, Mr. Chairman, it indicates that there is something sick about our library system, both in the schools and in the service to the public. And the sickness, I think, is best explained as being a financial sickness; they are short of money. The chain of command is weak, the role of the public library boards insofar as their councils are concerned is a very difficult one to carve out.

The grants from government are far too low in money, the lack of availability of staff is shocking, and there are not enough trained librarians coming out of our library system to stock these libraries and to give proper service.

In areas where there have been good public library systems grow up despite all these difficulties, it is just amazing the circulation figures that are there; and the use that has been made in North York particularly. I am somewhat familiar with the system—a library system that grew from nothing ten years ago into the second largest, perhaps the largest, in Ontario—certainly one of the first three or four largest. It has been just amazing. But it would be a pity, Mr. Chairman, if it is going to seriously suffer and all the impetus it has had is going to be seriously curtailed because of lack of finances, lack of clear chain of command and lack of best use of our facilities.

I would have hoped that the Minister would have turned a substantial amount of his attention to the provision of better library services for all of the people of Ontario, and would have been able to suggest to us some method of co-ordination of school libraries with public libraries, some method of better grants, some method of clearer delineation of financial responsibility, and some method of provision of more trained librarians and encouragement for more young people to become trained librarians than presently exists in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 513; the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on this same vote, I would like to bring to the hon. Minister's attention the brief presented by the south central regional library system, sent to each of the members of the House, and I will only read the recommendations therein enclosed:

1. The Department of Education to undertake a comprehensive survey of the physical library facilities throughout Ontario, to be conducted by the provincial library services.

2. The department to establish firm physical standards for new library facilities erected in Ontario, as is presently done for school buildings.

3. The Ontario government to make it mandatory by law for municipalities to meet the physical standards set when they are building a new library.

4. The Department of Education to provide grants of 50 per cent of the cost of buildings, furnishings, and land for the new libraries.

5. The provincial library service to be given sufficient staff and funds to carry out the above programme.

This brief was signed by Clark W. Johnson, chairman, and Charles E. Brisbane, director, on behalf of the board of the south central regional libraries service. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the recommendations, therein contained, are worthy of consideration.

Vote 513 agreed to.

On vote 514:

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, under vote 514, I would plead with the Minister that just as we have Ontario scholars, that we have some type of award by way of scholarship to individuals who excel athletically. I think it is about time, Mr. Chairman, that we recognize any individual who maintains passing standards, but excels athletically, that person should be recognized by being given a scholarship to attend our universities. If we do not do this, Mr. Chairman, the drain will continue. Our athletes will continue to go to the United States, and many of them will never return to our country.

Our performance in past athletic competitions, international competitions, has not been as good as it could be. Let me tell you that one of the reasons why it is as good as it is, is because a lot of our present high school students have accepted scholarships in United States universities where they have obtained this training, and returned to our country to perform for our country. I think it is about time, Mr. Chairman, that some type of athletic scholarship be set up for students who maintain, or who are able to achieve a minimum academic standing but excel athletically.

They have got to be passing students, and I do not think an individual who could not carry on the academic work in a university, should get this type of award. But there are a lot of our students who go into the States, come back to Canada, and even teach in our high schools after having been trained and developed, originally in Canada, but getting additional training in the United States.

Votes 514 to 516, inclusive, agreed to.

On vote 517:

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, under Moosonee education centre, I was interested to see up there the progress that has been made in Moosonee with the construction of the centre, but am rather concerned with the amount of money that had been directed though toward staff accommodation, and the type of staff accommodation that was built.

It is very elaborate in comparison with any other housing in the area, and I would gather, from many who have gone to Moosonee, to work there, that they feel such accommodation is not necessary to attract them to work in an area like that. It is in itself a challenge.

And construction of elaborate staff housing costing in the order of $40,000 a unit, or more, is not doing much to help the relationship and the understanding by the Indian people in particular, as to why the province has not money to put in sewers, and water, and a proper bridge into the southern part of the town where they do not have proper fire protection. In some of the homes that are owned down there the Indians cannot get the services that would be normally considered necessary for reasonable living, even though they themselves have built good housing. They really resent the fact that The Department of Education would consider it necessary to build very elaborate housing for the teachers. And, in connection with this, the whole approach of the department in Moosonee compares rather unfavourably with the approach which has been taken down in northern Arizona, in the Navajo reserve. At Rough Rock, the operations of their demonstration school, as it is called, is entirely under the control of the local citizens. I would appreciate learning from the Minister how the board operating the Moosonee education centre is appointed. Is it one that is elected in any way whatsoever, or is it purely an appointed board, and who does the appointing?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is a corporation, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the board are appointed.

Mr. Deacon: Who does the appointing, please, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I believe, Mr. Chairman — I would have to check this out — but I believe it is by the Lieutenant-Governor in council. It is a corporation.

Mr. Deacon: Well, Mr. Chairman, it interested me greatly that down in Arizona they have for many years carried out this same customary approach to the operation of their schools. In the reserve down there, one-third of all the Indians of America are living. A few years ago the chief of the reserve persuaded the government that it would be sensible to give the Indians themselves full authority over the operation of their school including the curriculum. They were quite fearful of doing this. They were even more fearful after they found out that the school board that was appointed consisted of seven people, only two of whom had ever been to

school, and only one of whom could speak English. The two who had been to school had attended grade 2 and grade 5 respectively. But, they have been astounded at the results which have come about since they have turned over the facilities and the budget to the local people.

The results have meant that the whole community is fully involved and fully behind the operation. They are teaching themselves not only the many techniques that are necessary to survive and gain a higher standard of living in today's society, but they are also teaching themselves that they can be proud of their past heritage as Navajos and can be Americans at the same time. Our Indians do not have a future because they do not see themselves having a future as Indians and as Canadians.

This is something that we might well develop in the ideal setting we have in Moosonee, where we have a predominantly Indian population. I suggest that it is worthwhile our risking the possibility of mistakes in the operation of that centre and turning it over entirely to a locally-elected board, as was done down in Arizona. Even though we might not think that such a board would be capable of administering such an expensive and elaborate set-up, we would soon probably find that it truly was accepted by the community and used to its fullest extent.

We would probably find that it was not only used by those that would normally be involved in attending it under the manpower training scheme or other schemes that entitle people to attend that centre, but it would be used by the whole community in many ways.

We now have a man heading the school who was a secondary school principal. Apparently there is considerable conflict among the staff due to the approach taken, with his background compared to what many feel would be a proper approach to the adults they are dealing with and under different circumstances than are found in secondary schools.

The importance of allowing these people to select their own curriculum and develop it cannot be overemphasized and selecting their own staff cannot be overemphasized. In Rough Rock over half the staff is Indian and they have seen that it is well operated. One of the features there that interested me greatly was that prior to their taking over the school, the government felt that the Indians themselves were not capable of taking care of a residence properly.

They have since brought in parents of those attending the school on a rotation basis, prior to which term of duty, they are given training as to what is expected of them, in the way of standards of maintenance of the residential sections of the unit. They are now getting very fine results not only within the school, but, of course, when these parents go back to their own homes. They find that they are certainly improving their own circumstances to an extent that heretofore was thought impossible.

The same is true in bringing older people in, using older men to tell those attending the school, of the heritage of the Navajo people. Certainly the Crees that attend the Moosonee centre have a heritage of which they could be proud, but of which they know little. They are almost ashamed of being Indians, rather than being proud of the heritage that they have. I think that we should use our imagination up there in that wonderful new centre which we have built and in which we have invested a great deal of money. We should turn it over to a locally-elected board, let them work out their own curriculum, find their own staff, and see what we can do to come close to the achievement of what they have been able to show in northern Arizona.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I notice all these grants down here and no mention made of Quetico centre. I was wondering if there is any place in these grants where it is indicated that this department does make funds available for Quetico centre? It is the only centre of its kind in northwestern Ontario. It is not only adult retraining, it is an arts and crafts centre. I did notice that during the opening, Mr. Cisco of your department was there and there was some liaison between Canada manpower and your department. I wonder in what way do you assist financially Quetico centre?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we assist Quetico under vote 515, under the federal-provincial agreements.

Mr. Deacon: Would the Minister tell me his views or what his approach and attitude is toward such a programme as I have suggested for Moosonee?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member is aware sufficiently of the problems. To expect me to react after listening to what I thought was a very helpful statement, and to say whether I agree or disagree is a bit much. I am very interested in what he has to say, and I have made a note to look at it more carefully. I am not in a position to say whether what the hon.

member says is happening in Arizona can be translated tomorrow to Moosonee, I do not know.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I would certainly be pleased to turn over to the Minister all the data that I have on this Rough Rock development, which has achieved such remarkable results.

Vote 517 agreed to.

On vote 518:

Mr. Pitman: I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister one vote which I think could be increased. The workers' educational association, I think, is one of the more important organizations that is attempting to involve people in adult education, and I am sure that the Minister would recognize that continuing education is going to be the greatest area of increase in the next number of years. It seems to me that there are two ways of going about it. The department itself can extend its activities or support the activities of those agencies already involved in adult education, and I am wondering if this might not be an area where the Minister might be able to develop something in that direction?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is one of the great problems with what I sometimes designate "miscellaneous funds". I think that you could go through the whole list and find that all of them might have a justifiable request for more money. I would only point out that last year we did, out of the miscellaneous fund, make an additional $2,500 available to the workers' educational Association.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, being new at this game, I was waiting until the "miscellaneous" grant to get some information on Quetico centre, and I was informed by the Minister that it came under vote 515. I wonder if he might tell me how much of a provincial grant goes towards the operation of Quetico centre.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would have to break this down. This is one of the joint programmes, and I will endeavour to get out of the total figures just what is the provincial contribution for the Quetico programme.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 518; the member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, this is a question which involves two or three items. I notice that in the grants to the Ontario college of education, the grants are all set aside for each college. I notice that also in the teachers' college this is true. This is not true for the colleges of applied arts and technology and I am wondering why these grants are not set out by institutions as they are for the colleges of education and the teachers' colleges? I am wondering also, if the information is available from the Minister, as to how much each of the colleges of applied arts and technology have received, and perhaps the Minister might even indicate whether the same system is used for these colleges of applied arts and technology and colleges of education. Do they use the same method of calculating the grant?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the same method is not used. The colleges of education submit a budget to the department, and this has been the procedure. We authorized these some time last fall or early in the new year. In respect to the community colleges, because we are still going through this evolutionary process, we arrived at what was really a lump sum figure and this now relates to enrollment of most of the number of courses that will be approved by the council of regents, and so on. It is impossible to specify a specific amount for each college this year. At the end of the year, we can tell the hon. member just how much each institution has received. It is the same way if you check the grants for the universities. They are now in one lump figure because of the formula approach. We do not know how much each institution will receive. We know what the total will very nearly be, but we do not specify individual institutions.

Vote 518 agreed to.

On vote 519:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on vote 519 if you will permit? The Ryerson polytechnical institute has had in the works a rather elaborate plan for its expansion. There has been the addition of some considerable acreage of downtown real estate to accommodate this. The amendment that we had in the House a few days ago permitted the university capital aid corporation to assist in the expansion. I wonder if the Minister can give us the timetable for the actual expansion, and some idea as to how this expansion will fit into the general programme of post-secondary education, and the relationship with the university.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the hon. member means by fitting

in with the expansion of the universities, necessarily. The board of governors at Ryerson had planned this, I think as I recall it, as a three-phase programme. It started out initially as four, but then they bought certain property to the south of Ryerson polytechnical institute that used to belong, I believe, to the O'Keefe brewery, and certain structural changes took place there and they were able to accommodate a number of students. I think that the first stage of the programme is about a $14 million capital investment. I think that their total anticipated student enrollment will be 10,000 to 12,000, and I think that they expect to achieve this—I am only going by memory, and I will get more complete information—by 1974 or 1975.

Mr. Nixon: When will the plans for expansion be completed?

Hon. Mr. Davis: This was the original date. I would guess that it will be a year or two after that—some time around 1974 or 1975.

Mr. Nixon: How are they actually going to build those towers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think that the first phase has $14 million set aside, which I think includes one of the towers. I cannot tell you whether it will be on the north or the west side. I think that it will be the west side of Victoria street.

Mr. Nixon: Since Ryerson is really separate from any other institution it has to be considered on its own merits as far as expansion either to encompass or approach a degree-granting status. It has been my thought for some considerable time, and I put it to the Minister's colleague, the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall), that there is a perfect possibility here, a perfect setup, for the use of the facilities at Sheridan Park. The real estate and the planning is controlled by the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is a great area.

Mr. Nixon: It certainly is—controlled by the government of Ontario, which is one of the most extensive concentrations of technical ability anywhere in Canada. If we were to make a part of the Ryerson campus out there at Sheridan Park and put the senior students in the science technology courses out in that location so that they could work in co-ordination and co-operation with private enterprise in research, then in my view we could open up a whole new possibility for the training of top-flight technicians from Ryerson. I believe that this would be equivalent to a degree in status if that were desirable.

But in my view there is something here that has been suggested for the last two years and that the Minister of Trade and Development has not acted upon, and that it may very well be the responsibility of the Minister of Education to examine it. I believe it is practical but I do not believe sufficient research has been done on it to see what can be accomplished.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that we should really restrict this to Ryerson. I have great respect for that institution, but Sheridan college—

Mr. Nixon: Not Sheridan college.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no I just—do not interrupt for a second. Sheridan college is locating its main campus about a mile and a half or two miles away from Sheridan Park research centre, and I think the type of relationship that the hon. member is suggesting could very readily be established between Sheridan college and Sheridan Park research area. I think that this perhaps is another way of approaching it and this is where their main campus will be. I think I am right in this—a mile and a half or two miles away from us.

Mr. Nixon: On the wrong side of the road.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well it happens to be in Halton county. It is not in Peel.

Mr. Nixon: That ought to be enough to end the possibility right there. I would say that while Sheridan college is within a mile or two of the area that I am talking about, the real conjunction is a conjunction in training. The training at Ryerson is at a level, I would say, beyond that attempted by any community college up until now. If it is not going to be beyond it, why keep it separate from the regular community college system?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of keeping it separate. I see no reason why some of the community colleges will not be developing some courses that will be on a par with Ryerson—not necessarily all of them. I think that, with respect to technician courses, that Sheridan college will be able to develop courses that would be every bit as appropriate as Ryerson and they will be geographically located.

Mr. Nixon: Well it would be a duplication of Ryerson then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. it will not. It will not be a duplication. As long as there is the demand, the total demand, in the province it is not a question of duplication.

Mr. Nixon: Well I believe it is a question of duplication, because the Ryerson institute is offering courses in engineering technology which, up to this point are far beyond anything any community college is offering. If you want to duplicate them elsewhere, fine—in the north, in the parts of the province remote from Toronto, fine. But why duplicate within 15 miles?

Hon. Mr. Davis: If there is a need. In other words you have engineering faculties at about five universities. Now one could argue this—

Mr. Nixon: My point is this that Ryerson has been on the verge of moving towards some more advanced status for a long time and I can see no reason for keeping it separate from the community college system unless you envisage some entirely different function for it. And this is one entirely different function that is a reasonable one.

Votes 519 and 520 agreed to.

On vote 521:

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, vote 521 I think it is. This is the Ontario institute for studies in education. I think there are some $9 million in this vote. I think that at least we should have what might be called a yearly statement of policy in regard to this from the Minister, who might be aroused by a few comments I have to make.

This is an institute which, of course, has been badly needed in Ontario. I think the main job of the institute was to perform three functions — research, graduate work and development. There has been a great deal of criticism, a great deal of concern, that the development function of OISE has not been as active, as advanced and as developed as perhaps both the research and the graduate work functions have.

Now I am wondering whether the Minister can give any reasons for this, whether sufficient breakdown in the Ontario institute is going to development. If so, perhaps he could give reasons why these criticisms are being levelled so often by people in the teaching profession for example.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether these criticisms are being levelled or not. I am sure there may be some. There will be criticism of any institution in whatever capacity it is performing. But I think in fairness, Mr. Chairman, that one can say that the development aspect of the institute has made very real progress. Perhaps some in the profession would like to see it do more, but there are limitations — economic, staff and really the development of their own programme. It is a relatively new institution and this is about the second full year of its operation. I am a little prejudiced, but I think they have made tremendous progress, not only in the area of graduate work, which is really part of the former function when it was at OCE and in the area of statistical research, but more importantly in the area of curriculum development and so on. They have made very major progress.

It may be that some of the teaching profession have anticipated more than they have received from the institution. There is always the problem of expectation exceeding realization in every field of youth and activity. Perhaps the criticisms have some validity, but I doubt it very much. I suggest it because, once again, I would be interested in the members having a great awareness of the activities of the institute. I could spend a couple of hours tonight because I am quite enthusiastic about the concept and what it has been doing, but I have suggested to the chairman of the education committee that here is perhaps one area where the committee itself might like to visit the institute—sit down with the senior personnel and discuss what is happening. If we can resolve two or three, I hope, non-controversial bills in the next week or so, I would suggest this would be a very useful function for the education committee. The director of the institution has suggested to me that they would be delighted to have the education committee visit and I would think this invitation would be extended to, say, the leader of the Opposition who is not a member of the committee. I am sure he would be more than welcome to sit down and talk to them about what they are doing and their problems. I think this would be the best way to do it.

Mr. Nixon: I appreciate that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, we would be delighted to have you, and you are known rather well.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether there has been an integrating function with the department itself. I think the institute is sort of away out here on the edge—at least it gives that impression—and there sometimes does seem to be an im-

pression left that they are operating in different spheres, that sometimes they scarcely touch, and there is not a great deal of liaison between what goes on in the research function of the OISE and what is going on in the more practical day-to-day activities of education in the department itself. I am wondering whether this is sorting out, whether you are resolving this?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not think anything ever sorts itself out completely or in finality in this day and age in education, but the relationship between the department and the institute hinges around the availability of departmental personnel on their studies committees. We have representatives from the department on the board.

Mr. Pitman: Are they on this study committee, too?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh yes, there is a very close relationship in the whole area of data processing, for instance. There is still not only joint use of some of the hardware, but a combined approach to many of the problems. There is a very close relationship. But I am not sure if I can define the department's responsibility at this hour of the night. The department's responsibility, of course, rests with the practical aspects and their application in the school system, whereas the institute is directed to research. But I keep saying to them, and they keep reminding me they agree, that they have to indulge in practical research. It cannot be all theoretical, it must have practical application within the school system or there is really very little validity in what they are doing. I think they have directed their energies in this way.

Mr. Nixon: Oh no!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh yes!

Mr. Pitman: The reason this comes up is because there seems to be so little connection between what is going on at OISE and some of the major legislation which has come into this House. For example, the bill which has reorganized the school jurisdiction, and many other areas. There seems to be so little contact. I am wondering—we are spending $9 million for this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, what other legislation coming before the House, really would one anticipate that the institute might have studied. The institute and personnel within the institute have been making speeches on record for many months—in fact one or two of them could have been associated with the institute for years with respect to larger units of administration; there is no debate here, I think.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but they were going to do some statistical research on this which we have never seen.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think this is the responsibility of the government or of the department. This is, I hope, in a small "c" or "p" political sense, a political decision. I do not want to go debating Bill 44 again, but I said we recognize that the boundaries are not in themselves perfection, but we recognize that from a practical standpoint, they gave us the best base that was available. And I think this is becoming now more generally accepted. I cannot think of any other legislation, really, that the institute might direct its energies to that has come before this House in this session. Can you?

Mr. Pitman: For example, school administration, several things; The School Administration Act—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I have great admiration for the institute but I think one must also realize that they cannot research every single item of change that might take place in the educational system. Do you want the institute, for instance, to research the fact of whether there should be a transfer review board? I really do not think that this is the function of the Ontario institute for studies in education really. Is it?

Mr. Pitman: I do not think it is entirely inappropriate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I do not know. I am very flexible in these things but I am really not sure that this is the kind of thing you ask the institute to do. Maybe the question of internal administration, whether you have a unitary or dual system, this might have greater validity, but the hon. member does not need their recommendations. He has already made up his mind very strongly the way it should be. So has the leader of the Opposition. You do not need the institute.

Mr. Pitman: Well, I think this is a rather specious argument, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, it is, quite.

Mr. Pitman: I simply suggested that because the Opposition has not. In fact this is one thing which is rather interesting—I wish it was easier to get material from the Ontario institute for studies in education.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Have you asked them?

Mr. Pitman: I have on several occasions made efforts to get material.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have never been hesitant about giving material.

Mr. Pitman: Well, let us put it this way—they do not seem to be wildly enthusiastic about throwing their research material in every direction; and I think their communications could be improved.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think this is true of every—

Mr. Pitman: Could I just ask another question? Why has there been such a change-over in the upper echelon of the Ontario institute for studies in education? It seems that quite a number of the chairmen have come and gone in the very short history of the institute. I was just wondering why there is this turnover.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with the personnel of the institute. I deal basically with the director and his, shall we say, immediate associates. I would not be prepared to say that there has been a great turnover. There has been a turnover of staff at a lot of new institutions and particularly, I think, in the areas of educational research. This is part of the structure, I think, of those kinds of institutions. But I do not really believe there has been a major turnover of staff. As I say, I cannot really tell you all of the details of the operation of the institute.

It is like saying to me or asking me, you know: "What all is happening at Trent?" or "What all is happening at the U of T?" It is a very significant type of institution with which the department obviously has a relationship, but which we do not run. And I think that, really, if the hon. members have an interest in it, I think the best way to find out exactly what they are doing—and they would welcome it, they are anxious that the members of the House, particularly the education committee, have some knowledge of the activities of the institute—I think it would be very beneficial if the committee were to spend half a day visiting with them.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated that he is in some communication with the director about the practicality of the research. Now certainly there has to be—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I just made a general observation.

Mr. Nixon: And he makes a general observation that he is aware of this responsibility, and I am sure that he is aware of the responsibility for basic research as well. There has to be some kind of a balance. And yet when we look at the vote that we are extending here, I think that the Minister is very reasonable in his expectations that some of the papers that are printed and come out of the Ontario institute have some immediate application, even to the decisions, political or otherwise, that the Minister is called upon to make.

Now, I would like to ask specifically if there was a paper made available by the Ontario institute, that would provide some direction to the department as to the reasonableness of boundaries for larger units of educational jurisdiction in Ontario, during the last year.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would have to check into this as it relates to the reasonableness of boundaries. I know the institute has been studying, and I think they have completed some with respect to larger units of administration. Now, whether this relates to boundaries *per se*, I would have to find out for the hon. member. And, as I say, the institute and the senior personnel who have made observations on this over the last two or three years, really, have all related to larger units of administration.

Mr. Nixon: Of course, they would have a reasonable approach to this, as I think the Minister and most other members concerned with it, but I—this may not be the time to comment on it—but from time to time we contact the Ontario institute so that we are up to date at least in some of the things they are doing. And we were under the impression that such a study was being undertaken, but that it was not possible at the present time—at that present time; some weeks ago—for us to see the results of this study. So, I am interested in the Minister's vagueness as to this. I would like to see any work that has been done on it.

I think the only thing I would have to say about the Ontario institute is that a good deal of its research should be and must be put in a form where at least the teachers and trustees and those concerned with education can understand it; that it is interesting and meaningful and applicable to present circumstances so that it will have some effect on the course of education. When the Minister talks about the department becoming a resource centre, then the Ontario institute is going to be the pinnacle of this resource centre, and everything it does is going to be read or

should be read with great interest and following application, if possible, by the new divisional board. So far, the material that has come out of the Ontario institute, with many important exceptions, has not lived up to that standard where it was readable, understandable, applicable, and in sufficient quantity to justify the vote that we are called upon to extend to it.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned that the institute had done studies on the larger units of administration. Did the institute come up with the figure that was used in the education committee—that a size of around 15,000 students or so for a unit, was the ideal size? Is that where the department got that figure?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I do not believe so, Mr. Chairman. I shall look into whether the institute came up with any figure, let alone the figure mentioned by the department. I think the members must realize that the department itself cannot operate without some high level of research itself, and with respect to Bill 44, this was given a lot of very intensive study by the personnel of the department. As I say, the figure that was given at the committee is an approximation, but I do not know whether this represents, shall we say, the thinking.

I would say with respect to this area, it is pretty much of a judgment decision based on the best information we can get. You know you cannot feed the information into a computer and come out with what is the ideal size, because to a degree it has to be a judgment decision or evaluation. I shall endeavour to find out whether, in fact, the institute came up with any ideal or optimum size.

Mr. Deacon: In what field did the institute come up with information—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, as I said to the leader of the Opposition, I shall find out just where their study stands and what recommendations or thoughts they have with respect to larger units of administration.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of what happened in the past. In other words, did the institute contribute anything which was of help in this past year, which would help with this bill. I have not yet heard a—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the institute has published a report with respect to larger units of administration. I know they have been working on this aspect for a period of time. This is what I shall endeavour to find out for the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: If their report is going to be useful—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, you know you can sit and wait, and this is one point the leader of the Opposition has made to me on many occasions—

Mr. Nixon: And it works the other way, too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite right, quite right, it does. But we did not specifically request the institute to make a study with respect to larger units because we have, we think, the competency to do it within the department.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: The institute apparently has been doing some kind of study, and the Minister is going to investigate and see, and I gather he is going to bring out part of the studies.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I did not say that.

Mr. Singer: No. You said you did not request the institute to do it because you thought that within the department there was sufficient competence. What is the point of all this? Because these have already been done, for better or for worse; the deed has been done. You have brought in the bill, the bill is gone, the decision has been made. Why are you not frank with us, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister? Why do you not tell us that if they did embark upon it, that it was another lack of liaison, and if they did embark upon it and your officials had knowledge of it and they did not bother to inform you, then you were letting them work in sort of a vacuum and produce something that was going to be no use to anybody.

We seem to be running around in great circles. If they spent part of their time and a substantial amount of their very substantial facilities to make this kind of a study and you did not even bother to wait for it, and you brought in the bill and you cannot tell us how far it got along, then why worry about it any longer. Why do you not say, "We wasted 'X' number of hours; now we will get on to something that may be useful."

Hon. Mr. Davis: It may have been a waste of "X" number, I do not know, I cannot tell you this.

Mr. Singer: How many dollars is the Minister asking for?

Mr. Nixon: It is $9 million.

Mr. Singer: It is $9 million! Surely you should be able to tell us what you are doing?

Let me draw a parallel, Mr. Chairman. In the law reform commission, and we are unhappy about that from time to time, but we have been able to get to the point with this Attorney General and his predecessor that they are working along certain lines; and the Attorney General, from time to time, stands up and says, well, I cannot tell you too much about this field until I get a report from the law reform commission. You could draw somewhat of a parallel, perhaps, between the law reform commission and OISE. But if OISE is off investigating the question of larger units—whether or not they are going to do any geographical boundaries—the Minister does not even bother to enquire, but he brings in his bill and he gets it through the House. What really is OISE doing?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I have said I would be delighted to have the education committee visit with the institute and get the full story of what they are up to.

Vote 521 agreed to.

On vote 522:

Mr. B. Newman: I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister, the submission to the Premier of Ontario re: the pensions of superannuated teachers, presented by them, to the Minister, and ask the Minister what he plans on doing, concerning the recommendations submitted, by them to him? I will not bother reading the preamble to the report. I will go right into the recommendations that they made, and ask if the Minister plans on implementing any of them?

They ask for a recalculation of the A, B, C, D and F pensions and dependence allowance, granted prior to January 1, 1966, on the basis of the average salary of the best seven years.

Point two. No pensioner in the above categories will receive an increase of less than $300, and (b), that the increase in the dependence allowance be not less than $150, and the third, that all benefits be retroactive to January 1, 1966, and four, they request, most strongly, that the principle, whereby the calculation of all pensions commencing January 1, 1966, which are based on the average salary of the best seven years, be applied to all pensions granted prior to that date from the inception of the teachers superannuation fund. The policy has always been to make new benefits applicable to all pensions in force at the time of the revision.

And then, they substantiate their requests by bringing in examples of British Columbia, Saskatchewan, the House of Commons and British pensions.

May I ask of the Minister, what disposition he is making of their requests?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this group of teachers has been in to visit over a period of some months. They visited with the Prime Minister, I believe, three or four weeks ago, if memory serves me correctly, with their views with respect to the recalculation of pension. The position of the government, and it is a government position, is that the matter is being considered. There was no rejection nor was there any, to be perfectly fair, encouragement. It was made clear that: Any alteration, with respect to the particular problem that presents itself to this group of teachers, must also be taken into account, with respect to the position of superannuated or pensioned public servants; that no decision on this matter can be made in isolation; that the government must consider its responsibilities to other segments of the society where we are, as a government, involved. This is the position that has been taken by the government, with respect to this representation.

Mr. Singer: That is a very interesting position to take but what are you going to do for them all—nothing? Is it sufficient to dismiss this very valid concern, that they have, by saying you cannot decide until you have decided it for everybody? Is there any decision that is going to be made for anybody —everybody?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would think that there will, obviously, be a decision, and I cannot tell the hon. member what that decision will be.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the situation is not too dissimilar from the position we had some long time ago—and it went on for many years—with the elderly retired lady teachers, who kept on coming back and back, and their group diminished in number from year to year until, finally—what was it last year or the year before—that the gesture was finally made and you raised their—

Mr. Nixon: That was two years ago; and they started paying it last year.

Mr. Singer: Yes, and the cost to the people of the province was minimal. You

delayed it long enough so that, really, it involved hardly any dollars at all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, let us be factually correct. There were two groups of teachers. There was a group of the superannuated teachers where, I think, this does not fairly apply. There was a group of widows – former teachers – and this was a diminishing situation, and I think, one must say there were two groups. They were not, shall we say, comparable problems, necessarily.

Mr. Singer: Well, comparable or not, the delay was sufficiently effective, that when the decision was finally made, it was one of the first requests that I heard about when I came into this House as a new member back in 1959. The Minister used to come, as he was a private member in those days, and listen, and he was nodding his head in great style, and eventually became the Minister of Education. Well, a few years after that, there was this small gesture made with the minimal amount of dollars.

Now the same thing applies to—a different extent perhaps—these people. I was visited by a very nice gentleman who is a retired teacher, who went over this brief with me, point by point, and I think he made a very valid case. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, it is a sufficient answer to tell these people that it is going to be considered at the same time as we consider everybody else's. When are you going to consider everybody else's?

The Minister, surely, should have that answer. Someone should be able to say on the part of government that either we cannot afford to disturb pensions, that they must stay as they are, or that we are going to make an adjustment. The point the Minister makes is a valid one and I cannot disagree with the point that he makes. Then, for goodness sake take a position and do not keep on passing the buck, the way you and so many of your colleagues can do.

Vote 522 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates for The Department of Education.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will go to the order paper first and then to the estimates of The Department of University Affairs, and between the hour of 1 and 2 o'clock, p.m., will be private members' hour.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:10 o'clock, p.m.

No. 111

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, June 7, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, June 7, 1968

Raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, bill to authorize, Mr. MacNaughton, first reading 4101

Labour-management dispute at Domtar Fine Papers mill, question to Mr. Bales, Mr. MacDonald 4101

Raising funds for housing from private sources, questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. Sargent 4101

Rothman purchase of Canadian industries, question to Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Sargent 4102

Salary of chairman of Ottawa-Carleton regional government, questions to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Sargent 4103

Long-term effects of men working with bare hands on high voltage lines, question to Mr. Simonett, Mr. MacDonald 4104

Licence plates to identify vehicles of short wave radio operators, question to Mr. Haskett, Mr. Nixon 4105

Third readings 4105

Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading 4105

Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading 4107

Ontario Labour-Management Arbitration Commission Act, 1968, bill intituled, Mr. Bales, second reading 4109

Training Schools Act, 1965, bill to amend, reported 4112

Department of Correctional Services Act, 1968, bill intituled, reported 4112

Reduction of municipal taxes on residential property, bill to provide for, in committee 4115

On notice of motion No. 33, Mr. Reuter, Mr. T. Reid, Mrs. M. Renwick 4138

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 4147

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, JUNE 7, 1968

The House met at 9:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that we are pleased to see at this early hour of the morning that the galleries are well filled with students, in the east gallery, from the William E. Brown senior public school in Wainfleet, and in both galleries, from Chedoke public school in Hamilton. Later on today we will be joined by students from Alway public school, Grimsby, David Maxwell public school, Windsor, Glenwood public school, Windsor, and from the University of Guelph Liberal club, Guelph.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

RAISING OF MONEY ON THE CREDIT OF CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South has priority on the floor.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have discovered that one of the Ministers is not here this morning, so my second question is for the Minister of Labour.

In the labour-management dispute between the Domtar Fine Papers mill in Cornwall, and local 212 of the papermakers and paperworkers, and the brotherhood of pulp, sulphite and paperworkers, negotiations were broken off on May 16, with the union requesting no conciliation board and the company seeking a board. When can the parties expect a decision from the Minister?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the hon. member, the decision will be made very shortly.

Mr. MacDonald: How about the answer to my question?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the current collective agreement negotiations in the whole pulp and paper industry is extremely complex. There are about 150 separate agreements under negotiation at the present time. Our conciliation branch is trying to bring some order and co-ordination into the whole picture, so that we can improve the possibility of settlement without strikes. For that reason I think that I must leave it at that and say nothing more at the moment. There will be a decision shortly.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce has a question from June 5 for the Minister of Trade and Development. Perhaps he would care to ask it at this time?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question today which is pretty well along the same lines.

The question for this morning, sir, is that the head of CMHC said this morning that $4 billion in new funds will have to be raised from private funds for housing by 1970. What sources of funds are being studied by the Minister?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I got this question a few minutes before I came into the House, but I would like to comment on it. I read this article in the *Globe and Mail*, too, by Mr. Highutt. He is facing a similar problem I think to most North American jurisdictions, and that is that there is just not sufficient money to go around to build houses fast enough for the exploding population. Let me say that the central mortgage and housing corporation have gone on record time and time again as saying that they are just bankers in the housing field.

As you know, we borrow most of our money funds for senior citizens and family housing—that is Ontario housing, or public housing as it is referred to—from CMHC. We borrow our student funds and some funds

for the land bankage. If the traditional sources of mortgage money are dried up, this places a greater responsibility on the government.

Our problem is: Where do we go for the money? It is obvious that if we get into financing $25,000 or $35,000 homes, or high-rise apartments, then other forms for raising revenue must be considered. As Mr. Highutt pointed out, I think, 15 per cent of the funds for mortgages are coming from insurance companies, 70 per cent from the mortgage companies, and some from the banks. So far, between CMHC and ourselves, we have been able to cover those first four needs —of senior citizens, public housing, student housing, land banking—and the HOME programme.

I would hope that there would be some relief for the builders who are building other types of accommodation without the government having to get into that. We recognize that there is going to be no housing of any substantial size, unless mortgage funds are made available all the way through for accommodation, and I would hope to make perhaps a more detailed statement during my estimates in the next ten days. We are looking at it now.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister accept a supplementary question along this line? Going farther afield, in Brazil they are borrowing money from the CIO, the IDA, and they are tapping large pension funds in the United States for housing loans. Would it be in this area that you could go—the CIO, and the IDA for housing money in Ontario? The loans from the United States to Brazil for emergency housing are for the same need as we have here. Is there any consideration here?

Hon. Mr. Randall: If the OHC, for instance, was in the business, like CMHC, of being a mortgage broker—but we are not at the present time. We cause houses to be built, but the financing is done through CMHC or private sources. I think that we have to look at the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) here who would have to be responsible for any more money borrowed by a Crown corporation. For instance, if Ontario housing corporation went to Europe and borrowed say $50 million, it is a liability on the books of the Ontario Treasury.

Any money that any Crown corporation borrows is a charge against the assets and is the responsibility of the Treasurer of Ontario. I might say that we have had a number of people in from Europe looking at the possibility of investment over here, and we are encouraging, we have encouraged—we have always encouraged—investment over here. I would hope that perhaps some of our foreign friends would see the opportunities of coming in here with that kind of mortgage money.

At the moment we have not approached any of these agencies, but we have everything under consideration, because as I said a few minutes ago, no matter what we do, if we do not have somebody at the end of the line to give a mortgage, the housing programme just comes to a dead end, does it not? This is one of the serious problems that we have been confronted with over the last year trying to make sure there are sufficient funds in the public market to take care of the mortgage needs.

Mr. Sargent: A question please for the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker.

What recourse has the family of Patricia Miller who died of a massive dose of local anaesthetic administered by—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Perhaps the member would read the question correctly. He has "a massive overdose" in his question.

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry. I am kind of shaggy this morning. That is right.

Mr. Speaker: It could have quite a different meaning.

Mr. MacDonald: A massive overdose!

Mr. Sargent: He allowed the question, so it must be all right.

She died of a massive overdose of a local anesthetic administered by Dr. Saul Eisen at Mount Sinai hospital on April 7, 1968? Question: What recourse?

And the second part of that is: What right does Dr. Samuel Leslie, another physician, have to refuse attending the patient unless she is married?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I just received this question a few moments before coming into the House. I will have to take it as notice, and answer it the first of the week.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. A question to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

What steps or policy has the government in mind to block further takeovers in business such as the Rothman purchase of

Canadian industries today, and has the government any plans to block further cartels and monopolies and put into effect anti-trust legislation?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): This is the first I have seen of this question, but I would like to comment on it, Mr. Speaker.

I know of no steps that we have in mind to block an amalgamation of a growing company, whether a cigarette manufacturing company or not. I do not know that that combination establishes any monopoly or cartel in either of the industries. We are interested in trends of amalgamation or mergers of various companies. We will watch this with a great deal of interest.

Of course, it will create a large organization. Whether that will have the desired results that the shareholders of those two companies think, by way of greater efficiencies, and the opportunity of securing employment for the employees of both organizations, are all things to be taken into account.

The type of merger that we read about this morning tends to fall into the category of what in recent days has been called a conglomerate; in other words, a merger of companies having interests in different segments of the economy. The question, of course, here is, have we any plans to block further cartels and monopolies, though I think the question is improperly worded to begin with because I know of no cartel or monopoly which is being established. The hon. member must know that anti-trust legislation falls entirely within the federal jurisdiction. The federal government has a department of its own, which is active in dealing with matters where trade practices might be considered restrictive.

We, however, in our Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, are interested in trends, and we are interested also in the health of the economy. We are interested in the shareholders' position, and the government, of course, is interested as a whole in that area of securing people's jobs for the future. If this type of merger gives greater stability to an operation, and it automatically follows that the jobs become more secure, that is something that none of us in this House will ever want to disregard.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Will they bring out whisky-flavoured cigarettes, sir?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: This is a question for the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch).

Mr. Speaker: The Provincial Secretary not being in the House that question will have to lay over until the first of the week.

Mr. Sargent: For the record, may I present the question?

Mr. Speaker: Not unless the Minister is present.

Mr. Sargent: Maybe it should not have been given to him, and it should be given to someone else then.

Mr. Speaker: We will find that out at the first of the week.

Mr. Sargent: To the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

What right has the province to use funds from the provincial Treasury to pay the salary of the chairman of the Carleton-Ottawa regional government?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Bill 112, section 4, subsection 2.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Has the member got that down?

Mr. Sargent: Is there something supplementary on that? The Minister has established a precedent in the Metro region here by having the funds coming out of the area to pay the Metro chairman's salary; why then, although you have a bill to allow you to do that, should you not amend that bill to make that come out of the local area?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member did not raise these very interesting points under the normal course of discussion on this when the bill proceeded through the House.

Mr. Sargent: That is pretty intelligent. I am asking the Minister now. Just because it is late, it does not say that I am wrong.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): The hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) knows the answers.

Mr. Speaker: The Attorney General has escaped the member in the last few moments. He is not in his seat. If you wait a minute, it looks like he is coming back.

Mr. Sargent: They caught him.

What steps does the government plan to institute in regard to a gun control law, such

as prohibiting purchase by mail and making guns harder to get? Secondly, would the government consider a week of amnesty for people to turn in illegally held weapons without prosecution?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many questions there are from the hon. member this morning, but they just arrived an my desk, I might say, as I walked to the House, and I do not propose to answer any of them today. Whatever more there are I will take also as notice.

Mr. Sargent: I have a further question to the Attorney General. This is a result of the broadcast from B.C. last night about wire tapping—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! Preambles are not allowed to questions. The member will place his question.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, because the Attorney General has—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the member place his question?

Mr. Sargent: How many cases of wire tapping were carried out by Ontario police in the year 1967?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Perhaps the member would read his question as submitted to the Speaker's office.

Mr. Sargent: What are the figures of the current number of wire tapping operations carried on monthly by police officials in this province as of this date, June 7, 1968?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has stated that it will be taken as notice.

The member has a further question of a Minister present?

Mr. Sargent: A question to the Provincial—I see he is out too—the Minister of Energy and Resources Management.

Will the government advise why we cannot have a public enquiry into Hydro raising its rate 9.3 per cent to rural customers now and 4 per cent to city customers in 1969?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I too just received notice of this question as I was leaving the office, so I will take it as notice, and give the hon. member an answer some time next week.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay. We have lost the opportunity, unless the Minister comes back.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): He is in the House now.

Mr. Speaker: Unless he is in his seat, he is not in the House as far as Mr. Speaker is concerned.

While the Minister is approaching, might I say that if questions come to Mr. Speaker's office as they have been doing from the New Democratic Party office on Thursday evening late, the answer probably can be given by the Minister the next day. If they come into the Speaker's office before 9—as we receive them now—of the Friday, then it is quite obvious that the question will not reach the Minister until he reaches his desk in the House and therefore an intelligent answer is probably not going to be forthcoming. I would suggest the co-operation of the members who wish to ask questions on Friday morning. The Minister has a reply?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have an answer to question 643 asked by the hon. member for York South yesterday. His question was—

Mr. Stokes: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order always takes precedence—has the member a point of order? Yours is Trade and Development, not Transport.

Mr. Stokes: Trade and Development.

Mr. Speaker: My error. I was looking for the Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett). Would you allow the Minister to complete his answer? Then, most certainly, I will be glad to give the member the floor.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker—the question:

Is the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission making any studies regarding long term effects on men working with bare hands on high voltage lines?

I wonder if the hon. member wants the answer to his question? The answer is yes. Ontario Hydro, along with the American Electric Power Service Corporation, have been conducting extensive studies for seven or eight years in the field of electrostatic influence on human beings. Ontario Hydro's representative on this committee is Mr. J. W. Simpson, assistant line maintenance engineer, operations division. Dr. Cowenhoevn of Johns Hopkins University, a specialist in this field, is also a member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay. I am sorry, I had another question here

for the Minister of Transport and I was watching for him.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is directed to the Minister of Trade and Development in the absence of the member for Oshawa (Mr. Pilkey).

Is the Minister aware that Coulter Manufacturing Company in Oshawa is phasing out its operation because of the Canada-U.S. auto trade agreement? Has the Minister taken any steps, or will he take any steps, to persuade the Coulter Manufacturing Company to continue its operation in Oshawa? Has the Minister given any consideration as to what provisions can be made for 150 employees involved in the phasing out of this automotive operation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, I just received notice of this question as I came into my office this morning. I have not had a chance to research it. I will get the information for the hon. member and take the question as notice.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would accept a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the Minister would take—this is the original question asked by the member earlier this morning?

Mr. MacDonald: This is the question to which the Minister replied, but would he accept a supplementary question now—the Minister of Energy and Resources Management? The Minister indicated that studies had been made. Unfortunately that gets me not much further ahead. Can copies of those studies be made available to those involved so that the general public might know what the content or the result of the studies are?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sorry I cannot answer the question this morning but I will discuss the matter with Hydro and perhaps I can get copies of reports.

Mr. Speaker: Would the leader of the Opposition advise whether someone from his caucus would care to ask the Minister of Transport a question, which I have here, which has been held over? I would be glad to give it to him if he would wish to ask it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is to the Minister of Transport, and, in the absence of Mr. Knight, I would ask the question at this time. Does the department issue a special set of licence plates to identify vehicles of short wave radio operators who are licensed as such? If not, is the Minister prepared to institute a programme, following the example of Manitoba, Quebec and the states of the United States that do so, so that these short wave operators' services can be used in a state of emergency?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the department does not issue special licence plates to amateur radio operators. It is not feasible with our present manual system of vehicle registration to provide the owners of these mobile transmitters with plates bearing their particular call numbers.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 59, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Bill 60, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Bill 107, An Act to amend The Corporations Act.

Bill 120, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Bill 127, An Act to amend The Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1964.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves second reading of Bill 140, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there are two bills that I expect will be put before the House this morning. The one that the hon. Minister has just moved will permit the department to implement French language instruction in elementary schools. I have understood, and I know it is a fact, that such instruction has been carried on for many years and my only comment here, leaving other comments for the next bill, is why is it necessary to have this legislation put before the House in order to provide for instruction that has been carried on for some time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, when the committee was appointed to look into—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Minister would wait to see if there is anyone else who wishes to engage in this debate.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the principle of this bill, my first point was going to be the one that the leader of the Opposition has raised. We had bilingual education at the elementary level. Indeed, we have had education completely in French at the elementary level, for quite some time. I recall during the Confederation of tomorrow conference downtown, when Joey Smallwood, in his inimitable way, informed the conference they had the only bilingual school in Canada up in Labrador City, that the Minister in his quiet, but devastating way, that afternoon informed him how many students and how many schools were getting that kind of education in Ontario now, and had been for quite some time.

Mr. Nixon: I did not sense that Mr. Smallwood was devastated then.

Mr. MacDonald: He is never devastated—even when he should have been by events and the facts of life.

Mr. Nixon: This is quite true, because devastation is in the eye of the beholder.

Mr. MacDonald: Some of it is in the eyes of all beholders as they look at Newfoundland at the moment. However, let us not get out too far in that, Mr. Speaker.

In short, these have been traditional rights and I am wondering if, in effect, what is happening is that they are being made legal rights, and, in effect, we are constitutionalizing what has been an accepted procedure.

The second aspect of the principle of this bill which I think is worthy of some comment is that where French is the language of instruction, we are now setting down the right of the English-speaking minority, that where there are eight or ten parents, or any viable group of some 30 students, they can make application for teaching in English where the predominant language is French.

This, Mr. Speaker, I think underlines a point that too often is forgotten in English-speaking Canada—that in our efforts to achieve a greater measure of bilingualism in this country, the English-speaking provinces are working to achieve what has always been conceded in the province of Quebec. We have genuine bilingualism there, we have the opportunity for English-speaking schools; I can speak quite knowledgeably, having gone through that system at the public and secondary school level. In short, we are rather belatedly providing the full opportunity for minority rights in any given community within other provinces in the fashion that has traditionally been the case in the province of Quebec.

My final comment, Mr. Speaker, is that in expressing support for this bill and the underlying principle I think we should see it in perspective and recognize how vital it is in the whole approach to easing the tensions in Canadian Confederation.

I would suggest in general terms, that the problems of re-Confederation, as they have come to be known, fall into two general categories: One is the division, or the redivision, of powers and moneys to be able to meet the responsibilities the federal and provincial governments may have. This is the really difficult problem that the continuing constitutional conference has set for itself. The second group is what are sometimes described as the B and B aspects of the problems of Confederation. I think the important achievement of the Confederation of tomorrow conference last November was that it revealed a much greater consensus among provincial Premiers on this issue than was thought to be the case. Indeed, I think it is not inaccurate to say that the powers that be in Ottawa were willing to let this conference go ahead, in the firm conviction that it would blow up almost from the start, that there would be no consensus. Well, we did achieve a consensus, indeed, even among people who started with a pretty healthy antipathy to the idea of bilingualism and biculturalism. It was at that conference, that Joey Smallwood went from nothing to everything, in terms of bilingualism, and his was one province that the B and B report had suggested need not be involved because the number of French Canadians was so small. But of more importance since then, we have seen in Saskatchewan, Alberta and even in British Columbia, something of a breakthrough which makes it possible to look forward to the day of more genuine bilingualism in this country.

I think bilingualism is going to be achieved in a real sense if we have the opportunity for bilingual education. It is one thing to develop a more complete bilingual infrastructure, at the municipal level, or at the provincial level, or at the federal level, but, I think, the real underpinnings for genuine bilingualism is that one should provide the opportunity for it at the school level. Indeed, at the elementary school level because, as

was pointed out yesterday, in the education debate regarding the priorities we give at various stages of education, language education, in the elementary grades, is the appropriate place for a real start; not only in terms of providing an opportunity for teaching French, but for the French to learn English, and the English to learn French, so that we can move towards the achievement of an overall objective of a bilingual nation.

In short, I welcome this bill. I think, in some respects, it is only legalizing what has been a tradition. I think it is very important that we, in the province of Ontario, lead the way with the legal substance, as well as some of the traditional practices that have developed over the years.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak before the Minister? The Minster has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take any time because I made a fairly lengthy statement on the introduction of this bill on first reading. The observations of both the leader of the Opposition and the member for York South are quite correct. When the committee got into the question of recommending legislation, as it relates to the secondary school field, I think it was obvious they had to consider the legal situation, as it related to the elementary school. And, while through tradition, custom, or whatever term one might wish to use, we have developed, in this province, a very extensive system of bilingual schools at the elementary level, it really was based on history or tradition. And, the committee recommended to me, and to the government, that we put this in the form of legislation so it would be complementary to the secondary school legislation. The government not only accepted it, Mr. Speaker, we felt this did make sense, and we wanted to put into legislation what has been the historical or customary approach to this form of education, in this province.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill 141, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, this is the bill that does implement the policies expressed by the Premier last summer in a speech before the French language educational association, I believe. He was speaking in Ottawa at the time. But, it was a full year ago. Even before that, in the discussions of the estimates of the Minister of Education, it was brought before the House, the difficulties experienced by French-speaking students in those communities where they had only French educational facilities to the end of grade 8; and the number of dropouts of these students, who, when they went on to the secondary level, could not cope with instruction entirely in English or, at least, largely in English. There were three subjects, I believe, where French instruction was permitted without even the kind of bill that we have passed just a moment ago. I can remember the discussions at that time. The member for York South and myself, and some others, carried on a fairly lengthy discussion with the Minister and I felt, on that occasion, that there did require some policy direction, as far as the government was concerned, because I felt the Minister was at a loss to tell us what could be done to improve the situation. He used the phrase at one time, "Well, what would you do?" and I think, from at least two sources on this side, it was indicated that we should move into French language instruction at the secondary level.

This now has come about, or at least can come about when this bill is passed, and it sets right a difficult situation that has come down to us from the history of our province. It is not necessary to go into any of those details, I think most of us are familiar with them, and we on this side support the principle of the bill that is before us.

The Minister, in his introductory remarks, made it abundantly clear that the curriculum, that would be presented, would give the students in the French-speaking communities ample opportunity to, in fact, graduate with bilingual abilities. I believe this is important. We are doing these young people no service if we present them with a curriculum which is less than complete for their needs, as they matriculate and go out into the world of everyday work and existence in Ontario.

So with this in mind, I would say we on this side support the principle of the bill, as it is presently understood. I feel there will be some dislocation in its implementation. We have read, from time to time, about comments made in some of the bilingual communities; not the French communities but the bilingual communities where there is some concern that English instruction will

not be maintained for that part of the population that is not equipped to take advantage of instruction in French. I am quite sure that these fears are groundless. There is no thought, surely, that any curtailment in funds needed would make it impossible for the provision of the adequate facilities for both communities where there is a significant percentage that has to be properly served.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, much of what I said in the previous bill applies to this, in its general reference to the importance of the teaching of French and the provision of bilingual education.

I am a little curious, as to the unwillingness of the government to grasp this nettle a year ago when they had such a magnificent opportunity in the instance of the closing of the Sacred Heart college in Sudbury. At that time, all of my most persistent prodding could not get any comment out of the Minister, other than the fact that this was a local responsibility. A few months later, particularly on the eve of an election, apparently the government changed its mind and was willing to accept this added burden and make it a central government responsibility in terms of clarifying our rights in this country. But perhaps one should not be unappreciative of achievements even though they are a little tardy and sometimes well gauged for the needs of elections.

I would like to underline a point that has been raised by the leader of the Opposition in terms of easing the fears, even in French-speaking communities, of a young person getting his education in French and, therefore, being ill-equipped to live in a predominantly English-speaking economy and society, such as Canada is or the North American continent is. It has always struck me as being a bit anomalous that one will run into fairly vigorous opposition sometimes among French Canadians to the idea of secondary education in French because of this fear.

It seems to me it underlines a problem that we have been grappling with in language teaching, not only to French children, but to English-speaking children, and that is that we have got to make it more effective in terms of the speaking of the language. Therefore, it applies as fully to the efforts that are now being made to teaching French more effectively to English-speaking Canadians in Ontario, so that when they have gone to some years of public school and four or five years of secondary school, they do not come out of the school almost as incapable of speaking French as they were when they went in.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) has lamented this plight that he faces. All of us do in varying degrees. Some of us are trying to repair the gaps because of the inefficiency of our teaching system.

The final point, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to make in commenting on the principle of this bill, is that I think it is extremely important that we fill the secondary gap in the flow of French-speaking students or bilingual education. Until now, we have had a bits and pieces approach. We have had a considerable opportunity for teaching in French at the elementary school level. We have moved formally to the establishment of two bilingual universities in the province of Ontario, but there is grave danger that these universities are going to wither on the vine so to speak, because there would not be an adequate flow of French-speaking students.

With the provision of a fuller opportunity for education in French at the secondary level wherever you have got a viable group across the province of Ontario, I think we will not only be achieving this overall objective for the fullest possible measure of bilingualism, including the basic element of education, but we will also be underpinning the bilingual universities that have now been established. In short, we have consolidated our position this morning by constitutionalizing, if I may use that term, bilingual education at the elementary level; we have got it to a degree at the university level, and now we are going to assure it more fully at the secondary school level so that we have a flow throughout the educational system.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak? The Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is very little that I can add, as I say once again, to the introductory remarks I made when the bill was presented to the House. I welcome the very positive response from the members opposite with respect to this legislation, because really, it is very historic legislation and I think that we can anticipate, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps this form of legislation will be of some benefit, not only within our own province, but perhaps outside this provincial jurisdiction as well.

I just want to make one point with respect to an observation made by the member for York South, when he was referring to the concern expressed by, say, two of our univer-

sities with the flow of students. Really I think in fairness that does not apply to the University of Ottawa perhaps, but certainly with respect to Laurentian there was a concern and is still a concern as to the numbers of students who can benefit by a bilingual form of university education. I am sure that this particular bill will improve the flow of students to Laurentian, although, as I say, at Ottawa I am not sure really that this was as great a problem as at Laurentian.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO LABOUR-MANAGEMENT ARBITRATION COMMISSION ACT, 1968

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour) moves second reading of Bill 142, The Ontario Labour-Management Arbitration Commission Act, 1968.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, it is a very interesting bill that the Minister has brought forward but I would like to know really what this government and what the department intend to do. We had a bill sitting here for four years, something to do with official referees and labour arbitrators. The Minister of that day, when he brought it in, said it was a great bill and we were immediately going to get on with building up a corps of trained arbitrators and trained referees and trained conciliators and everything was going to be fine.

That bill, as we discovered a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, has sat on the statute books passed but unproclaimed since, I think, 1962, and we have not had this great group of arbitrators, referees and conciliators built up, trained and so on.

We have another bill now—not quite the same in terms and the Minister is undoubtedly going to tell us it is quite different in its concept, but the theory is certainly the same. When we have labour problems we must have a means whereby there is a group or corps of trained officials who are impartial in their outlook, or as reasonably impartial as they can be. It is a difficult thing to get anyone who is impartial, and anyone who has opinions probably out of necessity has opinions that lead him one way or another. But hopefully, we can build up some sort of a group who will be at the beck and call of the government to be made available in situations such as this.

I say that we should get on with this. I would like to know why the government has delayed, why we now have a new statute, and what progress the Minister can reasonably look forward to achieving. It is all very well to bring in another piece of paper, to go through all of the ritual that we go through to make it law, but if the piece of paper does no more than sit on the statute books, unacted upon by government as the last piece of paper did, then the whole exercise is a waste of time.

Goodness knows, Mr. Speaker, we need all of our best thinking and all of our best talent to be made available to help solve the number of serious labour disputes that face us, and apparently they are going to continue to face us. We have to bend every effort to try and look after these in the fairest way possible.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I think I can say to the House that we will support this bill but we are not convinced at all of the government's real intention to get into this field. The present Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs was in good form when he introduced the last bill. A new era was about to come and we were going to set up a group in accord, and so on, and the bill has sat four years unproclaimed. Now the Minister cannot explain that away.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): We do not take second place in Ontario in this field in the whole of North America.

Mr. Singer: I know, but do not drag red herrings across the—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No red herring.

Mr. Singer: The bill sat for six years unproclaimed. It was the responsibility of the present Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs when he was then Minister of Labour. He gave, when he introduced it, in his remarks on the second reading, a speech that is going to be paraphrased by this Minister of Labour. It is very hard, Mr. Speaker, to bridge the credibility gap because we listen to this—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The Minister has a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I think the hon. member for Downsview is entirely in error. I do not recall introducing that bill, and I do not think I could be identified, as the hon. member would like to identify me, with the bill

which was never proclaimed. I doubt if it was ever introduced. It certainly has nothing to do with my administration—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, maybe it was not this man: it may have been the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales).

Mr. MacDonald: What bill is the member referring to?

Mr. Speaker: My own recollection to the member might be that it was a different department entirely that had carriage of that particular bill. I suspect Mr. Speaker has some personal recollection of it.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: My point is that I am sure that the hon. member for Downsview would want to be graceful enough to admit his error in the debate.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): He is always graceful; see him on the floor.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, if I have been in error then certainly I apologize to you and the hon. Minister.

An hon. member: Somebody has been in error.

Mr. Singer: Let me say that the bill is on the statute books and it has sat there for six years. Whichever Minister introduced it, certainly introduced it with a flourish, with drums banging and cymbals clashing and said, "Here we have the solution."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: All right, and they have a collective responsibility, it is the problem of all of them, every one of the Ministry.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: All right, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister wants to get into a fight, let me tell him what the facts are. In 1962, the government brought in a bill, whoever brought it in, whichever Minister, whichever one of your colleagues brought it in—and said, "Here is a solution to labour difficulties and this is what we are going to do." And the bill has sat there for six years unproclaimed. So the government has done nothing. Now, that is it. Those are the facts.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. member need not raise his voice.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, this hon. Minister brings it upon himself. He forces me to tell him through you, sir, that the government is full of sound and fury signifying nothing. They are constantly bringing in pieces of paper which mean nothing because they do not act on them. And I say, sir, that I hope there is more genuine feeling behind this bill that we see before us than there was in the last one, which has sat there for four years. The credibility gap is a big one and we have a hard job believing the government mean things when they bring in new bills that substantially are the same as the last one upon which they never took any action. That is what it is. If I by any chance involved the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs improperly as a person, I certainly was wrong, but he is involved as a member of this government and as a Cabinet Minister, and the government and the Cabinet have a bad record in this labour field.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I accept the apology of the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, backing up my colleague, the member for Downsview, I think it is a shocking thing that Ontario's labour force over all these years has not had any vehicle such as this to protect them. We have here in effect a necessary piece of legislation, but in essence it is another government commission, with blanket powers to govern our lives. The second section, clause 2 reads: "The commission shall consist of seven members. One shall be designated by the Lieutenant-Governor and there shall be three members to represent employees and three members employers." I would like to ask the Minister who is the chairman of the commission? Has he been appointed yet?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I see. Well then, how will you pick the three employee representatives and three employer representatives?

Mr. Speaker: The member will not expect an answer to that until the Minister has the floor a little later.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Ask the hon. member to let us have his recommendations.

Mr. Sargent: I am not clear. The fourth clause states the terms of office will be one, two, or three years and eligible for reappoint-

ment. I assume these will all be political appointments as in other commissions we have. And then we get on to the salaries of these people. I think we should know these things before we get into this legislation.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Grey-Bruce says that we need this kind of legislation to protect the workers. My experience with boards of arbitration is often they are there to protect the employer, not the worker. I hope that after the initial setting up of the board, which is of some little importance, that in the training of the staff you take into consideration—very careful consideration—all the various types of occupations that normally fall within the scope of arbitration boards.

Far too often we have had arbitrators sitting on boards who are not at all familiar with the working conditions and the terminology of the employment that they were trying to arbitrate. And it is very important that the people who are doing the training come from a great variety of occupations in order that the people who finally end up as the arbitrators are fully knowledgeable of, as I say, the terminology in particular of the various occupations. I think it is very necessary. I have not been satisfied with the arbitration procedures up to now and I hope this will improve on them.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few comments to this.

This bill acknowledges the need. That need has been emphasized again in the debate this morning. It has presented new procedures for fulfilling that need. What puzzles me is, what exactly is this commission going to do that the government has not done during the four years of lamented absence since the previous bill was introduced in 1962—six years, if it was really introduced in 1962?

We recognize that, if we ever implement fully the regulation that those who are sitting on the bench should not be involved in affiliation and arbitration procedures, we would have to have other personnel. Presumably we have been doing something about the development of those personnel. My question is really a twofold one; what might this commission do that the government was not doing to develop that bank of arbitrators? The second aspect of my question is—I am a little curious as to why the government felt they needed a commission.

One acknowledges the need for arbitrators, conciliators, referees. But could you not have had, from within The Department of Labour, a branch that did the necessary licensing and took the necessary steps to seek out people and to train them? Why do you need to have a commission to do what is essentially a fairly routine matter? After all, The Department of Labour is seeking out and training and putting inspectors in jobs in many, many aspects of the economy today. Why do you need to have a commission to do the necessary work here in this area?

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak to this bill? The Minister has the floor.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in dealing with a number of matters that have been raised this morning in reference to the principles behind the bill, I would like to refer first to the Act that was referred to by the hon. member for Downsview—that is, The Approved Impartial Arbitrators Act, brought in, I believe, in 1961 or 1962, prior to my coming to this Legislature.

Under that Act, a board was established. It was a three-man board, presided over by the chief justice of the high court of this province, and there were two other members. That board was simply empowered to register or to approve arbitrators. People could go to them and be, I presume, questioned, then if approved, receive a stamp of approval.

Since that time—and it began in the fall of 1966—the federal government took action to effectively remove the judiciary from the role of arbitrators, which they had carried on for some time. They are not prevented from serving in that position, but they cannot be reimbursed for it except for their expenses and they certainly have a great many other prior duties which they must undertake—

Mr. Singer: That is about as good a deterrent as you can provide for.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Well, I think they have an effective role and a very necessary role to play, so that we should not encumber that. But the judges had received approval from both union and management over quite a long period of time and they were reluctant to lose the services of that group of impartial people in the field of arbitration.

This new situation was dealt with very extensively by the union-management council, which was established last September. It was a unanimous recommendation—and I stress this—from both the union and management

people on that council, that this type of bill should be developed. At the present time, since the judges have not been available, we have found a number of people who were serving in the capacity of arbitrators. But they are people that have been doing this or allied or analogous work for some time. There are about 35 or 40 of them that we can suggest or make available to parties. But we feel in the coming year, because of the absence of the judiciary from this field, that we shall have to provide many more. And under this commission hon. members will note from the provisions of the bill, they are empowered to recruit and to register persons as arbitrators. The commission will provide training for them, and I think that this is an important area that will require concentrated work. It is one of the questions that was really raised by the hon. member for Wentworth, that they would be people of broad understanding from different types of industry, and so on.

This commission will actually handle many of the details of arbitration if the parties wish them to do so. I stress that the union and management need not recruit from or draw on this group of arbitrators as the sole source, but it will be available to them. I would expect that, because of the pressure to find satisfactory arbitrators, once we have an able panel, the bulk of the nominees will draw from this group.

I would say to the hon. members that it is the firm intention of myself and my department to proceed with this matter. The reason for establishing the commission is that we feel that it should have an impartial chairman, probably serving in a full-time capacity. The other members, three representing management, and three representing labour, would probably serve on a part-time basis as their services were required. But, with that type of situation, we can develop a group or panel of arbitrators that we will sorely need in the coming years.

One other point before I conclude, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the members are aware that this is one of the matters dealt with by Mr. Justice Rand in his hearing over the last two years. I am not sure as to whether recommendations will be included in the report, in connection with this field, but if they are they will certainly be taken into consideration and, if necessary, we will amend our legislation if we need to, following consideration of such recommendations. But as we are under great pressure today to provide arbitrators to settle grievances that have arisen during the course of the collective agreements, for this reason we feel that we cannot leave the problem in abeyance for another year. For that reason we wish to press forward with the legislation at the present time. I would give the members full assurance that once this bill is passed we will proceed to establish the commission and ask the members to proceed with all speed to recruit and train the necessary arbitrators.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 11th order; committee of the whole House, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

THE TRAINING SCHOOLS ACT, 1965

House in committee on Bill 128, An Act to amend The Training Schools Act, 1965.

Sections 1 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 128 reported.

THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACT, 1968

House in committee on Bill 129, The Department of Correctional Services Act, 1968.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, just a word on section 2. You may ask what "correctional services" mean, that other names may smell as sweet, and say it is just a question of semantics I suppose. I would like him to comment, if the Minister would care to do so, on the change in the name. Does the name "reform institutions" embarrass him? Is it perhaps too pretentious a name considering the little reforming that has been taken place? Does he think it is easier to correct than to reform?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have no hesitation in discussing this, but this has already been discussed in my comments on first reading and on second reading. I would refer the hon. member to his colleague who sits on his left, who gave a very good reason and explained why he wholeheartedly supported the change in the name, as very progressive—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municip Affairs): Let us have a little co-ordination over there.

Mr. Lawlor: You have not spoken for several days.

Sections 2 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 14:

Mr. Lawlor: On section 14, jumping down to the last four lines of the section, you go on to state about lock-ups: "And the municipality shall pay to the Treasurer of Ontario annually such rate per day for persons in custody in the lock-up as is fixed by the Minister for the year." I suggest that perhaps an amendment might be in order. We have gone through a whole series of legislation here in the past two or three weeks whereby the province of Ontario assumed the cost, and I would assume that it is assuming the cost of the lock-ups as well. So, why should municipalities pay to the Treasurer of Ontario? I do not think you intend that. I suggest it is an oversight and that the matter ought to be straightened out, and perhaps straightened out right now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think there is some misunderstanding on the part of the hon. member. I should say when a municipality was unable to establish a lock-up, arrangements were made with the county for the use of the jail for this purpose, and remuneration was paid to the county for the use of the jail facilities. As the hon. member said, under the province's assumption of the cost of the administration of justice, this section will be repealed, and the remuneration will now be paid to the Treasurer of Ontario. The cost of the administration of the local police department has not been assumed by the province of Ontario, and it is still under the local police. It is not until after a man leaves the local lock-up that he becomes the responsibility of the province.

Sections 14 to 28, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 29:

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, on section 29, I would like to knew whether, when a person does not make information that they have about the possibility of parole of some individual, known to the parole board, is there a sanction for not doing so or just how does that arise?

Secondly, under this section, may I say that the wording compared to the previous section 9 of The Parole Act is much improved. It spoke in terms of access. In other words, if anyone had access to information, whether he knew that he had access or not, and the information was relevant, then difficulties could occur. This is a good amendment and I commend the Minister on this. Would he care to make mention on my first question as to what would happen to such a person?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a good question, Mr. Chairman. When we drew this section up, I went into this quite thoroughly because it is the first thing that would occur to a person. Naturally they would ask, what is the point of having a requirement when there is no sanction if a person does not carry out the requirement? It is pointed out that most of the people we are concerning ourselves with here are public officials, who because the law requires it, would carry out their duty without the requirement of a sanction, such as magistrates, probation officers, police officers and so on. They know that by law they are required to carry out this requirement, and there is no sanction required in this particular case.

On the other hand, if a private individual has information and will not offer it, I think that the hon. member would agree that you would not want to penalize a man because he has information and refuses to give it. He may feel that he is required to give information that may be used against a friend of his, and you would not want to say that a man has to give this information for reasons of parole. I think that by and large, as the hon. member says, it is an improvement and will carry out what is intended.

Sections 29 to 32, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 33:

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman? I am sorry, I came in late here. Is there anything in this bill with regard to training in county jails, at all? Have I missed that part?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The only thing that I think that I could say is that where county jails are involved in this bill, is they become part of the provincial system. This was the purpose of the new bill to begin with, to include and bring county jails under our control, and they now become correctional institutions, that is, the same as any other. They are no longer called county jails. They are, as soon as the bill becomes law, part of our total provincial system.

Mr. Sargent: Well, can I assume that there will be more idleness or that there will be a programme for training in county jails?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, of course, Mr. Chairman, we discussed this during my estimates. It is our plan that there will be no idleness. There will be a programme laid out for all of the institutions within the purview of my department. But, I would hope that none would expect that this would be done overnight. There is a massive job to be done, and we are approaching it now, and we will do the best we can to introduce the programme, as enunciated by me, the other day in the estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Section 33?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I must point out to the member that this bill has been dealt with in committee, in its totality.

Mr. Sargent: I know, you are very kind, but it is very important.

Mr. Chairman: It is not on section 33, I must point out to the member, and we cannot discuss the principle or generalities of this bill at this time.

Section 33 agreed to.

On section 34:

Mr. Lawlor: On section 34, this deals with the regulations. I am thinking particularly of the regulations which might have some relevance to section 16, where the provincial bailiff removes a prisoner from one jail to another—in subsection 2—and there is a warrant for removal, signed by an official of the department. My only thought on that was that some afternoon, and perhaps the Minister has considered it, somebody will obtain one of those forms—as it is in the hands of two officials to be designated in the department—forge a signature and spring one of their friends, because not much more is required. Under the regulations, I would suggest that, perhaps, a countersigning of that warrant might be considered sensible—by either the Minister or the Deputy Minister or a second individual in the department—considering the nice use that may be made of a forged warrant.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with all the details involved in this. I will study the *Hansard* after it is printed, and when we are drawing up the regulations, which are being drawn up at the moment, I will make sure that the hon. member's comments, in this respect, are considered by my officials, in case there appears to be some loophole which has not been covered in this area. Thank you for the suggestion.

Mr. Chairman: Section 34?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on section 34, it says the establishment and governing programme referred to in section 20, which is the educational programme. The Minister has stated that this will come into being, he does not know when. I think that we have a right to know when we can expect that this vocational programme will be started in the correctional institutions in Ontario. When is it going to happen?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to discuss it, if you will permit it. But, this is out of order again. This does not refer to the programme, in the institutions. This, in fact, refers, if the hon. member will read that subsection, to the programmes referred to in section 20, which has to do with programmes outside of the institutions when there is temporary leave and that sort of thing, provided it has nothing to do with the jail system, as such.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the Minister knows what I am trying to find out. Why the evasion? Why can you not tell us when you are going to put this into effect in Ontario? Why can you not be honest with us?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member suggests that I have evaded this question, if he will just look back into the *Hansard*, he will find that I have answered it in this session alone and for the hon. member's benefit—I should imagine three or four or five times. I cannot tell you when the programme is going into effect. As a matter of fact, this portion of it is going to depend on the federal government's legislation being passed.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, in that case, the question is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. This Minister told me, years ago, things that have never happened.

Some hon. members: Shut up, sit down.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, come on!

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! We are discussing this bill clause by clause. Section 34 indicates—

Mr. Sargent: What kind of a snow job goes on here, anyway?

Some hon. members: Sit down, sit down.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): On a point of order. I object to the kind of language, and the use of phrases like "snow job".

Mr. Sargent: Well that is too bad. I am not talking to you, so sit down.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: And secondly, I object to this debate under the House in committee, which is presently sitting. This is a second reading debate, which the hon. member is now attempting to raise in committee. It has been debated on second reading, and I urge you and I ask you to rule this entire matter out of order.

Mr. Chairman: I think that the member realizes—

Mr. Sargent: You should not be taking instructions from the House leader, as to what is out of order.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member that I have instructions from no one, and I think that he realizes that we are dealing with this bill clause by clause.

Mr. Sargent: This Minister has misled the House over the years.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member please resume his seat? He is out of order. Section 34?

Section 34 agreed to.

On section 35:

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, we have been putting so many bills, turning so many bills into Acts, and placing so many bills on the statute books of this province, of recent date, that it is a great pleasure to see some of them taken back off again.

Sections 35 to 37, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 129 reported.

REDUCTION OF MUNICIPAL TAXES

House in committee on Bill 91, An Act to provide for the reduction of municipal taxes on residential property.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I move that the second reprinting be considered by the committee of the whole House.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister of Municipal Affairs moves that the second reprinting of the bill be considered by the committee.

Motion agreed to.

On section 1:

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Perhaps I might explain in section 1, Mr. Chairman, and in a number of other places, to make the purpose and the effect of the bill quite clear.

We have changed the words "tax credit", which formerly appeared, to "reduction of taxes". For a number of reasons, this is a more accurate way and, perhaps, a more legal way of describing exactly what has happened. It has an effect in a number of places through the bill, but the purpose of a number of these amendments is simply to change the wording from "tax credit" to "reduction of taxes".

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a very important piece of legislation, and in order to question the Minister clause by clause—

Mr. Chairman: Clause by clause consideration.

Mr. Sargent: —to bring this up to date. Under equalization across the province, will the average home-owner get the same amount of money across Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Sargent: What will be the variance, what will it range from across Ontario, from home-owners and apartment-owners?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: From $45 to $65.

Mr. Sargent: Well Mr. Chairman, how do you equate that some people receive more than others? What kind of equality is this?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think what we are talking about, Mr. Chairman, is beyond me. This has nothing to do with section 1. I suppose we are talking about the principle of the bill again?

Mr. Chairman: Yes. Section 1 deals with the interpretation of sections of the Act.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman I do not know—

Mr. Chairman: Well may I point out—

Mr. Sargent: That is pretty awful.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is an understatement.

An hon. member: You should learn the rules after this many years in the place.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I have been in this business of dealing with people all my life and I do not have to take any stuff from you at all over there.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: I am sure that the comment made by the hon. Minister that we were discussing principle is not correct. I would agree, however, Mr. Chairman, that the question that the hon. member is asking might be more properly in order under section 3, where the provision for the debate actually is contained.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, section 1, of course is the interpretation section, and the member's questions were entirely out of order in that respect.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is one point that I may make under section 1, which I think is of interest.

Subsection (h) formerly excluded properties which had been assessed under section 53, of The Assessment Act. That exclusion has been taken out. I think, to explain this to my friends, section 53 covers properties which, for example, are assessed for the first time, or were assessed for the first time on February 1, let us say of this year. They would therefore pay part-year taxes. It was originally thought that it would be too difficult a matter to apply a credit or reduction in taxes for a part-year and originally those properties assessed under section 53, were not included in the bill.

We have now decided, and with the concurrence of most of the court and treasurers, it will be possible to bring these properties in under the Act, and they will get a proportionate amount of credit. So the definition of municipal taxes has been changed to accomplish this end. I think it is rather a significant addition to the Act.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am sorry Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might say—under subsection 2, there is a change. Originally it was the subsection 2 of section 1.

Originally, you will recall, if a person was not separately assessed the owner could go down and see the treasurer, and this apartment should have been separately assessed. What we are doing by this small amendment is allowing either the owner or the tenant to go to the treasurer this year and say: "I was not separately assessed. I am entitled to the reduction." If the treasurer is so satisfied, then the credit can be made.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Well, on that subsection, Mr. Chairman, usually you do this through the court of revision, do you not? The previous procedure to change the assessment bill was to go through the court of revision, and their very strict time limits. When there is a series of appeals, any kind of revision of the assessment roll follows a very tight series of legal procedures. Are you doing away with this?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Singer: It seems you intend to do away with all those court of revision procedures appeals from now on.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, this really does not affect the assessment rolls or at any rate it will not in the year 1968. I think my friend is aware that there are a number of properties—and this is also true in the rural areas, where a farm is assessed for just land and buildings. No breakdown. But I think my friend is aware of situations here where, for one reason or another, a self-contained dwelling within the meaning of the Act has not been separately assessed.

Now, rather than go through all that rigmarole, but to still get in the benefit of the tax reduction, this section was put in this year. I have no doubt—that is the treasurer satisfies himself—that it should be paid, that it will be properly assessed the following year, and that it should not be the problem that it may be this year.

But we are not doing away with all the provisions of the court of revision. This really does not directly affect the assessment roll. It is the treasurer who is satisfied it should have been correctly assessed.

Mr. Chairman: Section 2.

Mr. Singer: Yes, Mr. Chairman, but I am still not clear on this. If the treasurer is satisfied, sir, he may certify that parts of such land shall be deemed to have been separately assessed in the year 1967 for the purposes of this Act.

You are in fact, sir, giving power to the treasurer to amend the assessment roll by adding, at least for the year 1967, all sorts of people who in his discretion he deems

should be properly added. At which point—have you not destroyed the whole base of the assessment roll?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I do not think so because the words there are "deemed to be separately assessed". If those words are there, the treasurer can make his claim to the Treasurer of Ontario, and say there are so many units separately assessed, or they are deemed to be separately assessed in case they all are not. In that way, the treasurer —if there were 100 units—can then pay out for 100 units. But the assessment roll will not be tinkered with.

Mr. Singer: Are you not going to end up with an assessment roll prepared by the assessor which is subject to the usual procedures, court of revision and so on? There is another roll—call it what you will—which the treasurer has added up, which may have an extra 10,000 names on it, which the treasurer has made up. Is it not conceivable the Minister was talking about what we, in our municipality, often call basement apartments, where—by the time you get two assessments—it is often higher than what you would have had with one assessment?

So the treasurer is going to have in his little compartment a different kind of roll. Perhaps you cannot call it technically an assessment roll, because you are not doing it here, but he is going to have a separate roll with more names on it and very possibly with more value, and have you not then destroyed the whole assessment roll—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, of course, as you realize this section has been written so that it is only effective for the year 1968. After that, they will have to be separately assesssd by the assessor and the treasurer, and we will have no power to do anything about it. We suspect this section may lead to some better assessment practices, although that is not the real purpose of it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I suspect you are opening up a can of worms here, and causing no end of trouble.

An hon. member. Zoning problems too.

Mr. Chairman: The fact is, the Chairman must point out that section 1 was carried and that the conversation between the Minister and the chair, and the chair and the member for Downsview—while it was perhaps useful—was out of order, and I do not think we should—

Mr. Singer: With great respect, Mr. Chairman, it was not out of order because the Minister had just finished explaining what section 2—

Mr. Chairman: The Minister was out of order in reverting back to section 1.

Mr. Singer: He was no more out of order than me, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We were out of order together.

Mr. Chairman: With all due respect, the Chairman pointed out that both the Minister and the member for Downsview were out of order. Section 1 has been carried. The Chairman is calling section 2. The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: The motivation for this bill, Mr. Chairman, was to admit inequity to the real estate people of Ontario and that is why you are trying to distribute $150 million, if that is the amount. We are talking in clause 2 about "every local municipality shall reduce the municipal taxes required to be paid each year". This is going to cost the municipalities a great sum of money out of their own pockets to enact legislation which should never have been here in the first place. Will the Minister please advise why, on this clause, this was not given back to the municipalities in the form of per capita grants to municipalities? I want to find out the answer, this is very important.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, with great respect, I think that falls under the principle of the bill which was fully debated at that time, as I recall for some five or six hours. The bill was approved in principle and the principle of returning money on real estate taxes in this way was decided at that time. The reasons why it was not done on a per capita basis, or any other basis, I think, were discussed and settled at that time.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I will accept that as being another one of your gross errors here, but the fact that municipalities at this point—do not get that sour look on your face because you are a new boy here and you have a lot to learn.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: He cannot do anything wrong, this man. The fact that the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) remarks about learning the law—you are the ones that make the laws. We have to try to adapt ourselves to them.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member please stick to the section of the bill?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): On a point of order. How long are you going to permit this kind of cross-conversation from the other side?

Mr. Sargent: When did you get back into the House?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, I suggest that if anything is out of order it is the kind of comments made by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would ask the member to refrain from the type of discussion that he is indulging in and stick to section 2 of the bill. Section 2?

Mr. Sargent: It is going to cost the municipalities a lot of money at the outset. Now they are paying these moneys and the people are paying their taxes, and they are paying the money which they do not have in advance. What are you going to do about that?

Mr. Chairman: I think the Minister has explained that. That type of question I do not believe is in order.

Mr. Sargent: The municipal tax funds are prepaying the money that you have not paid them yet and they do not have these moneys. Now where is the area of recourse to the municipalities at this point?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, section 2 says "the local municipality shall reduce municipal taxes by the amount as determined", and a further section says "they apply to the province to get this money back from the province in full". There is nothing in this Act that says the municipality must allow this credit at any particular point in time. They can allow it on the first, second, third, fourth, or whatever instalment they wish, and presumably I have said if they allow it on the last instalment they will actually have the money from the province prior to having allowed the credit.

Mr. Sargent: Have you instructed the municipalities to that effect?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes. I will have something further to say about that this morning under section 9.

Mr. Sargent: As a matter of record, the municipalities are paying the moneys out now because the people are expecting it because of all the publicity here. Insofar as the equalized mill rate—up to $2,000 of assessment—because there is no standardization in equalization—you have the disparity between $45 and $55, which is another inequity in this government.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You are quite wrong. The hon. member is quite wrong. The reason —because there is a difference—does not have anything to do with the assessment practices that may enter into it. The reason there is a difference between, for example, $45 and $65, is because there is a great difference in the tax burden in municipalities in this province. Obviously we would all say taxes in every municipality are high. That simply is not the case, however. At least if they are all high, some are higher than others, and where taxes are high—where the individual is being called upon to pay a heavier burden of taxes on real estate—then the credit is proportionately higher. If the taxes are relatively low, then the credit is low and that is the reason for the difference between what different municipalities are getting. It does not relate directly to the equalizing factor.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has said I am wrong. I do not know how he can say anyone is wrong in this view because the figure that I can get in a few moments shows that about 40 per cent of the people of this province do not have an equalized assessment. I do not know how you can justify it if you distribute $150 million to a tax base across the province which has no uniformity and no standardization. You are just flying a kite here and it will never happen.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Section 2—the member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister's last comment in reply to the hon. member for Grey-Bruce puzzles me. I thought that this basic shelter exemption was going to be based on the first $2,000 of the assessment, recalculated on the basis of current values.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And on the basis of the mill rate?

Mr. MacDonald: And on the basis of the mill rate.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: If you are paying—oh yes, I am sorry, I see it now—$2,000—the size of the mill rate will mean it could be $65 rather than $45. You are right.

My second question I wanted to ask the Minister—conceivably it should come under 9 because of the comment the Minister made a moment ago that he wanted to come back to this—is that I was rather intrigued in the the instance—if I may cite a personal case—of receipt of my own tax bill from the borough of York for the last half of the year, involving three payments. The basic shelter exemption is deducted from the total, and then it is divided—the three payments. Have arrangements been made with the municipalities so that, before the bill is passed, they are in effect implementing it for this year?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, they are doing it in a variety of ways. Perhaps I might do this now. What we have said generally is that, if we are dealing roughly with the first 15 per cent of real estate taxes, then I suppose we could have said in this year our share of the real estate taxes are going to be spent in December and part of November. So long as we were getting the money out to the municipalities in September it was proper.

Now Smith, as you know, suggested in the report, and perhaps not directly relating to this, that taxes ultimately should be on a monthly basis. I think he was going to send five municipal tax bills and five education tax bills on alternating months and we got December off, or something like that. Was that not it? Now, then, if you do that, and some municipalities are making a number of instalments—five and six, I think six is probably the maximum now—then the credit which is allowed by the province, Smith called it basic shelter, we now call it tax reduction, should be divided by 12 or 5 or whatever the number of instalments are. I think this makes sense.

Now we said that because of the lateness in getting it started this year, that was not going to be possible. I think most of the municipalities have understood this and have allowed the credit. I suppose in the case of your borough it goes through the computer and it is just as easy to knock it off. For example, we discussed at one point giving a municipality the power to round the amount to the nearest dollar. It does not matter; the computer can spew out 9 cents or 99 cents just as easily as an even amount. But, having got this far along the way, with the blessing and support and help of the Provincial Treasurer we are in a position to say this morning that we can return this money to the municipalities somewhat faster than was anticipated.

Mr. Nixon: He arranged for $400 million this morning through Bill 149.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: With the agreement of the Treasurer, reimbursement of the municipalities will be in proportion to, and approximately at the time of, reinstalment of realty taxes which will remain to be collected by municipalities—an approximate indication of the flow of funds from the province to municipalities is given in the following table. In July about nearly $39 million; in August $25 million; in September $30 million; in October $33.5 million; in November $14 million and December $13 million, for the total of $150 million. My own municipality, where I live, does not get around to collecting its taxes until December 15. I assume it will not be reimbursed by the Treasurer until some time in December. Ideally, that table should be spread out over the whole year, but we are spreading it out over the six months.

Mr. MacDonald: The municipality is being paid at the same time as they would have received the tax money from the property owner.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Does it surprise you?

Mr. Chairman: Section 2—the member for Etobicoke.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): I would like to ask the Minister a question that follows on what he has just said. This is the month of June. June and July are the months that many families who have children in school will be moving, and I am particularly concerned as to the individuals who own homes. Take the borough of Etobicoke for example. Parents sell their home at the end of the school year, and they have paid taxes—some portion of taxes. They move to another municipality, perhaps like the borough of Scarborough.

I would like to know if the Minister might be able to give me the mechanics of how this tax rebate or reduction is going to affect them. They will no longer be residents of the borough of Etobicoke after they have sold their homes. They will be in new municipalities in homes sold to them.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am told the legal profession apparently has great faith in the Legislature, and ever since the bill received second reading, right across the province, the tax reduction has been adjusted along with taxes in the same way the taxes are adjusted in real estate deals. This is happening all over the place.

Mr. Braithwaite: But if we do not know what it is?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is no reason in the wide world why in Etobicoke they would not know what it is.

Mr. Braithwaite: No, I just used that borough for an example. I wondered if there is any particular form that has been set up by the department. This is what I would like to know.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I think we have an indication here that out of the 900 and some-odd municipalities, I believe the amount of the tax reduction with respect to the 545 municipalities and 70 schools boards in unorganized territories has been confirmed with the Provincial Treasurer. This means that roughly of the 900 and some-odd municipalities, 600 have set their rates. In my own municipality they do not get around to setting their rate until September or October. One of the lawyers there told me that they figured out what last year's was and they were adjusting it on that basis.

Mr. Braithwaite: You are telling me there is no particular form set up by the department?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This has been suggested in the memos to clerks and treasurers which are going out. We suggested this to the clerks and treasurers and we assume that a lawyer at some point gets to know. The first time this comes up, or with the first deal that he has, he phones the tax collector in any case to find out what the taxes are so that he can adjust them and probably at that point he realizes he should adjust the tax credit as well.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, this is where the refund actually is made possible. It is based, as the Minister said, on the basic shelter exemption proposal of the Smith report and yet it is going to apply to more than one residence for a good number of our citizens and some of those people who are not our citizens. For those people who have summer cottages, and there are a great number of them, we are in fact by this legislation assisting them in the maintenance of two dwellings and I think this moves away—

Mr. MacDonald: Do they cover swimming pools?

Mr. Nixon: No, I am prepared to pay my own bill. I think we are moving away from the basic shelter exemption recommendation. Frankly I do not approve of the provision of tax relief for more than one residence. Where I believe the bill does move away from the best interest of the taxpaying public of Ontario, is where we provide assistance in paying taxes for non-residents who have summer cottages in this province. I cannot for the life of me see why any part of the $150 million that is going to be sent out to the municipalities should be used to reduce the taxes of those people who have their shelter or their basic residence in another country and who come over here because of the special advantages they have in summer residence.

In many cases I am told that the exemption will completely pay their taxes and they will have no further responsibilities whatsoever. I personally believe that there could have been a simple adjustment to the wording of this statute that would have permitted us to provide the exemption and the tax relief for those of our residents who live here on a full-time basis and not just in the summertime.

Mr. Chairman: Section 3 carried?

Mr. Nixon: I would like to hear the Minister's views.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We did deal with this in principle too, I think, on second reading, but I think my friend has narrowed the problem to American residents only, or American citizens only, who happen to have a second residence here.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I can see the difficulty in winnowing out from among our own population, which is the summer cottage and which is the residence and so on, but I think really we could exempt foreigners from participation in this.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Foreign rather than American; all right. We really do not know this, but we understand that about 10 per

cent of the "cottages"—in quotation marks, because no one is really just sure what is a cottage—may well be owned by non-residents of Canada, not citizens of Canada. But you still run into this problem, that they may well be residents of Canada; they may be an American citizen and they may a resident of Canada. That cottage may be a permanent residence, so you get into that problem.

Mr. Nixon: They have to live in Canada six months.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think you would probably find it easier, if you wanted to do this, just to exempt all non-citizens.

Mr. Nixon: Many of our full-time residents who are not citizens need tax relief.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Who are not citizens of the country. Exactly, and perhaps some of these people may very well be Americans who are living in what some people consider a cottage but they may very well consider their residence.

Mr. MacDonald: From 10,000 to 15,000 of my constituents are not citizens!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would think so.

Mr. Nixon: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me, I would think that if these non-residents are living here for most of the year they are no longer non-residents. If they are using their residential facility in Ontario for only a limited period of time in the year—four months or whatever could be designated—then they could be exempt from this assistance.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If you are going to do that, then you should exempt the Canadian who spend eights months of the year in Florida and lives in what he calls, and is in fact, his legal residence.

Mr. Nixon: That is the other side of the coin.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In my view, you have to consider both sides of the coin at once. But I think we are really departing from the central argument on this. What we are talking about is taxes on real estate.

Mr. Nixon: And a basic shelter exemption.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What we are talking about is reducing taxes on real estate and whether the cottage is owned by an American, or an English person or a Russian or whether it is a full-time house, the object of the exercise is to reduce the taxes.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has suggested this was raised in principle but I believe that the object of this bill is to provide tax relief for the residents of this province. When we think of the large numbers who come into Ontario to enjoy the obvious advantages we have in holiday and recreation facilities, or at least they recognize that in comparison with what they have in their own areas, then I think we are being particularly generous when we allow them to come here and own their cottage and enjoy all the advantages in many cases without paying any tax at all.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I have to disagree with my friend in this extent because I do not think we are being particularly generous in letting Americans come here, or anybody come here, and spend their money on real estate in the cottage parts of this country.

Mr. Nixon: Let them pay their tax. Let them pay their way.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think surely it could be argued that they have been paying, as anybody does who owns a cottage, far more than their share, because they pay education taxes, they pay for a number of services which they have no thought of ever getting.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): The Minister has mentioned the education tax. I might bring to his attention that there are many persons in Ontario who do not send children to school who do pay education taxes, outside the Americans.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a few remarks to this. As the hon. Minister is aware, in our part of the country possibly 85 or 90 per cent of the cottages are owned by residents from outside our jurisdiction. And this poses some problems and a lot of benefits. But I, as a cottage owner myself for the past 40 years, feel that we who are fortunate enough to have cottages should not get an exemption in this regard if this is not a permanent residence, and I think this could be determined.

In my own area, a great number of cottage owners are actually on leased land. I know of one particular area I was in last Sunday and there were some 100 cottages on leased land. The leasing arrangements are at such a nominal fee that, in fact, if they get this rebate they are going to have

money in their pocket over and above their lease, and the great bulk of these are owned by people outside the province. Personally, I would sooner see our own people, who do not own cottages, benefit to a greater extent, and we who are fortunate enough to have this added facility and chance for our own recreation, pay our own way.

Mr. Haggerty: I think we should mention here that cottage owners, especially in my riding—and there are a great number of Americans—in many cases the Americans that do own the property come over for maybe two weeks or three weeks or a month, and make use of their residence. And then they turn around and rent it again to someone else. How is this basic shelter tax or exemption passed on to these persons who are renting? I know of many cases where they do have large homes and apartments on top of double garages, and many other buildings where they have living accommodation set up, and which they do rent. How is this passed on to the tenant?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In the same way as it is passed on to any other tenant, except that what you are talking about I suppose is that they are renting a cottage from the owner for a month or two weeks.

Mr. Haggerty: A month or three weeks.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If it was three weeks they would be entitled to three fifty-seconds of their tax credit for the year. And I do not think they are going to get it.

Mr. Haggerty: Then, what is the sense of having it? I think my leader has mentioned that it should not go to this type of an owner. It should be strictly for Canadian residents, and property owners.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there are two points I want to make. I think some of the difficulty that has emerged from the debate today—without going back and dwelling on principle—arises from the fact that the government has moved from what the Smith committee called a "basic shelter exemption" to a tax exemption, a real estate tax exemption. If you had remained with the "basic shelter", you would have the context within which you would direct to a person living in his own home—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I agree, but I am sure my friend would want the record to be straight and not imply that Smith, in fact, did recommend that cottagers were going to get what he called "basic shelter." He called it an administrative difficulty.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me ask a question—the Minister earlier said that there were approximately 10 per cent of the so-called cottages that were foreign owned. What proportion of the $150 million does the Minister estimate will be going to that 10 per cent of foreign-owned cottages?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I have not got that figure.

Mr. MacDonald: Can it be got?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I doubt whether we have a breakdown between cottages. This, of course, is one of the most intriguing things about this, and I am sure you have read what Smith had to say as to how he arrived at this figure, which was then $120 million, and we have projected that to $150 million, which we think is a reasonable figure. But, our method of determining that figure was really not that much more scientific than Smith's determination.

Hopefully, out of this, and as more assessment rolls and tax rolls are put on computers and fed into a central bank, we will know how many dwelling places there are in Ontario, because really I have to say to you, we do not; it is a pretty wild guess. Following from that, we do not know how many you would legitimately say are cottages, or guess are cottages, nor how many are owned by Americans; the figure of 10 per cent has been used, but it is just a guess.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, as the previous speaker has said, I think this whole matter rests on what is basic shelter, and whether it is possible in this clause to put in such wording that we could eliminate this gift to those for whom this is not basic shelter. It is difficult for me to agree with Smith that ways could not be found to determine which is a person's basic shelter. But, if the department at this stage has not come up with it, I am sorry to think that they have not. They should give this further study to see if it could be done.

I am positive in this day of mechanization and computers that we could soon work out a system of determining and checking which is a person's claimed basic shelter, so we are not going to be contributing these funds to those who really are not needing them. The principle of this basic shelter exemption was to ease the burden on lower-income people. It was specifically to offset the unfairness of

property tax that the whole matter was conceived. Here we have the tax assisting people who have sufficient means to have two homes or more.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Chairman, there is another point on this that I think should be drawn out, and I agree with my leader that the cottage owner is being favoured here. He is going to receive a reduction, and yet a farmer who owns 50 acres of land, and the house has been removed or torn down, or because of age never been replaced, will not receive a reduction on that particular piece of land. Really, I do not think this is fair. He may own another 50 acres or 100 acres down the road; it will be separately assessed and he will not receive a reduction on the 50 acres that has no buildings. Yet we do have a reduction on cottage property, and I think this is very unfair.

Mr Chairman: On section 3, the member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Chairman, possibly one way to resolve this problem, if the Minister would consider it, would be to have, on municipal tax bills in areas where cottages are prevalent, a certain form of coupon attached thereto which would enable a person then to apply for this grant with respect to his tax account for the cottage property, by referring to what, in fact, is his other property for which he is already receiving a basic shelter exemption.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether this should come under item 3 or item 4, but what I am concerned about is where the basic shelter exemption is allowed, and the landlord does not have his taxes paid—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Four.

Mr. Stokes: It is 4 is it?

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, section 4 is the section in this Act that gives me the most trouble. I just do not see in a practical way how the refunds are really going to get to the tenants. Let us start with subsection 2 of section 4:

> In any year that a reduction in municipal taxes is made to a landlord, in respect of any residential property, the landlord or his agent shall pay or allow as a reduction in rent, to the tenant, the amount of such tax reductions, in such manner and at such time or times as are prescribed by the regulations under this Act.

In the definition section, Mr. Chairman, we do not have any definition of "tenant" and I suppose we would have to take the ordinary definition of tenant and that is anybody who leases. Are we talking about a tenant who is there for a week, or a month, or six weeks, or ten weeks?

How do you ascertain of all of the possible tenants who could be in a rented unit, which one or which group of them is going to be entitled to get this reduction, and how do they benefit from it? Tenant "A" comes in for a month. He moves out. Theoretically, if you apply the formula in section 2, you get a proportionate adjustment. Purchasers and vendors can adjust these things in a statement of adjustments. That is what the Minister was talking about; the lawyers work it out, and they add it to the statement of adjustments.

But how does the landlord get a refund or a benefit back to the tenant who was there in the month of January when he is only going to figure this out in December? Is he compelled to keep track of the comings and goings of that tenant? How does he know where he is 11 months later? What system is there and what possible way is the tenant who is to get the benefit of that, going to be able to come back in December or whenever the landlord gets his credit and say, "Now I am entitled to a twelfth of $50 or a forty-eighth of $50," depending on the length of time he has been there?

The Minister says if it is only a few dollars he might as well give up, and I am inclined to agree with him. But it just does not seem intelligent to me, to expect that landlords of large apartment buildings are going to keep track, or should have to keep track, of the comings and goings of the tenants they had 11 months previous.

I touched on another thing that really had not occurred to me when I started to talk, and that is, what is the definition here: Is a tenant a roomer? There is no definition of tenant under this Act and I would think that either you would have to go to the interpretation Act. I see the hon. Minister of Mines brought one of the statute books to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and he has probably got The Landlord and Tenant Act there. You look there for a definition of tenant. I do not know. Does it apply to roomers or does it not apply to roomers? If

it does not, how can you find that out from this statute?

You talk about "in such manner and such time or times as is prescribed by the regulation." Has there not been enough basic thinking or has there been any basic thinking? The Minister can tell us today what those regulations are going to say.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Some of it is pretty basic.

Mr. Singer: Yes, some of it has been pretty basic. I say that this section really is almost an impossibility unless you have a tenant who is there for a term of years. The calculation is going to be very easy. There is no problem about finding him. A tenant who is aware of his rights will get it. His lease has to run for a term of years too, because otherwise the landlord who has a monthly tenant is going to go through the motions of this, but he is going to grab it back by increasing the rent.

There is no way in the world under the scheme of this legislation, that you are going to protect tenants and ensure that they get any benefits under this Act, unless they have a lease for a term longer than a year and their rent is fixed for that period. If they have a lease for a term shorter than a year—whether it is a six-month lease, monthly lease or weekly lease—the landlords who want to can take this back by increasing the rent. There is no way you have even thought about that is going to stop this.

Substantially, Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that, insofar as protecting tenants, section 4 falls completely short of that protection. I do not think that the Minister can say, in any sincerity at all, that any saving is going to be passed on to the tenants. "The right of the tenant"—subsection 3—"to receive a reduction in municipal taxes is not assignable and may not be waived."

Well now, that is a good legal sounding phrase. But what does it really mean? It "is not assignable and may not be waived." That means again I suppose, "tenant moved out in January." He has got a right to a proportion of his rebate or assistance. Somewhere along the line that is a non-assignable and non-waivable right, so you are putting an obligation on the landlord to keep on chasing. The landlord is not going to keep books in this matter. He cannot. Is the landlord going to be able to elicit information as to the whereabouts of his former tenant for the next 11 months? Just nonsense!

Mr. Chairman, I think that this secton 4 points out the substantial frustration the government must face in trying to bring about an equitable system of benefits to tenants. I do not think you are going to do it. I think it is nonsense and I think somewhere along the line, the government has to realize that, because of a foolish election promise, you are stuck with something you never thoroughly thought out. You are stuck with something that is not going to work. You are spending $150 million of the public money and you are not distributing that money in an equitable way.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pass a few remarks on this section 4. At the outset, I might make mention that in some areas this rebate is less than the $45—less than $40 in fact—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Twenty-four!

Mr. Paterson: Yes. As a member, since this bill came out, I have had a great number of phone calls and conversations with people and have attended public meetings at which this became a very serious topic of conversation.

It has bothered me no end to have very nice little ladies come up to me, the real salt of the earth, and say: "Do we have to really give this money back to people living in our upstairs apartment?" As I say, these are good church-going people and so forth and once that they see or hear of money coming from a government agency, they for the first time in their life are getting something back from the government and just hate to pass it on.

So I feel that this bill has placed the Minister in the position of Eve in the garden of Eden and that he is tempting a great number of people that otherwise would not be tempted to cheat just a little bit.

But the real serious affect of the calls that I am getting is that these token amounts of $4, $5 or $6 per month, in fact, are going to be a catalyst to increase the rents for people by $10 and $15 per month. I can see the writing on the wall and these are my opinions on this section.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, I would like to ask the Minister how the basic shelter exemption will apply to those tenants of units where the landlord has not paid his taxes? It seems that this was introduced to help all tenants in the

province. If you have a landlord who happens to be delinquent—I think section 3 says: "Where, in the year 1968, municipal taxes on any residential property have been paid," and it does not apply to anybody or any particular unit where the taxes have not been paid.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think this is where you get into the "deem to have been paid" debt. On your house the credit will be allowed under the tax bill whether you pay the tax bill or not, between now and December 31. By the same token, the treasurer of your municipality applies to the Treasurer of Ontario, through us, for the refund of that tax credit whether you have actually paid your taxes or not. The same thing is true with the owner of a rented premises.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I agree substantially with what the member for Downsview said and also with the member for Essex-Kent. The chance of the tenant getting the money is very slim, but because it is slim, does not necessarily rule it out. I think that it will definitely benefit a few people. The fact that rents have already been raised to compensate the amount of the rebate is something that is already on record. There are many areas, I know of them, other members know of them, where the rents have already been raised to compensate for what little will be returned.

This is immoral, if one could put it in those terms. But the one part that I want to change—and I intend to introduce an amendment to it—is that in subclause 3, the right of a tenant to receive the reduction of municipal taxes mentioned in subsection 2 is not assignable and may not be waived.

Already, commencing on April 10, when this bill was first introduced, many landlords introduced clauses to contracts then being signed, before these things actually happened. As I read the bill, this does nothing to eliminate that problem.

Any person who signed one of the contracts or leases between April 10, and the time that this bill is proclaimed, will be stuck with whatever is on the lease. As I say, this is not the appropriate moment. In section 10, I will introduce an amendment, but this is the big problem with it. One of the many big problems in this particular area. The fact that some will receive the rebate is good. But because of the fact that others will not, we ought to very seriously consider ways of assuring them that they will get it.

We must also take care that unscrupulous people do not jump the gun the way that they have done in the last two or three months. Just because the Minister happens to make a statement that he is going to introduce legislation that will in some way affect them, they take advantage of it before the legislation is passed. But as I said, I will introduce an amendment in section 10.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am not a lawyer, but I do not agree with my friend. This is the reason that this section is here. A few landlords—and I do not think that many frankly—of people whose leases came up about the first of May or June, or perhaps where there were no leases, shoved a piece of paper in front of them, or sent out a piece of paper to some tenants. We had, I think, about five or six instances of this in writing, and there may have been more done by phone call. The tenant signed this rather than have the rent raised $5 a month, and waived his rights under reduction of municipal taxes.

It is my understanding that, although the person had signed that form, section 3 killed that. But I would leave that to the law officers to determine.

Mr. Deans: I very seriously query that because it says quite clearly in section 10, that the Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal assent. Now, that can be any day between now, and whenever it happens; but, it is not a day gone by, and any section in here can only come into force on that day, and not before. And any contract entered into prior to that day is valid. Now, I am not a lawyer, but I very seriously think that this would be the case, and I would not like to have those people have to bear the cost of litigation in order to find out.

Interjections by an hon. member.

Mr. Deans: That is the point.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): On this section, Mr. Chairman, and having to do with what the hon. Minister just said about these forms that these tenants signed to waive any entitlement that they may receive under this bill. I want to say that, from the indication that I have, these waivers are being used in great numbers. I have had a great number of phone calls, and I have had people come to my home with the waivers. Now, whether they are legal or not we do not know. What we do know is that the tenants are having their rents raised, and as the member for Essex South said, this legislation is, in effect,

causing an increase in rent. The government money of $150 million is, in large part, going to the landlords. Whether it goes to the individual home owner, fine, I think that this was a poor way of going about helping the landowner. But where there is some good, I am glad to see it. There is no question in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that under this section, thousands of tenants are not going to get the money that they should be getting. One way or the other, the landlord is going to get around this legislation. I feel that it is poorly written.

What is happening, Mr. Chairman, is that rents are going so high in some of our large urban areas, not only because of the shortage of housing but because of legislation and particular sections such as this, that governments are going to be forced to do something that you certainly would not want to do on that side of the House, and nor do I want to do, and that is, to bring in rent controls. But I would rather see rent control than see the tenants clobbered as they are being clobbered by the landlords today. This is a choice that we are going to have to make in the not too distant future because I see continually, new leases drawn, where the people are paying increased rents that are simply not justified.

Now, only last night, Mr. Chairman, as a result of this particular section, I saw a waiver drawn up by a landlord, where the rent had been raised $10 per month. A year and a half ago, the same apartment rented for $100, and it had been raised in the interim to $125, and now it is raised another $10. And, of course, the waiver is signed, and whether or not the waiver is legal, I want to say to the Minister, that this section has certainly encouraged increases in rent. Hundreds of thousands of people in the province and particularly in Toronto, and more particularly in my own riding where there are many thousands of people living in apartments, this benefit, under section 3, is absolutely useless to the average tenant.

What I fear is, not only is it encouraging the landlord to raise the rent, not just $5 per month but, in effect, it is raising it $10 per month, just like the letter and waiver that I saw last night—that came from a particular landlord. I say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that we are going to have to face up to the issue of whether or not we are going to have to control rents. I do not like to see government move into this field but, again, I repeat that I would far rather go through the risk of bureaucracy than see what is, assurely, far too many people paying too high rents.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to raise a point that I do not think was raised on second reading. Under the Ontario housing corporation, I would like to ask the Minister what will happen to the tenants where the landlord is OHC?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This is under another section and we will come to that.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Just a few comments to substantiate what the member for Parkdale has been talking about. I have on my desk here, letters which were sent out by a prominent real estate firm in Peterborough, and they are much more sophisticated than the people who have been coming to the Minister with waivers. What you have here is a form letter, because they were all sent out on the same day. It is a very simple letter.

> I have reviewed the income and general expenses of all the property that we manage and, reluctantly, I have to advise you that an increase in rent is necessary. I have to take into consideration what similar accommodation is renting for, increased costs of labour, and so on.

Then he tells them what the rent is to be raised. But it is the last line that I think is the stinger here—"If and when we receive the government basic shelter grant"—I do not have perhaps the lack of confidence in the government that this agency does, "if and when we receive the government basic shelter grant, we will pay it to you in a lump sum."

In other words, here is a very sophisticated effort to raise the rent and then, in the last line, to show that it is very closely related to what they intend to receive from the government. Now, this particular one, for example, the rent in September 3, 1966, was $60. By October 3, 1966, to July 1, 1967 it became $65. From August 1, to September 1, $70. October 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968, $80. And now $85. That rent has gone up—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I just want to point out to the member that, apparently, within the last year, before this Act was ever talked about, a $60 rent went up to $80, and now it has been raised another $5. I just point that out to my friend.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, but I point out, to the Minister, that this has been an increase of 33 per cent in less than two years. But, the point is, that the effort, I am sure, was to try and reduce rents; that the emphasis was,

that after this basic shelter grant was given, that the rents would begin to slide down. They are not. They are going up, and these agencies are using the basic shelter as an excuse to raise rents.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think I have to point out, to my friend, that rents in that particular instance had gone up from $60 to $80 before this was even talked about, before this was even mentioned. And, what the member is saying is, that we caused this other $5 increase. Well, this is utter nonsense. It has gone up $5 on its own.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, at the outset, the motivation of this whole deal was equality to real estate people. And may I say to the sneering Minister—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Which sneering Minister?

Mr. Sargent: Well, you have a lot of them over there. The heaviest thing in the world is an empty pocket, and the people in this province cannot afford to pay these great real estate charges. But the thing is that, you have set up sort of a system of equalization factors across the province which gives you the inequity between $45 and $65; and where a municipality has had an equalization in recent years, they receive a greater amount of money than the municipality which does not have equalization, or the municipality that has had one based on 1951 values, or something along that line—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, I do not like to interrupt, but what does this have to do with this section?

Mr. Sargent: What I want to know is this, Mr. Chairman, where a municipality has not had an equalization in recent years, what is their equalization factor?

Mr. Chairman: This has really nothing to do with section 4.

Mr. Sargent: I want to find out why one municipality will have, say, an equalization factor of 86, and one along the line will have maybe 20 points. Why cannot you have an equalization factor common across the province, on which they will get equal money? Will the Minister answer the question?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Minister is delighted to answer questions that are related to what we are talking about. The question the member is asking has nothing to do with this section of the bill.

Mr. Lawlor: I want to come back to what my friend, the member for Wentworth, mentioned.

The member for Downsview seemed to give some indication that it is a technical point, Mr. Chairman. I suppose the easiest way of putting it is this: What really is the effective date of your legislation? That is, I am thinking of the whole of clause 4—and we will have to go back, for one purpose, to clause 2 because the money comes in this way and then goes over to the tenant through that clause. It seems to me there are possibly four or more effective dates. Let us say there are basically three, with a municipality arising out of number two. The first date would be obviously January 1, that is, for the purposes of the taxes and for the purposes of the base upon which the computation for the rentals would be concerned. The second date might possibly be the date you introduce this legislation, on April 10. The third date is the date you have in your legislation, that is of Royal assent; in other words, the running time, when the thing gets off the ground and gets started. And then in clause 2, you have another possible date—"that the reduction for the purposes of section 3 shall be deemed to be made on the date of the payment of the first instalment of taxes is required to be made by bylaw under section 120." That date, I say, could be a multiplicity of dates. If one municipality passes its bylaw making the effective date of its first payment of taxes on April 3, another one on the 10th, another one on any other number of dates, you have no uniformity. It is utter chaos, if that is the ruling date.

I put these thoughts before you. I hope the Minister will not smile too much. It is partially to do with the legal profession in the province. As you know, in moving transactions through, there are things called adjustments and we have to adjust the interrelationship, both with respect to the overall tax situation and with respect to changes in tenancy, particularly on the sale of apartment buildings. And a number of members of the profession, not of my persuasion, have approached me, asking, "what is the date on which we really make our adjustments? Will you please ask in the House to see if a determinations of that point can be made? We are trusting that the date will be January 1, as that is the easy one." But, anyone glancing at the legislation is a little bemused, if not confused, as to really when and what date we

set up as the operative date upon which these adjustments might be made.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, the credit, as taxes—and I think probably the key words are in section 2—shall reduce the municipal taxes required to be paid in each year. The taxes, of course, cover the whole 365 days, regardless of which day they happen to be due on, or which date they are levied on. By the same token, the credit is applicable to the whole year.

Mr. Singer: Is the Minister not going to answer any of the other comments?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If I can suggest to the member for Wentworth, I wonder if he would be agreeable to adding the words "before or after this Act comes into effect." I think that serves his purpose just as well, and does the same thing. "Before or after this Act comes into effect"—to add those words.

Mr. Deans: This is subclause 2?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In subclause 2 to add after the word "waive", in subsection 3 of section 4, the words "before or after the Act comes into effect". I think that does the same thing. The law officer suggests it accomplishes both our purposes.

Mr. Deans: I would find that acceptable.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would move that amendment then, at this point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: Is the Minister not going to deal with any of the other criticisms?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, I will deal with some of the other questions raised. I thought the point raised by the member for Parkdale, perhaps, came right to the problem more than anything else. There is no guarantee that this money is going to be passed on where there is no lease. There is no way of determining whether someone who has waived their rights, if they have done this, which the amendment makes more difficult, there is no way of determining whether that was a justified thing to do or not. Interestingly enough, in some of these waivers, some people sign waivers. I disagree with it because in the bill they have no right to be issuing these waivers. It got my back up a little bit, I admit. That is why subsection 3 is there. But some people were signing waivers saying, "in return for having my apartment decorated this year, I waive my rights under The Basic Shelter Act," or words to that effect. Two women wrote and thanked me for getting their apartment decorated. They obviously felt they were ahead. I do not know what decorating the apartment cost—I have no idea—the rent remains the same. They got it decorated, and they were delighted. But the only way you are going to determine—and my friend from Parkdale said this, and said it well—the only way you are going to determine whether rent increases at any time are justified or not, or are fair or not, is if you have some kind of rent control.

Mr. MacDonald: Or a review board.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is really the same thing, is it not?

Mr. Singer: No, it is not the same thing, at all.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, the position of this party has been, the position on this side of the House is, that we are opposed to rent controls.

Mr. MacDonald: So are we—at this stage!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Right! So we are all opposed to it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Well, what you have got here, in this section, is just a farce.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Do you want an answer, or do you not?

Mr. Singer: Yes, I have been waiting for it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I thought my friend from Parkdale came to this problem. The answer to the questions raised by the member for Downsview were amply given by the member for Parkdale. If you want those kind of guarantees you are going to have to have rent controls, it is as simple as that.

Mr. Singer: Or another scheme for this Act.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, then, we are back to the principle of the bill are we not?

Mr. Singer: Surely, Mr. Chairman, the Minister should be able to justify what he is trying to do. All he does is throw up his hands up in horror, and say, "It is too bad, we cannot do it unless we have rent control and we do not believe in rent control." Did you ever hear such an abject admission of defeat? He brings in something that he knows cannot work and he says: "Tough, and the

only way we can make it work is to have rent control." It is a sad, sad government. Tell me about the roomers. Are roomers covered as tenants? And why?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Are they on the assessment roll?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Are they on they on the assessment rolls?

Mr. Singer: They could well be on the assessment roll. And why should they not be?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Is it separately assessed?

Mr. Singer: Why should they not be? Are they not given basic shelter exemption?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well then, they are eligible, if they are separate—

Mr. Singer: Why should you not make them eligible? Why should they be picked on? If they are excluded, why should you pick on them?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I have just got through saying if the room or rooms in which they are living are separately assessed, if it is a dwelling within the meaning of The Assessment act, then they are entitled to the rebate. Read the bill.

Mr. Singer: All right. Mr. Chairman, will the Minister tell us how the tenant who moves in January is going to get his money back?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In a normal year; not in this year, let me start that way.

Mr. Singer: Bad year to move in January.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If you want the answer—

Mr. Singer: Yes, I would be delighted—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well then, let us deal with the normal year first. And the regulations will say that if a person moves out on June 30, they are entitled to six-twelfths of the basic shelter credit of the tax reduction, or one-half; if they move out on January 1, they are entitled to one-twelfth from that landlord.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): On January 1?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If they move out on February 1, I am sorry; if they move out on February 1, they are entitled to one-twelfth; if they move out on November 1, they are entitled to eleven-twelfths. And the person who moves in on November 1, is going to receive from that landlord on December 1, the remaining twelfth.

Mr. Chairman: I believe we are dealing with the amendment to section 3. The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): I would like a clarification, Mr. Chairman. I think I have it but I would like someone to answer my question. It would appear to me, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, that where there is a lease in existence, it is a very simple method to calculate one-twelfth of the rebate to that individual. That is no problem. But, before this bill gets Royal assent, in this year when the taxes have gone up on all properties pretty well in all municipalities, the landlord has leases that come into existence almost monthly; they do not come into effect the first of the year, they come into effect as soon as the tenant moves in.

Let us say on this day that a tenant moves into an apartment building, is there anything to prevent that landlord from increasing his rent $25 per month? To compensate him for the $5 per month that he has to pay back to the fellow who is bound by lease, he adds it in and says, "Well, I need some $700 to pay my taxes, I will raise my rent and as soon as this law comes into effect, I will then give one-twelfth of the rebate to my tenant." In other words, he provides himself with $300 to pay back $50. Is that the way it works, up to this particular date? If I have that right, I can see where the landlord can come out of this thing with a lot of money.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. I think I know what my friend is getting at; he must confine it within 1968, or within the 12 months of the year. It must be cleaned up by the end of the year, in any case, so that it cannot go on and create a problem then, from which in that case, the landlord would profit in rent. I think that is what my friend is getting at. I can give the House an indication of the principles, very briefly, on which the regulations are being drafted.

A person who is a tenant for the whole year is entitled to the benefit of a tax reduction for the whole year. This is what you have just said. A person who is a tenant for part of a year is entitled to an appropriate proportion of the year's tax reduction. In a normal year, the landlord must pay the amount of the tax reduction to his tenant on

December 31, or within 30 days of the end of the tenancy, whichever is the earlier, so that if he moves out on June 30, presumably it is going to be paid when he pays his rent on June 1, or it is going to be allowed. This is probably what is going to happen. But he must pay it within 30 days of the end of the tenancy; it is his responsibility to do it.

I assume that in most instances it would be deducted from the last month's rent, when that was paid. In 1968 only, because many landlords will not receive the benefit of tax reduction until the end of the year, the draft regulations allow them to make the payment on or before December 31, without worrying about the 30 days. They have to do it, though, in this year—by the end of the year. It would be unreasonable to require landlords to trace ex-tenants who had ended their tenancy before the passing of this Act.

The landlord's duty is to make a payment to such ex-tenants as established when they apply to the landlord for a payment. In other words, if a person who moved out in January of this year, on January 31, it is his duty to claim for that one-twelfth from the landlord. Some of them will, some of them will not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): How do you enforce it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Pardon?

Mr. Young: The problem of enforcement here is that the tenant has to enforce the law.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Perhaps I had better finish the statement, shall I?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, perhaps the Minister could finish; the member for Niagara Falls was pursuing this particular—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am sorry, I did not mean to interrupt. The tax reduction may be passed by the landlord to the tenant by reduction in rent if both the landlord and the tenant agree to such procedure. When a tenant owes arrears of rent, it would be unreasonable to require the landlord to make a payment of cash to him; I think that is obvious without elaborating on it. Finally, the amount of tax reduction in any year cannot be established until the mill rate for that year is set. To avoid delay in the payment of tax reduction to a tenant who ends his tenancy before the mill rate is set, the draft regulations provide for such payments, which are to be made before the date on which the first instalment of tax is payable, to be based on the amount of tax reduction in the previous year. He can base it on the previous year. I am sorry I interrupted my friend in the middle of the question.

Mr. Bukator: No, you did not; your information was quite good. But to get back to the point that I was trying to make pertaining to the people who are landlords, and are feeling that they ought to raise the rent because the taxes have gone up. As I understand it, there is nothing to prevent them from raising the rent now on their new leases. Having done that, they have tenants who are paying $100 a month, and they have new tenants as of this year who are paying $125. What is to prevent them, when the leases are renewed for the $100 a month tenants, to raise that to $125?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Bukator: Nothing; that being the case, the landlord is in a wonderful position to make a lot of money. The tenant is not going to benefit by this as much as you are trying to help him, because they will raise the rent to pay the extra taxes; raise the rent to get that $5 back, plus a little more increase for their trouble.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I do not follow my friend's—

Mr. Bukator: No? Well, I will stand on my feet a little longer. The man who is bound by a lease for $100 a month into June of next year will get his rebate—that tenant will. But the landlord looks at it from the other side of the ledger, and he says, "My taxes have been raised; I cannot get it from the existing leases, I must get my money now to pay my taxes, and also to compensate me for my trouble, plus the $5 that I will have to give them when I must pay the rebate also," when your bill comes into effect. Having said that, they will raise your rent by $25 a month and there is nothing that can stop them and I realize somewhere we must start.

This is a bad year for the Minister.

Just to follow up a little further, maybe you can give that to the tenant and make him happy, but when that individual has his rent raised next June from $100 to $125, what landlord would not be happy to give him $5 if he collects $25? So there is no way of giving this money to the tenant. He, in the first instance, has paid the shot and it appears that he will pay it as long as he continues to be a tenant.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I am simply following up with the question as to who is going to enforce this legislation? It looks as if the burden of the enforcement—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that might be more properly dealt with under section 7; we are talking about enforcement.

Mr. Young: I think it comes in here. The angle I want to speak about is that the tenant himself has to force the landlord to pay him this rebate; this is the point. I can see two things happening. Number one, the members of this House, who have a great many tenants in their jurisdictions, are going to be flooded with requests from those tenants to get the money for them. Many of them will not dare go to the landlord themselves, they will say, "We want some reinforcement; would you come and help us?"

We are already getting plenty of complaints about the raising of rents. I had a chap in just last evening whose rent has been raised three times in three months and he is getting pretty desperate because his income is limited. When this other matter comes in and he realizes that he has a right to a rebate, he is going to come to us and he is going to ask us for our assistance in getting that rebate from the landlord. Perhaps that is part of our function, I do not know.

But the second thing is, if in fact he is serious about it, if in fact the landlord refuses and he has to sue him, go through the courts; it will not pay him but he may be stubborn enough to want it. Is the Minister going to talk to the Attorney General and have the number of division courts in this province raised to a place where business can be handled properly? Here is the problem, where the tenant himself, it seems, is going to have to take the initiative to get his share, and many tenants are going to be browbeaten into submission by the landlord who will tell them, "If you try any of this stuff, out you go," and he will not know where he can go, so he will keep quiet. I just cannot see the possibility of tenants getting their rights under this bill.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has admitted that there is nothing to stop them from raising the rents, and further, there is no way to guarantee the tenant will share in this grant if he moves.

Let us look at a case: If a landlord has, say, 300 apartments in this metropolitan area here and he has an experience of 70 per cent occupancy, then basically we have maybe 90 apartments floating around with vacancies; talking about 90 times 50, that is maybe $4,500 in one area that may or may not get in the hands of the tenants. So if you have the potential of $4,500 per unit, being $40 to be distributed by the landlord, you multiply that by the thousands and thousands of people who are transient in the apartment field and you have a gigantic sum of money—maybe $500,000 to $1 million—floating around that will never get to the recipients who are eligible for the money.

Someone said it is not the Minister's fault he has inherited this can of worms, but it is good to see them squirm once in a while because he has not got the answers to these questions.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, the answer to the question which was raised by my friend from Downsview really has been given by this member. If in fact there are apartment buildings with only a 70 per cent occupancy, we would not be here discussing this this morning.

Mr. Sargent: You pick a figure.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think in point of fact, the occupancy rate in apartment buildings in the city of Toronto is now something like 98 or 99 per cent. It has been for a number of months and that, of course, is the problem as we all know. There is not enough competition in the market place at the present time, for a number of reasons. Costs have risen and—

Mr. Sargent: There should not have been vacancy—mobility that are moving. There was a terminology that people on the move are transient people.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I see what you mean, all right.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the Minister, assisted by his snarly friend from St. George, suggested that I should read the Act and I would find that the tenant had to be on the assessment roll before he could get any refund. I wish either he or his colleague from St. George would show me where the Act says that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Pardon?

Mr. Singer: I said I wish either the Minister or his colleague from St. George would

show me where the Act says the tenant has to be on the assessment roll before he is entitled to his refund or rebate. As I read it, and I have read it through three or four times in the last 10 minutes, it is not there.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I will point out to my friend that what is in the Act is a dwelling which is separately assessed, and that is what the rebate is made to. It is not made to you as an owner, it is not made to me as a tenant. It is made to the separately assessed dwelling.

Mr. Singer: It is made to the separate dwelling? There are two kinds of refunds that you have. You have a refund in section 3 and you have a refund in section 4, and in section 4 there is no refund to the tenant, and there is nothing in section 4 or anywhere else that says a tenant is only someone who is on the assessment roll. Subsection 2 of section 1 shows how he can get on if he wants to. But there is nothing in section 4 that says the tenant has to be on the assessment roll so he can be a roomer, day boarder or anything else.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Provided he is living in something which is separately assessed.

Mr. Singer: It does not say that. It does not say that. It says: "And any landlord, in respect of any residential dwelling, the landlord or his agent shall pay to the tenant—" subsection 4, section 2. Now there is nothing there that says—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It starts off by saying that a reduction in municipal taxes is made to the landlord. The only way—

Mr. Singer: To the landlord?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Right; exactly!

Mr. Singer: And he gives part of it to the tenant?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Right!

Mr. Singer: All right. But let me then come back to roomers. Are roomers then not entitled to the refund, and if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If they are living in rooms which are separately assessed.

Mr. Singer: How do you bring that out?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Because they do not get the credit unless they are in a separately assessed unit—

Mr. Singer: But that statute does not say so.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Could I read the statute to my friend?

Mr. Singer: Yes, please do.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It says:

> Where in any year a reduction in municipal tax is made to the landlord, in respect of any residential property, the landlord or his agent shall pay or allow as a reduction in rent to the tenant thereof the amount of such tax reduction.

I think it is obvious it would follow from that, and I am not a lawyer. If no tax reduction were allowed to the landlord, then there is no tax reduction to pass on to the tenant, therefore the tenant does not get it.

Mr. Singer: No. The building is assessed. The building is taxed, and it may be taxed for $1 million and the landlord gets back his refund based on that in the proportions that you work out here. Then, you come to the tenant. There is a tenant in that building and he says, "I want my refund." Whether he is on the assessment roll or not, as you read subsection 4 of section 2—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am not talking about the assessment roll. I perhaps confused my friend when I brought in the assessment roll, but as to whether the tenant is actually on the assessment roll or not probably does not matter.

Mr. Singer: Oh, but you and the Minister of Mines were sneering at me a few moments ago about that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You brought in the question of tenants and related that to the assessment roll. It is whether the dwelling is separately assessed on the assessment roll.

Mr. Singer: Well then, are the roomers entitled to get their dwelling assessed?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am not a lawyer but I would read this:

> Where in any year a reduction in municipal taxes is made to a landlord, in respect of any residential property, the landlord or his agent shall pay or allow as a reduction in rent to the tenant—

I would read "tenant" there as person, roomer, or whatever you want to call him.

Mr. Singer: Now we have got the admission.

An hon. member: Get it on the record.

Mr. Singer: There is just another example, Mr. Chairman, of how this thing is not possibly going to work.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Would my friend explain that?

Mr. Singer: Because if you are saying now that roomers are entitled to get this kind of refund, the mechanics of any possible enforcement of that are just beyond any imagination I have.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Would my friend give an estimate of how many of what you and I would call "roomers" are living in units which are separately assessed? Which dwellings—

Mr. Singer: It does not say "separate" here; it says "assessed."

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. I think my friend knows. It is here. It refers to a section of The Assessment Act, which says they live in a dwelling defined as two rooms in one of which at least meals are prepared. They sleep and meals are prepared. Now how many roomers, as we know them, are living in that kind of accommodation?

Mr. Singer: The operative line insofar as tenants are concerned is that tenants are anybody who pays rent. Whether they are roomers or people who go down to the Royal York hotel for a night, they are still a form of tenant, and they pay rent for one night. The operative section surely is where, in any area, a reduction of tax is made to the landlord in respect of the residential property, and you are doing it, and therefore, your wording is too loose. If you intend to exclude them, and if you intend to include them, will you please tell us how it is ever possibly going to be done?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Nobody is excluding or including roomers, or anybody else. The key word is the real estate, the dwelling.

Mr. Singer: No, it is residential property, which includes the whole thing or a part of it, surely.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Provided it is separately assessed.

Mr. Singer: It does not say that.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, to show you how widely this whole section is—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Look at section 1, for instance.

Mr. Sargent: With regard to the assessment of a hotel or a commercial building, they receive their rebate in total and the distribution of this to tenants should be carried forth in this Act. Take the person who lives in a hotel; the hotel gets the money; the exemption as a real estate payment. They do not? Apartment hotels?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It depends on whether it is an apartment or a hotel does it not?

Mr. Sargent: So the apartment hotels receive it, but hotels do not?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: How do you break down the difference between an apartment hotel and a hotel? They have both; lots of hotels have apartments, so how do you break that down?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Whether the units are separately assessed or not.

Mr. Sargent: So then the city of Toronto will be mailing out cheques, then?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The hotel bill will be assessed as a commercial property; the apartment is assessed as a residential dwelling, and I suppose if you have a combination then they are assessed two ways.

Mr. Sargent: I am not asking do you suppose. Who is to police this—the assessment department of the municipality? Is the Minister going to reply?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I have answered it and if the word suppose offends my friend I will use another word. I will be positive about it—a hotel will be assessed commercially, an apartment will be assessed residentially—where it is an apartment hotel, where there are two different kinds, such as the Sutton Place, then there will be two different kinds of assessment.

Mr. Sargent: You must be kidding! Where in this Act does it say that? This is a real can of worms you have here.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps while we are waiting for the Minister—the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: May I return—my friend from Downsview is worried about tenants. If he would refer to section (i) and refer to The Assessment Act, I think he would see that it does not matter who is in the room, whether it is a tenant or a roomer. If you look at subsection (i) of section 1: "Residential property means land separately assessed under paragraph 6 of subsection 1 of section 20 of The Assessment Act in which there is a building used or intended to be used as a residence."

No. 6, "each subdivision" and we are talking about not polling, but subdivision of a building, "shall be assessed separately and every parcel of land," and we go on forgetting about land, "provided that no portion of any building used, or intended to be used as a residence, shall be separately assessed unless it is a domestic establishment of two or more rooms in which the occupants usually sleep and prepare and serve meals."

Now that is a very acceptable definition. So what you and I think of as a rooming house, or a boarding house, which we have stayed in from time to time, where we might have a private room or a room but where we all sat around the kitchen table or the dining room table, that room is not separately assessed. I guess we call those people boarders or roomers—they do not get the benefit.

Mr. Singer: I think the Minister still has missed the point. The residential property can be the whole house. Let us take a house that stands there, and there are 12 roomers in it. The property by itself is separately assessed, there is at least one assessment.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Right!

Mr. Singer: Come then over to section 4 where "in any year reduction is given to the landlord in respect of any residential property separately assessed", and the landlord gets it because the house is separately assessed. He then has to give a portion of it back to the tenant, and he may have 10 or 12 tenants in there who are roomers. Now it follows from that—certainly it does.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. He is only going to get one credit to begin with. He only gets the one credit because he is only—

Mr. Singer: You do not say that, you do not spell it out.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like very much to bring to the attention of this House the group of 75 fine young students from the great city of Windsor. They are from the David Maxwell public school and they are one of a group of approximately 5,000 from the city who have been down this year to see the Legislature in action.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I come back again to the suggestion which I made at the second reading of this bill, the suggestion that the assessment notice should carry a series of coupons or some device of a similar kind, which would give a monthly credit to the person holding the lease.

Now, there has been a lot of discussion here this morning about the kind of dwelling that this legislation applies to. If an assessment notice goes out and says "this is an assessment on a dwelling", that would carry the device—the coupon or whatever it might be. It it is any other kind of assessment notice it would not carry this device. It just seems to me that this would clear the way and make it very, very easy for the tenant to assert his rights, and for the landlord to know that he must give those rights. It would not, of course, overcome the problem of him raising rents—that is always with us—but it would accomplish much of the things we want accomplished. It would overcome many of these difficulties we have been discussing this morning.

The Minister gave us some reasons why he felt this is not a practical solution to the problem.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: In the form of trading stamps, is that what you mean?

Mr. Young: Not trading stamps, it is a form of receipt. The government has given money to the tenant via the landlord, and this is an acknowledgment of that fact. I suppose it is a form of money, a form of legal tender, and that legal tender is attached and it can be detached, and the tenant recognizes that he has received a legal tender which the government intended for him.

Now it seems to me that this is a device which could well be examined again in the light of the difficulties which have been brought up today, and I recommend this solution again to the Minister.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister of Municipal Affairs has moved that subsection 3, of section 4, be amended to add the words "before or after this Act comes into force".

Amendment agreed to.

Section 4 agreed to.

On section 5.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am not clear on section 5 as far as the province is going to pay the municipalities at the end of the year 1968, after the municipalities have made their—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think, when my friend was out, I indicated that they were going to be paid starting in June, depending on whenever their taxes are due, whenever they allow the credit, or a portion of it.

Mr. Sargent: Well, then, the only point is that—I may have missed this too—the fact that the method of payment, for the basis of payment to the municipality, is based on their assessment equalization factor, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Sargent: How do some municipalities get paid more?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What we are talking about here in section 5 is how the municipality is reimbursed by the Provincial Treasurer. They total up the amount they paid out and, in effect, submit a bill to the Provincial Treasurer and they get the money back.

Mr. Sargent: It is the mechanics of the method of payment?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is right.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister discuss for a moment the variances of moneys received across the province, insofar as—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I have discussed this already and I think most people in the House understand this.

Mr. Sargent: I will make it very simple then—answer this question. Because of equalization studies in each area, do they pay different moneys?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Chairman: Is there more discussion on this particular section?

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, on section 5, some municipalities will rebate to the land owners the $50, or whatever the case might be, in the second instalment of their taxes. Immediately that the municipalities allow this rebate, as I gather from the Minister, they bill you and within a period of 30 days.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I hope so.

Mr. Bukator: They get their money back. I imagine most of the municipalities that we represent will ask us as members that question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, well I indicated there was a change. We originally said we were going to start trying to get the money out in September. The Provincial Treasurer has indicated to us that we can start getting it out in July.

Section 5 agreed to.

On section 6:

Mr. Singer: Section 6, Mr. Chairman; 6(a): "The Lieutenant-Governor in council may make regulations describing the forms for use under this Act and the manner in which application for reimbursement may be made."

Now, who is going to use the forms for reimbursement? Only the municipalities, or the home-owners, or the tenants, or everybody?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. The intent of 6(a) is this: On some sort of a form, which I have not seen yet, the treasurer of the municipality will apply to the province for a refund.

Mr. Singer: Well, I would suggest to the Minister, that if this is only applicable to municipalities, that he say so in that section. A first glance at that section would indicate two or three possible interpretations, and if you can interpret it beyond, as it appears that you can—beyond the use of municipalities—then it would seem to shift the onus onto tenants and/or to home-owners make some sort of application, and you weaken the burden that you will put on landlords to get back and on the municipality. This seems to say that there should be some form that people fill out. I would like to see that section amended so that that subsection would apply only to municipalities.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, the word reimbursement has only been used in connection with reimbursement of the municipalities by the province. I suppose that it is implied there that applications for reimbursement only mean the reimbursement of the municipalities by the province. However, I cannot see any harm in adding the words after

reimbursement "to municipalities". There is no harm in that.

Mr. Singer: Fine!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Unless legislative counsel—that is certainly what it means—its applications for reimbursement by the municipalities to the province. I cannot see any harm in adding those two words.

Mr. Chairman: Is the Minister seeking a motion to that effect?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: "To the municipalities" would be the—

Mr. Singer: The words "to the municipality" be inserted.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister of Municipal Affairs moves clause (a) of section 6, on the second line, after the wording "reimbursement" be amended to include the words "to municipalities."

Hon. Mr. McKeough: "To the municipality!"

Mr. Chairman: "To the municipalities."

Those in favour of the amendment?

Carried.

Mr. Singer: Now subsection (c) of 6. I would rather debate that in connection with subsection 8, and we are in difficulty since we are doing it section by section, but the two of them tie in together, Mr. Chairman. Where would you like to have that debate take place, because I am disturbed about it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: All under 8(a)?

Mr. Singer: All right then we hold (c) in abeyance until we deal with 8.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I believe that we should either pass section 6 or not.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can just deal with it under 8.

Mr. Chairman: We can permit the discussion under section 8, is that the—

Mr. Singer: I have reservations about (c) which relates to 8, and this is the difficulty because 6 refers over to 8, and the two of them really fit in together.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: In the event that section 8 is amended, I am sure that the House would entertain a motion that we could revert then to 6(c).

Mr. Chairman: Yes, well that would be necessary in order to revert we would have to have the concurrence of the House.

Section 6 agreed to.

On section 7:

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I cannot concur the fact that a fine of $200 is due and payable on the landlord being caught in the act of not distributing his money. On the other hand, you allow him, if he is caught, to credit the $200 to rent. Is that the way I should interpret this clause?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. If he is convicted, he is subject first of all to having to allow the credit at that point, and then is subject to a fine of up to $200 on each conviction. So if he has 100 suites and has not allowed it on each one of them, he could be in for quite a piece of change.

Mr. Chairman: Section 7.

Mr. Singer: On section 7, there have been various speeches made—

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Section 7, the member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: There have been various speeches made and various suggestions that the Minister is going to have a task force to enforce this Act. The penalty section.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not to enforce.

Mr. Singer: Well, all right. I would like the Minister to tell me how we are going to bring erring landlords to heel and punish them under section 7.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, if we are talking about the task force, perhaps this is where it comes in.

As I explained in the House, I am quite sure people—the landlords or tenants, mainly in this instance, the tenants—are going to come to members of this House. For example, on the municipalities. They will write to "Action Line" and say they have not got the reduction of their taxes—it has not been allowed to them.

Many of them will undoubtedly write to me. I am sure many members will undoubtedly write to me. Now I am certain we will turn them over to the subsidies branch. That is where they are going now. Undoubtedly there will be letters back and forth, between the landlord and the department, the tenant and the department, and sooner or later

you get to a point where you are not getting very far by letter. Maybe there have been some phone calls in the meantime.

When we get to that point, when things are completely frustrated, and the letters are not being answered, or are not being followed, then there will be some people available towards the end of the year to go out from the office, or from the offices across the province and sit down with the landlord or tenant and see if they cannot bring them together. It is not going to work in every case. Not by a long shot, but I think what we have—

Mr. Sargent: It sure is not. This whole mess should never have happened.

Mr. Chairman. Order! Section 7.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am wondering if the member for Grey-Bruce has finished.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: No. I want to hear the rest of the Minister's remarks, if I may.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: So, I do not say that my friend shakes his head. I do not know how many there are in this final group—but the letters have not straightened things away. But by sending somebody out I think, quite frankly, in some instances, we are going to be able to do some good. I am sure they are going to get many cases where they are going to decide that the landlord or the tenant or both are at each other's throats, and the best thing they can do is get out of there.

Particularly in this first year—you would not do this in other years—but there may well be a lack of understanding both on the part of the tenant as to what he is entitled to and the landlord as to what he should do. We hope that these people—and I do not know how many will be required—really can solve a few more problems. Ultimately, if the tenant still feels aggrieved, he goes to the Crown attorney and swears out an information.

Mr. Singer: That was what I wanted to find out, and I am very disappointed. I am not surprised really by what the Minister says. What your task force is going to be is a sort of mediation service, a conciliation group, similar to what the Minister of Labour has in the human rights aspects. Discrimination and so on. But surely this is in an entirely foolish concept. Surely here you lay down very strict and stringent provisions that the landlord must give the money back. Now you are going to set up a task force and, in due course, if it is brought to your attention, you will go out and attempt to mediate and try to explain everybody's rights. If that does not work, then the tenant is going to have to go to the Crown attorney and lay a charge, spend time laying the charges, go back to court, and probably have to proceed with the prosecution himself. What tenant is going to go through all of that nonsense to try and get back $50?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: How would you do it?

Mr. Singer: I would say that the initiative has to lie with you. I would say that if you are going to spend hours and days attempting to conciliate, and if you cannot conciliate then throw your hands up and say, "I am sorry, Mister Tenant, I cannot conciliate, trot down to the Crown attorney and figure it out with him." And yet the tenant will be in the same position. He will go down and spend time with the Crown attorney if he can find him, take the time out to swear out the information and in due course, it might come before the courts. The landlord will undoubtedly have a lawyer there and it is—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am not a lawyer, but how could the information be sworn out by a member of my task force and how could the Crown attorney accept it or not or be prepared to take it to court or not without the tenant being there? He has to be there in any case.

Mr. Singer: That is right and what I am suggesting is that your role in this is not to be a concilator. If, on information received by your department you have reason to believe that an offence under this Act has taken place, then if you are serious, you have a duty to take that offence before the courts.

But what you have told us is not that at all. You have told us that you are going to try and conciliate. If it does not work, then the tenant is on his own again. I say that that really destroys any teeth that might appear to be in section 7.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, on that background behind your chair are two scales of justice which indicate that we are supposed to be fair in this House, or, at least I trust that we are supposed to be fair in this House. And yet there is a deliberate enactment in this Act which says all landlords are vile, and no tenants are. There is provision here

for taking a landlord to court and making a criminal out of him if he has not abided by the provisions of this Act, although he may have innocently believed that he had a good position in refusing to comply with some of the terms of this Act. Now, why in heaven's name has the landlord got an alternative of either paying—whether he thinks that he is right or wrong—or being branded a criminal? Why should it go to magistrate's court? Why not in some other court?

Mr. MacDonald: He has no criminal record if he is not convicted.

Mr. Ben: He does. He may have a good reason to believe that he does not owe the tenant that much money, or else that there were other arrangements. He may in good conscience believe that he is right, and go to court and be proved wrong. Then he has a criminal record. Now, I think that this is iniquitous and wrong.

Mr. MacDonald: There is no record if he is acquitted of the charge.

Mr. Ben: There is a thing called *mens rea* or intent. The landlord in all good conscience believed that he was right, in other words he did not have the intention of defrauding anybody, but thought that he was right. He went to court and the court—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, I think that it is apparent that the debate is going to continue.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the committee rise and report two bills without amendment, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report two bills without amendment, and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this is a private member's hour. The subject to be presented in the House and debated will be resolution No. 33.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 33 by Mr. A. E. Reuter:

RESOLUTION:

That in the opinion of this House the government should take immediate steps to institute an educational programme for our schools to acquaint our young people with the dangers of glue sniffing, and further that consideration be given to passing of legislation to control the sale of glue and other toxic substances of similar nature.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, a matter which has been of considerable concern to me for some time, and to many other people, involves the habit of some of our young folks to indulge in the use of certain solvents in order to obtain modern kicks. The most widely reported incidents involve the inhalation of airplane glue which is used in making model airplanes. I am sure sir, that you can recall as all hon. members can recall, the great pastime of making models that became popular when we were quite a few years younger than we are today. My own early recollections include the use of a small tube of especially powerful glue that made materials stick together well without the use of nails or screws.

Back in those days, who ever thought of sniffing the stuff for kicks? The instructions would say: Use out of doors, keep away from fire, and I am sure, sir, that you and I and most youngsters took heed of the warnings, at least to some extent. But what has happened to our youth in the intervening years? Why do they seek the kicks that come from such harmful habits? I do not pretend to have the answers to those questions sir, in fact, there seem to be very few answers, let alone solutions, that are available to us.

There are those who say the more publicity that is given to the problem, the worse it will get. I will admit the possibility that this may be so, however, I believe that this is a risk that we must take in order to gain control. Certainly, avoiding the problem and hoping that it will go away does not in any way provide even a partial solution. While the control of the manufacture and sale of such substances probably falls within the purvue of the federal Food and Drug Act, and certain aspects come under the jurisdiction of the criminal code of Canada, I do not believe that there is nothing that can be done by the province to help bring about some relief.

Before I offer some suggestions as to what Ontario might do, I want to review the matter in some detail, in order that all hon. mem-

bers might be fully informed as to the magnitude of the problem. One of the very first reports ever published on the subject was in Arizona in 1960. Since that time there have been only a few detailed reports or studies that have been published. However, there are many, many press reports, many news reports, and these are becoming more and more frequent as time goes on.

First, sir, it is not the glue itself that is harmful, it is the solvent used in the manufacture of the glue. These same solvents are used in other substances, such as nail polish remover, lighter fluid, paint thinner and many other similar substances. Indeed these other substances are also used to produce the same results, the same kicks. But the common ordinary substance called aeroplane plus is the most widely used today.

I first became acutely aware of the problem right in my home area in the city of Galt. This was less than a year ago and since then I have been gathering all the reports I could possibly find, and have been following the press very, very closely—gathering all the information I possibly could, from any source, to observe the situation as it really exists not only in my own area but in the Toronto area and indeed right across the province and the country.

There are various citizens' groups that first brought the matter to my attention due to an alarming increase in vandalism that was traced by local police in the city of Galt to gangs of teenagers. It was found that a sharp rise in the incidence of glue sniffing was occurring at the same time as the vandalism. In one particular case, a young gang took over an old abandoned property in which they held glue sniffing parties, and they wrecked this property and eventually burned it down. In another case, a gang took over a vacant building that had been slated for demolition and there were approximately 17 youngsters rounded up one night, and later released, because they were juveniles.

In one case a youngster was acting as if he was a violent mental patient and others appeared to be highly intoxicated. Another youth reportedly said he had been sniffing for so long that it took 20 tubes of glue before he could achieve the kick he was looking for, and even then he had to carry spare tubes of glue along with him to prolong the effect. Earlier in the year, in Richmond Hill, a jury found that a 16-year-old girl who had started glue sniffing only last August, 1967, had died after a complicated illness resulting from her collapse after continued inhalation. Just a few weeks ago three teenagers were found staggering along the railway tracks in this area with glue smeared all over their hands. They were holding their hands to their faces to inhale the fumes.

In Hamilton, recently, police raided a teenage drinking and vapor-sniffing party at a fashionable Westdale home and arrested three teenagers and placed pending charges against nine other boys and girls from 13 to 17. In the city of Galt, just a little while ago, a newspaper employee picked up 52 empty glue tubes in one of the local parks. One Sunday night, not too long ago, an area policeman arrested a 19-year-old youth who was found whining and howling like a dog. He had been seen earlier with a brown paper bag over his head and when he was arrested he had four containers of glue in his possession.

An evening *Telegram* report of March 3, 1966, revealed that three boys, aged 10, 12 and 13, were charged with administering a stupefying drug to themselves. The report stated that this was the first time anyone had been charged with sniffing glue.

The Toronto *Daily Star,* on November 25, 1965, stated that four 13- and 14-year-old boys appeared in Metro juvenile court after they had gone wild on a glue binge and had toppled 105 tombstones in a local cemetery. This same article recorded the case of a 16-year-old boy who tried to beat his parents and a younger brother to death with a steel tool. In the same article again, it related the story about two boys in New York City who thought they could fly. They plunged to their deaths from the roof of a tall building under the influence of glue inhalation.

Mr. Speaker, those are just a few of the cases about which I have read. I have read about many, many more incidents of different cases but I think these are sufficient to relate to the House the really serious nature of this problem. Apart from the dangerous results while under the influence of inhalation, there are other physical and mental after-effects that must be considered. According to a article in the Canadian Medical Association *Journal,* studies have revealed very little in the way of physical damage to organs. The article states that there is no evidence that brain damage occurs. However, there are conflicting reports and there are certainly threats arising in the chronics who are emerging from those who now can be classed as experimenters.

There is evidence of addiction, as indicated in the case of the boy I mentioned earlier who needed 20 tubes of glue to get his kicks. Larger and larger amounts are being taken by these addicts and there is a danger of turning to more powerful and more dangerous drugs. According to an article in a regular news column with which I am sure most members are familiar, written by Dr. J. G. Molnar—I believe is the pronunciation—after repeated sniffing, damage appears in the liver as well as in the blood. Other investigations have revealed evidence of long-range effects such as loss of weight, low blood pressure, change of personality, brain and kidney damage and ultimately death.

Dr. Jacob Sokol of Los Angeles, after examination of 750 glue sniffing children, reported that the habit causes liver, kidney and lung damage; abnormalities in the blood, including anemia; decrease in the white blood count, and changes in the red cells as well as pus, bacteria and blood in the urine. Dr. R. E. Turner of the Clarke institute of psychiatry claims that glue sniffers may undergo irreversible changes in their intelligence and behaviour.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that there can be no doubt of the magnitude of the problem. While it appears to have developed only within the last ten years, the evidence available clearly indicates the need for control. There are alarming reports from all parts of the United States and Canada, and right here in Ontario, and parents and citizens' groups are asking for some action.

In some areas of the continent some action has been taken. In New York state, in 1965, a law passed at that time prohibits a person from intentionally smelling or inhaling fumes from glue containing a solvent releasing toxic vapour or fumes to cause intoxication, stupefaction or dulling of the brain or nervous system. It also prohibits possession for these purposes, and the sale or offer to sell with knowledge of such use, and it fixes penalties.

In Colorado, in Denver juvenile court, an experimental programme to help rehabilitate young glue sniffers showed results sufficient to warrant further refined testing and evaluation. In this project, the results of the programme were used to provide schools, police and other agencies with a better understanding of the problem. Federal funds were provided to promote this programme which included group therapy and counselling for the young addicts. In New England in 1962, The Department of Public Health enlisted the aid of merchants, parents and school teachers in a campaign to try to stamp out the fad. Storekeepers were urged to report any sudden increase in sales and were to limit the individual sales to youngsters. The Greenwich health association of Greenwich, Connecticut, has prepared and distributed a very comprehensive booklet entitled, "The Glue Sniffing Problem."

Many of the states have legislation of one kind or another, and in Winnipeg, according to the Canadian Medical Association *Journal* of February of this year, the poison control centre of the Winnipeg children's hospital has attempted to lessen the problem by a programme of education amongst school teachers, ministers and social workers. In fact, the grade 9 health curriculum in Winnipeg schools includes a special subject entitled, "Drug and Substance Abuses," and the children's hospital there has made available a team consisting of a psychiatrist, pediatrician and a social worker. The Manitoba provincial health education authority has also launched a parent education programme, and The Juvenile Delinquents Act of Manitoba provides for charges to be laid for deliberate inhalation for purposes of intoxication and they have prepared an excellent pamphlet on the subject.

In Montreal in January of last year officials at St. Mary's hospital organized a seminar for teenagers in a neighbourhood YMCA, and instead of the expected attendance of about 200, over 500 long-haired teenagers showed up. There is also controlling legislation in Canada in Alberta and British Columbia.

As nearly as I can determine, Mr. Speaker —I may be wrong, but as nearly as I can determine—at the moment very little is being done officially in Ontario. In 1965, the Scarborough board of health decided to contact federal and provincial members of Parliament to enlist their aid but I believe nothing resulted. In late 1967, Dr. Edward Turner of the Clarke institute of psychiatry said the practice should be made a criminal offence. At the same time, a Toronto school trustee, Mr. Alan Archer, urged the Senate at Ottawa to pass Bill S-22, to which I will refer in a few moments, and at the same time indicated he would urge the Ontario Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) to sponsor a provincial bill.

Early this year, Lepages Limited, a large Canadian manufacturer of the glue, urged that strong action be taken against store owners who knowingly sold glue to children for sniffing purposes. And in January of this year, Toronto's legislation committee proposed a motion that would add glue to the list of

substances not available to minors under The Minors Protection Act. Just within the last month, Mr. Speaker, the problem has come into prominence again and the daily press has been full of reports of one kind or another.

On May 7 the Ontario medical association was quoted as saying, "There is no way anybody can stop a juvenile from glue sniffing." The article went on to say that the association did not believe the practice should be made a criminal offence, but that young sniffers should be referred to health or social agencies. On the same day, sir, Judge William J. Little interpreted The Juvenile Delinquents Act to include glue sniffing and he promised also to prosecute shopkeepers who sell glue to children knowing they are going to indulge in sniffing.

More and more parents, school officials and others are becoming increasingly alarmed. Just one week ago, a local mother appealed to the hon. Attorney General for some action, and as a result, I understand that an amendment will be sought to the criminal code of Canada. A meeting will be held with the local school authorities and local police will be supported in laying charges against merchants selling glue to children for sniffing purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit through you to the Attorney General that this is not enough. Bill S-22, which was introduced to the Senate on October 31 last year, was duly passed but it did not reach the House of Commons. The bill has died, and with the political situation now existing in Ottawa, who knows how long it might be before the criminal code is finally amended? In the meantime, the problem continues. Bill S-22 was a good bill; it specifically mentioned in the schedules attached to the bill the subjects which would be controlled and which were to be included. It included bleaches, cleansers, sanitizers, glues, household polishes, and soon—many different types of substances that did contain harmful solvents.

But, as I say, this bill has died and no one knows how long we are going to have to wait until Ottawa does bring about some legislation. Certainly the province must add its support to desirable federal amendments, but it seems to me that we in Ontario have a problem to face that cannot be left up to Ottawa. Whether or not the inhalation of glue and other similar substances is an offence under the criminal code is one thing, but the distribution and sale of such substances to our young people is another. I am not at all prepared to go along with an absence of provincial control in this respect. Surely we can extend some of our existing statutes or even introduce new legislation that will help to some extent to bring about some immediate relief.

The hon. Attorney General indicated on Wednesday of this week that no decision had been taken to introduce such legislation, but I respectfully say to him through you, sir, that such a move on his part would be very well received by those who are seriously concerned and that any such legislative action could not help but produce some beneficial results. As long as there is no legal control, the indiscriminate sale to young people will continue. True, enforcement may be difficult, but I firmly believe the mere existence and a wide circulation of publication of any such statute in this respect would serve as a deterrent.

Legislative control over the uses of such products as well as over the distribution and sale is only part of the possible solution. The hon. Attorney General has indicated, as noted in the local press on May 30, that he frankly was not aware that the practice had reached such proportions as it had. On Wednesday of this week, he indicated to the House that he did not believe the matter had reached dangerous proportions. This, of course, is a matter of opinion, and I must say, sir, that in my opinion the whole problem is one of great danger, so much so that in addition to whatever legislative control we may bring about, we need a very extensive programme of education.

In my opinion, it is necessary that the hon. Ministers of Health (Mr. Dymond) and Education (Mr. Davis), as well as the hon. Attorney General, must get together immediately and set up an interdepartmental committee, not to study the matter, but to embark on an educational programme at once. This programme should be directed to parents, teachers, police, clergymen and all people who might have any concern. Much information is now available and can be put together in printed brochures for wide distribution so that our people can become thoroughly aware of the dangers of this stupid curse on our young people.

I urge all hon. members to support this resolution.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, may I first say how pleased I am to have another articulate spokesman on this side of the House, and I would like to welcome the member for Waterloo South as a speaker on this side of the House in his new

capacity. I would like to say also that I have listened with great care to his remarks and I find it very difficult to say many new things about the subject. But I would like to underline some of the valid points he has made.

He expressed concern, Mr. Speaker, with the opinion of the Attorney General, that the Attorney General was not aware this was a significant problem in our society. I would like to state for the record that there are many articles on this subject—not just newspaper articles, but many research articles, particularly south of the border where they have known this has been a problem for some time. For example, in 1963, there is an article entitled "Glue Sniffing" in the *New York Journal of Medicine*, by Drs. H. Jacobziner and H. W. Raybin—five years ago. It is a fairly detailed study pointing out the very harmful effects of glue sniffing and some of the reasons why teenagers particularly indulge in it.

There is another article, in 1964, entitled, "Acute and Chronic Effects of Glue Sniffing," and this appeared in the *California Medical Journal*, by three eminent doctors, including Dr. M. L. Barman. There is another article entitled, "A Comparison of the Cognitive Functioning of Glue Sniffers and Non-Glue Sniffers," which appeared in the *Journal of Paediatrics* in 1964 as well. One of the authors was Mr. J. Dodds. Of course, an excellent article, which I quoted in a previous discussion on glue sniffing in this House some months ago, appeared in 1967, in *Paediatrics*.

So the point that the hon. member for Waterloo South made—at least I believe he made—that this has been a known problem for some time, this particular problem of glue sniffing as well as solvent sniffing. That there has been extensive research on it, as opposed to press reports on some children who died from glue sniffing, is well taken, and I share his concern that the hon. Attorney General of this province thinks it is largely a non-problem. It is not. It is a problem which is serious. It is a problem that deserves action and not garbled statements about its importance or non-importance.

Mr. Speaker, I would like next to turn to a personal connection which I have had with this problem in my own area. I would like to quote from a letter I received dated December 12, 1967, from a Mrs. Claire S. MacKay, who is the head of a study group of wives and mothers in the West Hill area. She sent me a petition at that time. I would like to read a few paragraphs from her letter. It is addressed to Mr. T. Reid, MPP, Scarborough East, Scarborough, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Reid:

> Please find herewith, petition signed by 1,200 persons interested in the government assisting in getting a safe glue product on the market by legislation by removing the present harmful products from the glue.

She goes on to say that:

> Several other petitions have been received since the petition here was sent to me, on the same problem.

She continues in her letter:

> On behalf of our study and discussion group, I wish to say thank you for your interest and concern. We will be watching for future developments in this regard.

Well, at this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to members of this House and to you, sir, what their petitions said. This is signed by 1,200 ordinary people, living in the West Hill, Scarborough and Highland Creek area of Metropolitan Toronto and they are very concerned. I simply say this sir—that if 1,200 parents out in my area of this city, the area where I live in this city, say there is a problem, then I put their 1,200 words against the single word of the Attorney General. Their petition reads as follows:

> In view of the increased use by children ages 9 to 14 years of harmful glue for the purpose of sniffing which damages the brain, liver, kidneys and blood and for which there is apparently no antidote, we the undersigned, urge our government to take immediate action to halt this dangerous practice by:
>
> First: immediate legislation to ban the sale of this dangerous product and making a sale of this product a criminal offence.

This is very strong language! The petition continues:

> Second: legislation to forbid the production of this dangerous glue product until the harmful ingredients are removed or a harmless but repulsive ingredient is added —for example tear gas—making it impossible for it to be used for the purpose of sniffing.
>
> Third: that the government make low interest loans available if necessary to encourage the manufacturers of glue to pursue research on safe substitute glue.

They note, that "we the people who have signed this petition," including my wife and myself, "are quite willing to pay more for glue that is safe."

That is an essential point, Mr. Speaker. The petition continues:

> We are quite willing to pay more for glue that is safe. This is preferable to paying for treatment centres tomorrow to take care of those persons damaged today through the indiscriminate use of such a dangerous and commonly-used household product.

I think that point about the consumers—the parents of children, some of whom know their children are sniffing glue, being willing to pay more for the product is very instructive.

In other words, they are saying for goodness sakes do not let the manufacturers get away with doing nothing on the argument that if they put in something else into the glue it is going to make it more expensive. They are saying, sir, that they are willing to pay more so that argument by the government, by the private manufacturers of the products, just does not wash in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to send this petition directly to the House leader, the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree) and I trust he will look at the petition. He will see that it is signed by 1,200 concerned parents in Metropolitan Toronto, that it is dated November 27, some time ago. I asked him to forward it to the colleague that he thinks should have it.

I would like next, Mr. Speaker, to underline another point the hon. member for Waterloo South made about this being a serious problem. I would like to quote from the Calgary *Herald*. I believe this is some time within the last two weeks. While this is in another jurisdiction, I think it is relevant to the discussion here. It is entitled: "City Boy Victim of Glue Sniffing" and it reads as follows:

This was, I might add, sent to me by Mrs. MacKay who is responsible for this petition. She had sent a copy of this petition out to a friend in Calgary who was trying to do something about it. Subsequent to this, this boy died.

> An inquest has been ordered into the death of a 14-year-old north Calgary boy who is the city's first apparent victim of glue sniffing. The boy, whose name is being withheld by police, was found a few minutes after 8 a.m., Tuesday, by his mother. He was lying on the floor beside his bed with a plastic bag over his head. Police found two half empty tubes of glue on the floor nearby, traces of glue were found in the plastic bag. City detectives put forward the theory that the teenager became so intoxicated he passed out with the bag still over his head. The boy's mother told the detectives her son went to bed shortly after 10 p.m. and he was found in the morning still clothed. Police say the incident of glue sniffing among Calgary's school children has been quite high in the past. It is especially popular during the school holidays when students get together, said a spokesman.

Well, there has been a death in Calgary as a result from that. I would like to note also, Mr. Speaker, in the same article is the following statement:

> Last fall in Calgary the Alberta medical association recommended tighter controls on solvent usage causing glue sniffing an increase in social and medical problem here. They said—

and these are doctors, sir—

> mental and physical disability which results from glue sniffing can be permanent.

I would like to underline again, the point the hon. member for Waterloo South made.

Turning to the comments that the Attorney General made in this House the other day and not referring directly from *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker, but from a direct quotation from the Toronto *Daily Star*, he is reported to have made this statement which I wanted to question. He said, apparently we may be able to limit the use of glue by making it an offence —sniffing that is—to be found intoxicated or in an hallucogenic state from glue. This just appeals me. If the government has this approach to its public responsibility, it just shatters me. I was particularly pleased therefore, Mr. Speaker, when the member for Waterloo South spoke up, as a government member, against his own Minister's views.

The Attorney General, I think, said that a ban on glue would only mean a switch to other substances such as gasoline, nail polish or vanilla extract. Well I would just like to counteract that with an authoritative quote from the article from paediatrics, volume 39, numbers 3 and 4, March and April 67, an article entitled, "Solvent Sniffing," written by Doctor Edward Press and Doctor Alan Done. I would like to quote this in reference to that particular point the Attorney General made as to why children indulge in this glue sniffing business. The doctors said:

> One factor among children in particular —there are two other factors—is the ease of

obtaining the material for presumably legitimate uses and the facility with which that material can be carried and concealed. These latter factors appear to determine to a considerable extent the current popularity of glue preparations.

So I think it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, to follow up on the remarks made by the hon. member for Waterloo South, to state that perhaps glue is somewhat unique. It is not like Dutch cleanser, or nail polish. It is something that a teenager can go into a store and buy presumably for legitimate purpose. It is something he can conceal easily in his pocket. He can carry it around because it is in a small quantity. This might make this type of glue—not all glue of course—unique or substantially different from other types of solvents which can be used for sniffing.

So I would say that I think we can pass legislation in this House to make it possible to restrict young teenagers from obtaining the glue. I think we might be able to put it in more bulky packages so they cannot carry it around in their pocket. They might have to take it home in a big package if they want to make airplanes—this type of thing. I think perhaps we could act now on this particular substance rather than wait until we find out about the whole problem of solvent sniffing and other such materials.

Turning next, Mr. Speaker, to the question of the federal-provincial jurisdiction problem, I would like to quote from a letter I have from Robert Stanbury, the MP for York-Scarborough, in response to my letter concerning this problem of glue sniffing in Scarborough. He replied to my letter. His letter was dated January 9, 1968. He says this—

> As jurisdictional health is shared between federal and provincial governments, research and education on ths subject could be undertaken by either or both.

I think that is important. Mr. Stanbury is a very careful MP and no doubt checked with the present Prime Minister before replying. So we have an area of joint responsibility—neither the province nor the federal government are excluded—both can become involved in the area of research and education. Mr. Stanbury continues:

> Except insofar as criminal penalties might be imposed, control of advertising or sale is within the jurisdiction of provincial governments.

That is what we are into, and I would very much like the Attorney General to consult with Mr. Stanbury, or directly with the Minister of Justice, the hon. Mr. MacDonald, the acting Minister, to get it clear in his own mind where the responsibility lies and where there can be joint action. Certainly in the area of control of advertising, the control of sale, this government has a direct responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, finally I would like to say that we must not proceed in this area on the assumption that the private sector does not feel a sense of responsibility in this matter. I think if we make the assumption that some of my friends to my immediate left make, that all private enterprise is bad, and that all private enterprise has been clobbered over the head to get it into line, this is being irresponsible in our society. I would like here to refer to a reply that the clerk of the corporation of the borough of Scarborough received from Lepages Limited. This letter is dated January 4, 1968, and is in response to a letter that Lepages received from the council of the borough of Scarborough in response again to Mrs. Claire MacKay's petition. Here is what Lepages say. I do not think they go far enough but they are moving a little bit. They say:

> Let us state that our company feels we are a manufacturer with a responsibility to the general public and for this reason we have written to our MP and MPP advocating that legislation be put on the books that penalizes the unconscionable seller and the anti-social user.

I think that is important, that they want to move into that.

I will just conclude then, with one final remark that this particular private manufacturer has made efforts—

> —by including a card in each display of tubes that these not be put on a self-service area and that sales of large amounts be refused to youngsters unless accompanied by an adult.

I think the intention of Lepages is there. I do not think they are willing to go the fundamental step of putting something in that glue which would make it obnoxious for sniffing, but I think they do feel a responsibility. Surely this government, with this type of attitude on the part of the private sector in our society, could really move forward and save a lot of young children from such an open opportunity of indulging in sniffing. Thank you.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, this problem of glue sniffing by

children and young people has prompted over 5,000 people to sign petitions looking for action from this government. It has prompted the Toronto school board to press for action from the government. It is a problem that any father or mother in Ontario would like to think would not reach their children so that they are, along with the people who have worked on the petitions, waiting, looking to this government, for a solution to the problem. Surely, Mr. Speaker, they could not be asked or expected to do more to draw to this government's attention that this is an urgent problem of local concern.

I am rather shocked, Mr. Speaker, to see the view of the Attorney General when he said that to make it an offence to be intoxicated into an hallucinogenic state by glue was the problem. This is not the problem, Mr. Speaker. It is not just the legality of usage. This is a problem that is a social and health problem. The Minister of Health should be making a statement as to its deleterious effects to find out how harmful glue sniffing is. It is up to the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) to look into the social aspects of the problem.

The Attorney General referred to studies; what studies he did not say. What we need, Mr. Speaker, right now, is action. Studies and the education in this problem can come later. It is a must for the Attorney General to deal with this problem. It is a crime that the children can get this substance so easily and harm themselves and other children by doing so, and doing so, Mr. Speaker, in the ever present spirit of adventure or kicks. For the Attorney General to issue a statement correlating the enticement of this substance with that of nail polish, or vanilla, or gasoline, is an example that he is simply not in touch with the reality of the problem, and it was ridiculous to drag this type of red herring over what the real issue is.

Glue, as it has been said before today, and airplane glue in particular, is a young person's or child's thing. Vanilla has been with us for a long time, Mr. Speaker, without incidence of usage by young people and children. The storekeeper is not going to hand out multiple bottles of vanilla without it registering as being somewhat unusual. This is an excellent example that the Attorney General has not really come to grips with the reality of the problem. In the matter of alcohol, which can be a social and health problem, there is controlled sale to minors. It is entirely within the jurisdiction of this province, and as such must be controlled through the sale.

Who is it going to hurt, Mr. Speaker? The children will not go without model airplanes; they will not go without the correct amount of glue to build airplanes. It will simply mean an adult will purchase it, and it will ensure against the possibility of any unscrupulous storekeeper from pushing the sale of glue to youngsters. I would think the harmful effects that were drawn to our attention today by the member for Waterloo South, in themselves, without this public pressure, would be suffiicient to draw action from the Ministers of this government. To say it should be dealt with under the criminal code, is to ignore the social and health aspects of the problem.

The government must know who the manufacturers are, find them, control the sale, prohibit its use by minors, prohibit its purchase—Mr. Speaker, I should say—by minors, and label it strongly for the dangers of usage. Responsibility rests squarely with this government. Should there be a fatality or damage to a child in this interim period of delay, there is no question whose responsibility this would be. It is not enough for the Attorney General to say, "We may be able to get it by making it an offence." Why allow this to happen to children?

The same technique that is used in the controlled sale of alcohol in the province of Ontario could be applied to the sale of glue. Up until this year, the province controlled the use of pool halls by minors, yet ignored this more serious and dangerous problem. There should not be any hang-up or delay at all, Mr. Speaker. For the Attorney General to say, "No, they cannot legislate against this," is ridiculous. If he will not, perhaps the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs will.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, with respect to Monday, and the order paper, it came to me that in view of the importance of the debate on the shelter or the municipal bill, which was not concluded this morning, it would be desirable to continue that debate to its conclusion on Monday, and accordingly we will go to the order paper for that purpose, and continue with the estimates of The Department of University Affairs. I believe it was previously announced with respect to the sequence of other departments, that Energy, and Trade and Development would be the departments to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, before that motion is put, I rise on a point of order. Yesterday, I submitted to the Clerk, notice of a motion which the government has indicated they will call for next Wednesday—a proposed amendment on the supply motion, so-called want of confidence motion—and it appeared in *Votes and Proceedings* this morning. But it appeared in an edited form in which the real substance which creates the context of the motion has been edited out.

Mr. Speaker, I protest most strongly on a number of grounds, the first of which is that this was an arbitrary action; we were not extended the courtesy of any discussion with regard to it; it simply appeared this morning in its truncated form. That, I think, is an infringement on the rights of the House. Indeed, there are many other things I might like to say but I shall try to restrain myself.

Second, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that this is a substantive motion—in fact that it is modelled directly on a motion that was introduced in the British House of Commons, including the portion which was edited out—and I have a copy of it here in a book entitled, "Parliament and Mumbo-Jumbo," by Emrys Hughes, MP, which is available in the parliamentary library here. But my most important complaint is that it destroys the whole thrust and meaning and purpose of our motion.

So I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that this motion appear in the form that we submitted, which is our right. The edited portion is not a preamble, as has been decided by the Clerk. It should appear on the order paper on Monday in the form that we submitted it so that it will be available for debate on Wednesday. I would like your assurance that that will take place.

Mr. Speaker: This matter has been drawn to my attention, and also provisions, I think it is, of rule 41, which says that there is to be no preamble or recital to a motion. Whether or not it is in order in Westminister is of little concern if it is not in order in accordance with the rules of this House.

The dealing with notices of motion for the order paper in the past has been, and has been up to the present time, that they are given to the Clerk of the House who is in charge of the *Votes and Proceedings* and the journals of the House, and are by him, as I understand it, printed, not edited. But if they are not in order they are either referred back to the member who has submitted them, or dealt with by the Clerk as the rules of the House require.

The Clerk advised me that he had looked this over, that he had tried to get the leader of the New Democratic Party, probably the leader was not in just then, but in order not to hold it up, as I understand it, the Clerk published it in its present form. I certainly will be glad to discuss the matter with the leader of the New Democratic Party and the other two party leaders and the Clerk of the House. But that is the situation as it stands at the moment.

I would need to be persuaded, if the matter were referred to me for a ruling, that what I looked at casually—because it was not Mr. Speaker's duty to deal with that—was not a preamble or a recital as expressly prohibited in our rules. And I would think that it would be very easy for the leader of the New Democratic Party to reword it so that the thrust would not be lost but that it would be in accordance with the rules of the House. I am open to suggestions.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I say to you very firmly that I have no intention of rewording it. And I refer this to you for your ruling because this comes under your direction in the House. It is true that we follow the rules of this House, and not the rules of Westminister, but I submit to you that this is a substantive motion and that we can seek guidance from the experience of the British House of Commons. The Clerk has chosen to describe the edited portion as a preamble.

I have another substantive motion from the United Kingdom House which I do not know whether you, Mr. Speaker, have seen, but certainly the Clerk has seen it because he borrowed this book. In that motion, the quotation from Churchill is not regarded as an irrelevant preamble, it is an integral part of the motion. Anybody who reads this, Mr. Speaker, will recognize that without the portion that is edited, the whole thrust of the amendment has been destroyed.

I am forced once again to come to the conclusion that political considerations entered into the decision. And I say very firmly, sir, that I submit this matter to you for your ruling. It will have to be a ruling, I assume, not later than Monday so that it will be available for the debate which the government has agreed to on Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker: May I just refer to one or two matters mentioned by the member for York South. First of all, our rules do not say that a preamble needs to be relevant or irrelevant. They merely say that it shall not be a preamble, so that that particular point—

Mr. MacDonald: It is not a preamble.

Mr. Speaker: —that particular point, as to whether it is relevant or irrelevant, does not enter the picture at all. Secondly, so far as I know, the Clerk of the House has always been free from any involvement in politics, and I think he is in this case. This particular matter was dealt with by him without reference to me, other than to tell me the situation. I suggested he get hold of the mover. As far as I know, he was in contact with no one else. I also know that he is a very experienced official of this House, in its operation and in its precedents.

I, in a moment, will be very pleased to hear what the leader of the Opposition has to say, but I merely say to the member that as far as his submission today is concerned, I will certainly be glad to discuss it not only with the Clerk but with the member who has put it before the House and with those others who may be concerned, so that we can deal with it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, dealing with the point of order, I must say in my view that it is unfortunate that it was suggested that the Clerk would in any way be associated with a political decision in this regard. But I do feel, sir, that among your heavy duties is the responsibility to decide in matters such as this what may or may not go on the order paper, and that it is certainly your duty to get advice where you see fit, and to listen to advice proffered in this House. But the decision is yours, which can be dealt with by the House if that is called upon.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, we can expect your ruling on Monday, am I correct?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker will give his ruling in due course.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, this motion has been called by the government for Wednesday and therefore we must have your ruling by Monday.

Mr. Speaker: The member and the House will receive my ruling when that ruling is available, and if matters have to be adjusted because of the occasion which has arisen they will have to be adjusted. I certainly will do my best to ensure that proceedings of the House are not interrupted or unduly detoured.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 2:00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 112



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, June 10, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 10, 1968

Presenting reports, Mr. Welch 4151

Practice teachers overseeing student teachers from teachers' colleges, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Shulman 4151

Millbrook prisoners writing and receiving letters, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman 4152

Safety of lighted pools on Toronto Island and elsewhere in Ontario, question to Mr. Simonett, Mr. T. P. Reid 4152

Amalgamation of municipalities in the Porcupine mining camp, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Ferrier 4152

Unqualified high school teachers in Ontario, and college of education, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Martel 4153

Statements by the Conservative candidate for Nickel Belt as reported in the Sudbury *Daily Star*, questions to Mr. Gomme and Mr. Dymond, Mr. Martel 4153

Public inquiry into increases in Hydro rates, question to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Sargent 4154

Housing loans from private sources, questions to Mr. Randall, Mr. Sargent 4154

Coulter Manufacturing Company Limited, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. Pilkey 4155

Birth certificates procured by James Earl Ray, questions to Mr. Welch, Mr. Nixon and Mr. MacDonald 4155

Reduction of municipal taxes on residential property, bill to provide for, reported 4157

Estimates, Department of University Affairs, Mr. Davis 4164

Recess, 6 o'clock 4196

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, JUNE 10, 1968

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today we have visiting us, students from St. Cecelia separate school, Toronto, and Eitz Chaim school, Toronto, in the east gallery; and in the west gallery, from Campden public school in Campden and Grapeview public school, R. R. 3, St. Catharines. Later today we will have students from Aberfoyle public school in Aberfoyle, Woodside public school in Oakville and North Bridlewood public school in Agincourt with us.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House, the following reports:

The alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation report for the year ended December 31, 1967; the Ontario cancer institute for the year ended December 31, 1967; the Ontario cancer treatment and research foundation for the year ended December 31, 1966; the Ontario hospital services commission for the year ended December 31, 1966; the Ontario mental health foundation for the year ended March 31, 1967; and the 47th annual report of the public service superannuation board for the year ended March 31, 1967.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Secretary. Will the Minister explain to the House, how James Earl Ray procured false birth certificates under the names of Ramon George Sneyd and Paul Bridgman?

Second, does the Minister contemplate any change in procedures as a result of the success of these fradulent applications?

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South has a similar question.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I have a two part question, Mr. Speaker. In view of what has happened in the James Earl Ray application for a birth certificate, does the Minister consider that procedures need to be tightened up?

Second, what is the Minister's reaction to the reported comment in the *Globe and Mail* this morning, of Deputy Registrar General, H. F. C. Humphries that minors are securing false birth certificates all the time for purposes of getting into bars and taverns?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering, as I am expecting some more information which will assist in the answering of these questions—and with your permission—if I could defer my answer to a little later on in the question period. I will then have that information.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Trade and Development. Has the contract been let for the Chapel Glen Village HOME project at Flemingdon Park? If so, to whom? And when is the expected completion date?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. Why have practice teachers in Toronto not been paid for overseeing student teachers from the provincial teachers' colleges for the months of January, February and March?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, regarding the payment for practice teachers, these payments are made directly to the boards of education concerned and the boards, in turn, make the payments to the practice teachers—pursuant to the pay list prepared by the teachers' colleges.

I understand that the payment was made by May 15 to the boards of education for the regular practice teaching sessions during January, February and March and I am informed that the Toronto board of education

has paid its teachers for this period of time. There may be miscellaneous payments for irregular practice teaching weeks and these should be in the hands of the boards by the end of this week.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question? Why does it take so long? Why do you have to wait to May 15 to make your payments for services that were given back in January?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this has been a matter that relates to the administration, the calculation of the hours and arrangements with the various boards of education. It is a system that, I think, is understood by the practice teachers rather well and while, I am sure, they would like their payments perhaps within two or three weeks after the work has been completed, it is impossible to get all the information from the teachers' college and from the boards to pay it in that short period of time.

Really, there has not been any substantial objection from the profession. The instance that the hon. member may be referring to could relate to the regular practice teaching situations. There may be a number of these where the amounts will not be calculated and available until the end of this week.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, sir. A question to the Minister of Reform Institutions. Have any prisoners at Millbrook reformatory been informed that they may not write to or receive letters from a certain individual or individuals?

If so, what is the reason for this prohibition?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is, "Yes". The answer to the second part of his question is that this prohibition may be applied from time to time in an institution when it is deemed advisable in the best interest of the inmates and/or those writing to them, or the security of an institution and/or for the protection of the public.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister allow a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will try one for size this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: The Minister must have received instructions from the Premier (Mr. Robarts). Will the Minister inform us how many people, at the present time, the prisoners may not be allowed to write to?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this is not a supplementary question. It requires my investigating to find out what the answer to this question is. I will try and get this information for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Has the Minister received a report concerning the safety of lighted pools on Toronto Island? Are any changes in the regulations to be introduced governing the wiring and lighting of fountains, ponds, and pools in the province?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, there has not been sufficient time to get a formal report into my hands relative to the reported electrocution of Mr. John A. Forbes in a shallow ornamental pool on Centre Island on Saturday, June 8 last.

However, many exhaustive tests were carried out on the electrical installation over the week-end by Ontario Hydro research and electrical inspection personnel and so far, no trace of any faulty current can be found.

Discussions with the coroner have indicated that there is medical evidence of electrocution. No changes in the regulations are envisaged at this time because decorative pool installations of this nature already must need very rigid safety requirements.

Such installations, however, were never intended to be used for wading pools or swimming pools for children, but if the officials responsible are going to permit their use for this purpose, consideration will have to be given to invoking the newly-revised regulations applicable to bona fide swimming pools. No action is contemplated until the results of the investigation are known, and there is conclusive evidence that shock current was the cause of Mr. Forbes' death.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Will the Minister make funds available for a feasibility study of the amalgamation of the municipalities in the Porcupine mining camp?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): In reply to the hon. member, I

would say that, to my knowledge, no such study has been suggested or requested by the municipalities in the Porcupine mining camp, and I really cannot answer that question until we have a formal request from them.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I have questions for the Minister of Education: What percentage of those high school teachers employed in Ontario during the school year 1967-68 were unqualified?

What was the percentage of unqualified teachers for northern Ontario? How many winter course graduates were there from the Ontario college of education in the school year 1967-68? How many of these winter student graduates went to teach under the supervision of Mr. Roger Allen in the Sudbury area? How many went to northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, 8.5 per cent, 18 per cent approximately 1,080, 14 and 62.

Mr. Martel: Would the Minister repeat those a little more slowly? I tried to copy them down.

An hon. member: 38-24-36.

Hon. Mr. Davis: My colleague, to my left had another figure in mind perhaps.

I said 8.5 per cent—these are approximate, Mr. Speaker—18 per cent, 1,080, 14 and 62.

Mr. Martel: Can I ask the Minister—based on these figures—a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if it is the kind of supplementary question that relates to some specific information, obviously I am not in a position to accept it. If he is going to ask me a somewhat controversial question, which I think I could phrase for him, I really do not think it constitutes a supplementary question. If it is not controversial, then I will accept it.

Mr. Martel: I was just wondering if the Minister, based on these facts, would be willing to have a college of education located at Laurentian University for the fall of 1969, because we have no other place to draw teachers from?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would agree that this is not too controversial in that this request has been made over the past, I believe, year and a half. It was indicated to the people who made representations from that area for another teachers' college—or college of education, rather—that we already had plans under way for the one at Queen's.

I announced, very recently, the one at Ottawa university, and we have to do this on some system of priority, and I think that it is fair to state that we could not plan and develop the facility there for the fall of 1969. I think it is also obvious that as the number of facilities are increasing in this province for teacher education, that both the Lakehead and Laurentian are two areas that would be considered as possibilities.

Mr. Martel: A question for the Minister of Highways. Is it the policy of The Department of Highways that constituencies which do not elect Conservative members are cut off from receiving funds for highways, as was stated by the former provincial Conservative candidate for Sudbury East, and the present federal Conservative candidate for Nickel Belt, Cecil Fielding, and reported in the Sudbury *Daily Star* of June 7, as follows:

> As far as Hanmer and Capreol are concerned that two weeks after the last provincial election the well dried up in Queen's Park as regards one school and your roads, which are in deplorable shape.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the answer is "No".

Mr. Martel: Could I ask the Minister a supplementary question? I am just wondering if some assurance could be given to the residents in that area that this is the case when this type of statement is hitting the press?

Hon. Mr. Gomme: I think, Mr. Speaker, the member will circulate the answer.

Mr. Martel: Thank you. A question to the Minister of Health. When will the government take over the radar base at Falconbridge and turn it into a hospital school for retarded children as was reported in the Sudbury *Daily Star* on Friday, June 7?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): I think the Sudbury *Daily Star* of June 7 must have been very busy. This is the first I have ever heard of this.

Mr. MacDonald: Wonderful! That certainly pulled the rug from under Mr. Fielding.

Mr. Martel: I appreciate that very much. This ought to be a slaughter then.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, may I answer question 653 asked by the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent)?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: His question: Will the government advise why we cannot have a public inquiry into Hydro raising its rates 9.3 per cent to rural customers now and 4 per cent to city customers in 1969.

The answer: Justification for the anticipated increase in interim rates to municipal utilities was contained in a report of the chairman of the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario to the utility representatives of the Ontario municipal electric association on March 5, 1968. A copy of this report was mailed to the homes of all members of this House on March 13.

On June 6, 1968, representatives of the commission reported to the standing committee on government commissions and explained why it will be necessary to implement the first rural rate in 15 years, as well as the reasons for anticipating further increases in the wholesale cost of power to municipal utilities.

A public inquiry will serve no useful purpose, since all pertinent facts have been presented. The commission has an outstanding record of maintaining power at low cost, and we are satisfied that the increases, though regrettable, are necessary.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have the answers to questions, but I would prefer to wait until the hon. members are in the House, if their respective leaders would like me to, or I will give you the information today.

Mr. Speaker: Are they for the official Opposition or the New Democratic Party?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Two from the member for Grey-Bruce, and one from the member for Oshawa (Mr. Pilkey).

Mr. Nixon: Let us have them.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Question 631 from the member for Grey-Bruce: In a press report in the *Globe and Mail* on Monday, June 3, Mr. Robert Bradley, executive director of the Toronto housing authority, stated that Toronto leads North American cities in a housing shortage. Would the Minister advise if he will approach the following agencies for housing loans:

(1) The international development agency; (2) the American federation of labour; (3) the CIO?

The answer: The basis for Mr. R. B. Bradley's statement was vacancy rates for certain selected United States cities compared with stated vacancy rates for Toronto. An anlysis of United States and Canadian vacancy figures shows that these cannot be considered on a comparable basis. In Canada, vacancy rates are measured for apartment buildings of six or more units.

In the United States, all available rental housing is included. The method of conducting vacancy surveys in the United States differs considerably to that of Canada. United States mailmen check empty units on their routes. By this method a unit which has been rented but not yet occupied would be incorrectly included. The effect is that United States vacancy rate figures over-state to a large degree the extent of vacancies as measured by Canadian standards.

Vacancies show but one aspect of the housing situation. For example, between 1961 and 1966 the percentage of "doubled up" families in Toronto declined from 12.1 per cent to 8.7 per cent. This is a much higher standard than obtains in most United States cities.

The number of housing starts in Toronto last year ranked third highest on the North American continent. In terms of starts per 1,000 population, Toronto had a ratio of nearly 15 per 1,000 last year. For the ten largest cities in the United States the average ratio was below five per 1,000. The highest, Washington, was 10 per 1,000.

In answer to the question with regard to the other development funds the first is:

The international development agency, to which the hon. member referred in his question, is an agency of the world bank and makes long term investments in under-developed countries by financing the construction of water supply systems, roads and other such services that are basic to economic developments.

Under, or partially developed countries, in the opinion of the IDA, would be those where the per capita income is in the range of $300 per annum. I am sure the hon. member for Grey-Bruce would agree with me that Ontario would hardly qualify for such assistance.

The American federation of labour and the congress of industrial organizations merged in the 1950s to form the AFL-CIO. This body, which performs a co-ordination function for its affiliated unions, has, as its counterpart in Canada, the Canadian congress of labour and more specifically in Ontario, the Ontario federation of labour.

The Canadian labour congress together with the co-operative union of Canada and

the Canadian union of students founded on March 27 of this year, the co-operative housing foundation. One of the stated objectives of that foundation is to encourage and promote all forms of co-operative housing and to stimulate organizations and groups to develop co-operative housing projects. The Ontario housing corporation is working very closely with this organization and will certainly do everything possible to assist the Canadian labour congress in directing its energies and funds into this area.

In answer to the second question, No. 637, Mr. Speaker: I am advised by CMHC that at no time has a statement been issued that the lowest level of income eligible for a National Housing Act mortgage is more than $8,000. In order to make a meaningful statement concerning minimum income levels for NHA mortgages, one would have to know the amount of the mortgage, the prevailing interest rate, the term of the mortgage, the amount of municipal taxes and whether the level of income refers to the head of the household or to the family.

DBS statistics for February, 1968, show that the average weekly wages and salaries for the industrial composite was $109.78. This represents an income per year of $5,709. Not included in this average income are professional persons, self-employed persons and similar classes in a higher income bracket. In four major urban areas in Ontario, average wages are: Toronto, $5,750; Windsor, $6,193; Hamilton, $5,906; and Ottawa $5,195.

In answer to question No. 647 from the hon. member for Oshawa: Coulter Manufacturing Company Limited announced on May 30, 1968, that they will be phasing out their operations in only one of their two Oshawa plants over the next several months. This was recorded in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* on May 31, 1968. Members of my department have already been involved in discussions with its management on this matter.

The company manufactures door locks, seat adjusters and sundry stampings associated with the automotive parts industry. For many years, Coulter Manufacturing has been a direct supplier to General Motors in Oshawa.

Reasons given for the phasing out of the plant are, that as a result of the new United States automotive safety regulations, there has been a change in design of parts made by Coulter Manufacturing. General Motors have decided to discontinue two sets of tooling for these parts, consequently this activity at an outmoded plant will be displaced.

The number of jobs affected will be 150 but it is unlikely that more than 75 persons will actually be laid off. The rest will be used at the remaining operations.

Most of the employees are skilled or semi-skilled so that persons laid off will probably have little difficulty in finding a new job, particularly since the unemployment rate in Oshawa is relatively low. Members of my department will be contacting the company with a view to finding an alternative use for the property when it becomes vacant.

In discussions with The Department of Manpower and Immigration, as well as the Ontario government's Department of Labour, I understand that there will be little trouble in finding work for displaced employees because of the announcement on May 4, 1968, that Honeywell Controls Limited will establish a new plant in the area as a result of a decision by the Ontario development corporation to grant the firm a $219,000 forgivable loan.

Employment needed by Honeywell will be initially 80 persons which is expected to rise to 175 within 5 years.

Mr. Speaker: Has the Provincial Secretary the answers now to the questions reserved a moment ago?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, there is just one further piece of information which is on its way. I might just answer a question which was raised by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce in the House on Friday.

I will repeat the question: A Toronto hotel owner states this morning that a province-wide beer strike could force many hotels out of business if it continues two weeks. What intervention of the government is planned to meet with Brewers Warehousing Companies Limited?

In answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of information which I have received from the liquor control board of Ontario with particular reference to an anticipated decision which is to be handed down by the arbitration board in that matter, the government does not plan any steps at the moment insofar as this situation is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I might make some reference now to the questions directed to me by the hon. leader of the Opposition and the member for York South.

In view of the publicity being given to the matters raised in these questions, and particularly the inference to be drawn from some of the press reports, and I am now quoting:

> It appears to them to be an easy matter for anyone to obtain birth certificates fraudulently.

As the Registrar General of the province, I feel that the matter is of such importance that the members of this Legislature are entitled to a full explanation of the procedures followed by the office of the Registrar General in the issuance of birth certificates. An applicant for a birth certificate must apply in writing either by letter or by the completion by a departmental form designed for that purpose, setting out his full name, place of birth, date of birth, full name of father, and full maiden name of mother.

The applicant must sign the application and indicate his address. If the application does not contain sufficient information or is made by a person other than the person who is requesting the birth certificate, additional information is asked for, or the written authorization of the person is required.

It is interesting to note at this stage, Mr. Speaker, that we have some 1,200 applications for birth certificates on a daily average, received by mail, and some 200 to 300 applications are received and made in person by those who attend at the public counter of the Registrar General at the office at 70 Lombard Street. These applications, whether they are received by mail or filled out at the public counter of the office of the registrar, are processed within three days and mailed to the applicant at the address furnished by him.

This is just the general procedure which gives you some of the background for the particular questions we have. If I might turn now to the questions of the hon. leader of the Opposition, it is perhaps unfortunately worded in that he is asking me how false birth certificates are issued. We do not issue false birth certificates, and I would like to make that point quite clear. What use may be made of a birth certificate after we issue it is another matter, about which I should like to make some reference shortly. In other words, any birth certificate—

Mr. Nixon: My meaning is quite clear.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It says quite clearly: How did he procure a false birth certificate?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It was false as far as he was concerned.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That is a different matter. The birth certificate was not false.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think that is very important to get this straight. We do not issue false birth certificates. A birth certificate is simply the registration of an event.

Mr. Nixon: How did it get it into his hands?

Hon. Mr. Welch: My answer to the hon. leader of the Opposition with respect to this certificate is that the department records show that a letter purporting to be signed by Paul Edward Bridgman, and dated April 10, 1968, was received in the office of the Registrar General on April 11, 1968. A money order for $2 was enclosed with a request for a birth certificate in the name of Paul Edward Bridgman, and the address given was 102 Ossington Avenue, Toronto.

The letter contained the full name of the applicant, the date of birth, the place of birth, the full name of the father, and the maiden name of the mother. The letter mailed from the department of the Registrar General to Paul Edward Bridgman, 102 Ossington Avenue, was returned to the office of the Registrar General, the sender marked unknown.

A letter dated April 16, 1968, purporting to be signed by Ramon George Sneyd, was received in the office of the Registrar General on April 18. There was enclosed in the letter $2 with a request to send a birth certificate for Ramon George Sneyd, at 962 Dundas Street West, Toronto. The letter contained information and repeated all the required information, and such a certificate was sent out to Ramon George Sneyd at 962 Dundas Street West, Toronto, and as of the giving of this answer has not been returned.

Referring to the second part of his question and the first part of the question of the hon. member for York South, I have asked my Deputy Registrar General to review all these procedures once again to satisfy me as to the adequacy of the precautions to be taken, such precautions to be consistent with the service which we must continue to give to the public requesting this type of information in the legitimate way they do.

To turn to the second part of the question of the hon. member for York South, he wants to know my reaction to this business of using birth certificates in bars and taverns, and my reaction is one of great shock. The

Deputy Registrar General refers me to the statement which is attributed to him in this morning's *Globe and Mail*—and I am now quoting:

> The kids are doing this all the time: persons under 21 frequently obtain false birth certificates, indicating ages over 21 so they could get into bars and taverns.

The Deputy Registrar General assures me that this does not in any way refer to a person obtaining a birth certificate of another person under false pretenses. According to information which he has personal to him, it refers to a situation in which a minor apparently either borrows or rents the birth certificate of a friend who is over 21 years of age to use it for this particular purpose. And I hasten to underline the fact once again that a birth certificate is the record of an event, it is not proof of the identification of a person.

I would assume if birth certificates are being used for this purpose in this type of establishment, it is incumbent upon those who have the responsibility of satisfying themselves with respect to the age of the person using the certificate that the person and the certificate belong to the same person, if you get what I mean. After all, there should be some responsibility in view of the fact that this is not obvious by this certificate itself. I trust that I have now answered all parts of these two questions.

Mr. Singer: That is your responsibility, too.

Mr. MacDonald: How would you suggest they do it?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Hon. members opposite would probably put a photograph on the birth certificate.

Mr. Speaker: May I remind the members of the meeting again on Wednesday noon at 12:30 with members to discuss matters of procedure and tradition in the House. I understand that these are proving very fruitful.

May I also, for the information of the members, advise them that at noon today the member for York South, in his capacity as member and leader of the New Democratic Party, and the Clerk of the House met in my office on the matter which was raised on Friday. It has been adjusted by the publication of an amended notice of motion which will be in the order paper tomorrow. I thought the members would like to know that there is therefore no necessity for a ruling by Mr. Speaker in this regard.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, do you expect to call that motion on Wednesday of this week?

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker has no control over when motions are called—that is the prerogative of the government and the House leader. So, as far as Mr. Speaker is concerned, it will be in the order paper and can be called on any day from Wednesday on.

Mr. MacDonald: I might say, Mr. Speaker, the House leader assured me on Friday that Wednesday would be suitable—though I recognize that circumstances may require a change. As I understand at the moment, Wednesday is a suitable day. And if there is any change in that, I would appreciate knowing—as well as many others.

Mr. Speaker: In any event, it is my understanding that these matters are arranged in advance by the party Whips so there is no question of one party not being ready to proceed. I presume the leader of the New Democratic Party and his Whip will ensure that this is cleared.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 8th order, committee of the whole House; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

REDUCTION OF MUNICIPAL TAXES ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY

(*Concluded*)

House in committee on Bill 91, An Act to provide for the reduction of municipal taxes on residential property.

Mr. Chairman: On section 9:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): No, section 8; section 8 has not passed.

Mr. Chairman: Neither has section 7 according to the Chairman.

Mr. Singer: Oh all right. It certainly is not section 9.

Mr. Chairman: We have passed section 6. I believe the member for Humber was dealing with section 7.

On section 7:

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): That is correct, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I started to discuss

section 7 last week before the House leader adjourned the discussion for the purpose of having a debate in the private members' hour. I was saying at that time that I was very much disturbed by this section because it makes criminals out of people who have no intention of finding themselves in that position and who are acting in complete good faith.

I pointed out that a person could have a legitimate state of mind feeling that he did not owe a tenant any money. Or perhaps he did not owe to the tenant as much as the tenant was claiming, and he would be resisting either the payment of the total amount or part of the amount in complete good faith. He would be hauled up before the magistrate and, since the magistrate can only make an order awarding a sum to the tenant if he had in the first instance found the landlord guilty, the landlord would have to be found guilty and obtain a criminal record.

Now I do not know whether the hon. Minister ever intended this or not, but I think the hon. Minister last week expressed in his own mind that he did not think this was just. Surely, Mr.—

Mr. Chairman: Please. There is a considerable amount of interference and conversation taking place in the House. It is difficult for the member for Humber to speak.

Mr. Ben: Surely, Mr. Chairman, it would perhaps be fairer to have this matter go to a division court judge who would be empowered to adjudicate the matter between the tenant and the landlord. If he finds the landlord is liable to the tenant he could make an order, that the amount that he finds due should be paid. In addition, if he does find that there is an amount owing, and that the landlord will, without just cause, try to avoid paying this amount to the tenant, then he could impose a fine.

In other words it would be the reverse of what section 7 provides for at the present time.

Another solution would be to have a rental court, as at one time they did have. But first of all, I think it should be the job of the court to determine whether or not an amount was owing. A fine should only be imposed if the landlord wilfully refused to pay over the money.

I may appear to be digressing for a moment here, Mr. Chairman, but I am not. When I was on council there was a great deal of controversy about obtaining a permanent voters' list, and it was felt that only those people who were on an electoral list—the assessment rolls—should be entitled to vote and it should be their responsibility to ascertain that the assessment rolls are, in fact, up to date.

Perhaps the Minister would have a lot of the worry taken away from him if he did enact some legislation which would compel either a landlord or a tenant, or both, to immediately notify the assessment commissioner in any municipality of a change of ownership or tenancy. That way the assessment rolls would always be up to date. Since the Minister has stated that only those who are on assessment rolls as occupying a residence, will be entitled to a rebate, he would have an up-to-date assessment roll that would obviate the necessity of having enumerators go out at election time. This section would not be as required, as the Minister seems to feel, because then the municipality would relieve the landlord from making any rebates whatsoever. They would simply send out a cheque to the person on the assessment roll, and since the assessment rolls were always up to date, they could even pro-rate it. If a landlord has two or three or more tenants during that one year, who would have qualified for part of the rebate, the assessment department as a municipality could send these cheques to the tenant, and you would not have to have this section 7 in here at all.

Mr. Chairman, I am not moving any kind of amendment. I think this particular kind of section is iniquitous and that the Minister himself spotted the iniquity as I was speaking last Friday. I feel that the Minister must have some alternate solution. Surely, having expressed himself, he is not going to permit this section to stand. He will have to come up with some alternate solution, and I am going to wait to see what his answer will be.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I did not say that it was iniquitous. All I suggested on Friday was that you and the hon. member for Downsview should get together and sort this out.

Section 7 agreed to.

On section 8:

Mr. Singer: On section 8, Mr. Chairman, I do not understand this at all. This is an effort I suppose, to try to give tenants in public housing some sort of refund. In my riding I have the Lawrence Heights development, which is probably the largest public housing development in Canada. I know a

bit about the rent structure, and I am glad to see the Minister of Trade and Development, because he has some knowledge of the rent structure also. In fact, I handed to him the other day a brief complaining about that structure, and I have talked about it with him and his officials on many occasions.

To bring the Minister of Municipal Affairs up to date, the rent structure in this development and, I suppose, most developments of this kind in the province of Ontario are very complex.

Presently the scale calls for rents ranging from 30 per cent of gross income down to practically no per cent of gross income.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, because my friend says that be does not understand the section, perhaps it would be helpful if I gave an explanation of what the section means, and then he could carry on from there.

Mr. Singer: I was using the phrase, "I did not understand" with some poetic licence, Mr. Chairman, because I am going to pick out the odd phrase from it and ask the Minister if I am correct in my assumption, if it means what it says; if it is supposed to be interpreted the way that it is written; or whether he has some secret method of interpretation which does not appear in the written words that appear in section 8 of the statute, that was why I was laying the groundwork for this.

As I say, the rent structure within these developments is very complicated and they relate to the ability of the people who have the benefit of this kind of structure to pay the rent required. They tie in very closely, in some cases too closely, with the gross income of the people who live in this kind of accommodation. It can range, as I say, in the top limit of 30 per cent of gross income down to no per cent of gross income and, in some cases, there is no rent payable at all. As I try to understand what is written here, apparently the credit is going to be given for an amount that is not less than a sum determined in accordance with the regulations under this Act.

We have no regulations under this Act having regard to similar privately owned residential property in the area, is there then a project afoot to evaluate what is the economic rent of all these units in Lawrence Heights and so on? In Lawrence Heights you have some 2,200 separate units; is there now a system afoot to determine the economic rent of each of these units?

If this is the case, you have set yourself a very complicated task. Whether it is you or the Minister of Trade and Development who has set yourselves this task, I do not know. But the way that the bookkeeping is done now by the Ontario housing corporation, they have no idea like this in mind.

What they have is a complicated set of books, a certain amount of subsidy, and certain gradation along the rest of the way. If you are then to determine who is going to get benefits by setting an economic rent—if that is the phrase—on each of these units, you are going to embark on an exercise that has not hitherto been embarked upon and it is going to be very complex.

Maybe it would be a worthwhile exercise, provided the time is taken to do it properly so that when information is available, we will be able to attack in a more meaningful way the present schedule of rents charged by the Ontario housing corporation.

Now let me quickly add that the rents charged by the Ontario housing corporation —the Minister of Trade and Development is going to tell me this any minute—are a schedule that has been recommended by his corporation and approved by the Cabinet in Ottawa; and I know that. I am just saying that it is not properly done, no matter who approves of it or who drafts it. I do not think it is properly worked out.

Who is going get the benefit? This is my substantial question—who is going to get the benefit? The people who live in there are most concerned that their scale of rent is far too high. One would have thought that when the government was going to embark on this kind of a plan, as imperfect as it is, and goodness knows it is imperfect, that some of the first people likely to benefit would be those people who would be living in publicly subsidized housing.

Those are the people who should get the first benefit, far ahead of people who are living in single family homes which they own themselves, certainly far ahead of people who are able to pay substantial taxes. One would have thought that the government would have been looking for a method to assist people who have to live, through no choice of their own, in publicly assisted housing projects.

This is not going to happen here and section 8 does not provide that it is going to happen. Who is going to benefit in Lawrence Heights? Those people who are perhaps above the acceptable salary schedule,

who have stayed in that development long enough and who will not be evicted by the Ontario housing corporation—notwithstanding the fact that their income has increased—because they have no place to go, so their rent has gone up. Those are the only people who are going to benefit.

But the people on the lower end of the scale, the people who really need help, the people who are being charged on the 30 per cent of gross income and less; the people who are being charged because the wife has gone out to work for a few extra hours to bring a little more money into the house; the people whose rents have been raised because their teenage children have gone out to work and every time a teenage child goes out to work, there is an extra increase to the gross income of $75 a month. Those are the people who are not going to be helped, Mr. Chairman.

Now it would seem to me that somewhere along the line this government should have recognized that, when they were going to embark on this kind of a scheme, they should have directed a substantial amount of care and attention to those people who live in publicly assisted housing. The way this sections reads, I do not see how it is going to work to the advantage of the people who need help more than any other group in our community. I think if you are going to give benefits you have to give benefits across the board, and you have to give benefits to the people who live in this publicly assisted housing.

All right, we came down to the phrase: "Shall determine the rent of similar privately owned residential property in the area". I say that is going to be a very difficult job. I do not know how you compare apples to oranges. I do not know how you can compare what an economic rent would be if these buildings were privately owned, because in fact they are not privately owned. Maybe that task can be done and some sense can be brought to these words: "The agency shall determine the amount of reduction that would have been made to the municipality under section 2 if the residential property had been assessed and taxed in the usual way"—which is not being done—"and shall allow such amount in reduction in accordance with section 4, may apply to the department for reimbursement". Then "the person who pays the taxes shall apply to the department for such reduction, the Treasurer of Ontario shall pay to such agency the total of such amounts".

Now there is my final concern, Mr. Chairman, because in this case—I wish I had the Minister with me—in this case it is going to be the Ontario housing corporation who is going to apply to the department, to the Provincial Treasurer, for the refund, and the Ontario housing corporation is going to give the money back.

So there is no indication in this section at all that even the people on the top level are going to get any reduction in their rental. Now we worry under section 4 about how tenants are going to benefit, and we found that it is going to be a very difficult thing to work out. Here, under section 8, tenants in publicly owned housing, are not going to benefit in accordance with what is written here.

The refunds that are going to come back are going to come back to the agency. In the case of Lawrence Heights, the agency is the Ontario housing corporation. This does not make sense, it just does not make sense. What are you doing? You are taking it out of one pocket and putting it in the other. Or is there any real desire in the mind of government to help the people who live in publicly owned housing in the province of Ontario?

If you are going to help them, there is certainly nothing that I can read in section 8 that indicates that they are going to be helped in any way at all.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well I admit, Mr. Chairman, that it is a very long section under 8. But I think if my friend, the poet, would underline these words he would read it the way it possibly should be read: "The agency shall determine the amount of reduction and shall allow such amount as a reduction in the rent."

Mr. Singer: Where is that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The middle line is: "The agency shall determine the amount of the reduction and shall allow—"

Mr. Singer: Oh yes, you are right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —"shall allow such amount as a reduction in the rent." But I admit it is a very long and involved sentence.

Mr. Singer: Well, if that is the case—if that is in fact the case—how do you allow reductions on those rents based on 30 per cent, 20 per cent, 10 per cent, 5 per cent of gross income? Is the benefit going to be spread all the way through?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Singer: How then do you justify it? Surely if there is going to be a benefit, then every group that lives in there, except the people on welfare who are paying no rent, should benefit. And this does not seem to be the case at all.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, first of all I am told—I think my friend raised a couple of questions—I am told that in any case, regardless of this Act, the Ontario housing corporation wanted to determine what the economic rent would be. So that is not being specifically done for the purposes of this Act. They would have been doing that anyway. I have forgotten the reason although it was explained to me, but they would be doing this in any case.

Secondly, I do not think it is the intention of this Act—and I think this is the philosophy behind this section—to subsidize something twice. I am not knowledgeable in this field at all. My friend from Downsview most certainly is and certainly the Minister is. Perhaps they might like to discuss it. But if there is something wrong with the present subsidy, then it seems to me that that is where it should be corrected. If, in your view, the present subsidy is not at the right level, we should not muddy the waters by bringing in another subsidy in this direction. I think that is the underlying philosophy of section 8 all the way through.

Perhaps if I read the memo it would explain exactly what is involved. This section provides:

> —that the tenant of a residential property that is owned by a public housing agency will be eligible for a tax reduction only if he pays an amount of rent that is the same as, or close to, the rent of similar privately owned residential property in the area—

The general thinking behind this section of the bill is that most tenants of a public housing agency pay a rent that is substantially below the market rent. The rent of such tenants is related to their ability to pay as measured by income and bears no relation to the cost of the market value of the property. It is not the intention of the government to allow a tax reduction on a residential property where the rent is substantially below the market rent and is related to the tenant's ability to pay. However, the bill as amended provides that these tenants of a public housing agency, whose rent is equal to, or very close to, a full market rent, shall receive the benefit of the tax reduction.

I think that is the philosophy behind it and I think what my friend has said—and I am not equipped to argue this with you, or discuss this with you really—I think the bulk of your remarks is to the effect that there are some tenants, many tenants, in public housing, who are paying too much rent. Well this bill is not designed to get at that problem—if, in fact, it is a problem.

Mr. Singer: Well, we have the Minister of Trade and Development here and I would like to get some more sense out of this than presently appears from what the Minister says. I would think in Lawrence Heights that there are very few people who are paying what eventually is going to be considered an economic rent. Out of your 2,200 odd units I do not think you are going to have more than a handful who are paying a so-called economic rent. The end result of this is going to be that the Treasurer is going to take money out of one pocket and give it to the Ontario housing corporation in the other pocket. Per unit, the Ontario housing corporation will have more money. But the people—and they will not pay it out—they will pay it back—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Singer: No?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No—unless the money is going to be passed on to the tenant. The agency shall determine the amount of reduction and shall allow such amount as a reduction in the rent. If they do not do that, there will be no application to my department—to the Treasurer—and the money will not flow.

Mr. Singer: All right. I will accept that. Supposing you do not have the complementing bookkeeping entries. Still to go back to the philosophy of it—if the government's philosophy is to help people who need help, is there a group in this province who need more help than those people who live in publicly subsidized housing? There is not.

Despite this $150 million that you are now throwing into the kitty designed to protect or to help people who are homeowners and/or tenants, you have all of those tenants who live in publicly assisted housing who are not going to get any help. You just have a tiny little handful which is going to be able to get any help and I think this is wrong.

Come back to my Lawrence Heights development and I would be surprised if the Minister can show me more than a tiny handful which is paying the so-called economic rent.

But they are paying rents that they feel are onerous—far too onerous. They are being assessed extra rental if the wife goes out to work. They are being assessed extra rental if the teenage children go out to work. They are struggling to keep their heads above water.

They are locked into these developments because their rent takes every available extra penny of their disposable income. They can never get out. The rents are geared so high that they can never amass sufficient savings so that they can build up a down payment to buy a house.

So, this is what you are doing. You come along with $150 million expenditure, Mr. Chairman, and here is an opportunity to really assist people who need help. The Minister shakes his head. Well, the principal philosophy is not to help these people; it is another department that is supposed to help them.

Mr. Chairman, here is an opportunity and you are missing it. You have muffed the play badly. Here you have a real opportunity to help people who need help and you are not going to help people because for as much assistance as section 8 is going to be to anyone in Lawrence Heights or in Flemingdon Park, when and if it gets underway. This statute is hardly worth the paper it is written on.

I am surprised, Mr. Chairman, that someone in the front benches of the government would not have recognized that here was an opportunity to do something that would be helpful to people who, more than any other group in the Ontario community, need help. You are not giving them any here. It is a grave disappointment that this section is worded the way it is.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would simply say, Mr. Chairman, I think my friend has indicated that he does not approve of the present scheme of rentals in Ontario housing units, and that the subsidy is not great enough. Now surely if that is his problem, or if that is anybody's problem, that is where the burden of your remarks should be directed. I cannot imagine anything which will be more confusing in terms of government subsidies than if we start piling subsidy on subsidy.

My friend says, one way or another, that this bill does not subsidize people who are already subsidized. I admit that completely. I think that is the intent of the section. We do not pass on a subsidy to people who are already subsidized. What you have said is that those people who are on subsidies may not be receiving enough subsidy. Fine, then let us attack that subsidy. Let us deal with that problem but do not muddy the waters by coming at it this way too.

Mr. Singer: If we do not want to muddy the waters here, when are we going to get a consolidated government programme that is designed to attack harm and hurt where it exists, and stop playing ping pong and bouncing the problem from Minister to Minister? "It is not my fault", says the Minister of Municipal Affairs. "It is the fault of Trade and Development". And it is not going to be his fault, it is the fault of somebody else.

This is what bothers us about this government. You cannot accept responsibility when a problem hits you in the face. You keep on shoving it away. Somebody else is responsible—let somebody else look after it. It is no good—it is no good at all. You are not helping the people who need help more desperately than any other group in the community. That is why this Act is such a dismal failure.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I want to tie two points together that have emerged in this debate. The Minister just said that he cannot think of anything more confusing than contemplating adding subsidy to subsidy. For once I have some sympathy for him. I cannot think of anything more confusing than this bill from start to finish. If there ever was an administrative and a legislative monstrosity, this one is in a class by itself, and no government—Socialist, Tory or any other—could trim this one.

It is just beyond description and I am convinced that what I am saying is what you really believe—as I interpret the smile on the Minister of Mines' face, I suspect that he understands it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): I am not smiling with you; I am smiling at you.

Mr. MacDonald: The only reason why I cannot build up very much sympathy, is that while you are doing a lot of studying on the Smith report and all its recommendations before you implement them this is one you seized quickly and threw it out for election purposes. Now you are stuck with it and oh, what problems you are having to implement it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, we went through all this on second reading.

Mr. MacDonald: I know it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It really gripes them over there that we kept an election promise.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh no!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Now, let us get off the second reading and get on with section 8.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh no. Let me deal with the two points now in the context of the comments I have made.

On the one hand, the Minister uses an excuse that it would really be beyond description to contemplate giving a second subsidy to what is, in the overwhelming majority of cases, the group of people who are most economically deprived in this province—people who are having a tough time to get on.

He is revolted at the thought that a second subsidy should be given. Then, Mr. Chairman, we talked earlier about the proposition of the inequity of a government that is trying to help our citizens and yet will not grasp the nettle of sorting out foreign ownership of cottages which are not even basic shelters.

There are only a few months of the year that they are being used. The Minister threw out a figure, and many of these are just educated guesses, that he thought 10 per cent of the cottages might well be foreign owned.

Now I suggest to the Minister that instead of being appealed at the idea of piling subsidy on subsidy to a group that is an economically deprived one, and therefore is entitled to get another subsidy, he should sort it out and sort out those foreign owners of cottages who are only up here for five or six months of the year.

This would only be one more little problem in administering this bill and the money that you are going to give to Americans to subsidize their summer cottages, in many instances, so that they pay no tax at all, give it to these people. That is a defensible proposition. So do not be appalled by another complexity because you have many to live with in this bill.

Sections 8 and 9 agreed to.

On section 10:

Mr. Chairman: I believe the Minister has an amendment to section 10. This was the date of its coming into effect.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, referring to section 4.

Mr. Chairman: This amendment was handed to me: That clause 10 of Bill 91 be amended as follows: "The Act with the exception of clause 4 comes into force the day"—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, well that was the amendment moved by my friend, or suggested by my friend from Sudbury East (Mr. Martel), and I think we added the words in section 4, subsection 3, "either before or after the passage of the bill" and I think that handled that amendment.

Mr. Chairman: That eliminates this amendment.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, let me speak to section 10 just for a moment. I had a copy of that proposed amendment too. I indicated to the member for Sudbury East that if he had moved it, we would have supported it. We have a very difficult task in this bill in trying to express, as loudly, as firmly and as sincerely as we feel it, our contempt with the way in which this government has presented this bill and the mishmash that it has created.

Our support of this amendment would have been only for the purpose of expressing that contempt. The sum of $150 million being given back to the taxpayers as inexpertly and unfairly as it is being done, at least is a small step forward. And, as I think I said in the beginning, no one really votes in favour of shooting Santa Claus.

But this bill is an abortion, Mr. Chairman. This bill is a disgrace. It helps some people; it does not help all of the people of the province equitably. With those remarks, I say had this amendment been introduced, we would have supported it to express our sincere feelings about the way this bill has been brought in.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I really cannot understand, Mr. Chairman, after those remarks, why the hon. member does not vote against reporting the bill. He is so worked up about it.

Mr. Singer: I explained that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not very well.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Sections 10 and 11 agreed to.

Bill 91, as amended, reported.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report one bill with certain amendments and ask for leave to sit again.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one bill with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 19th order; House in committee of supply, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Chairman, in the estimates of The Department of University Affairs, it provides for the fifth year of operation of this particular department. Since traditionally decades and half decades seem to be regarded as reasonable periods at which to review events and accomplishments, I should like to take this occasion to examine, relatively briefly, what this five-year period has meant to higher education in Ontario.

This is not intended as, nor will it be, an exercise in trumpeting the achievements which have marked the period since the department was founded in 1964. I hope, however, that such a review will bring an appropriate degree of perspective, not only to this debate, but to the general understanding of what is taking place in regard to university development in our province.

The events of the past several years reveal, I believe, the considerable interest and common desire of all who are concerned with higher education for the best university system that can be developed. As a result there may be a tendency, at times, to concentrate our attention and efforts on those imperfections and problems that seem almost inherent in a field as complex as university education.

This, to my mind, should be regarded as a positive phenomenon, from constructive criticism and advice, improvement will inevitably come. It may be, however, that at the same time it can lead us to overlook some of the very significant achievements that are the result of joint concern and effort. For these are years without precedent in our history, and with few parallels certainly in this country, and, indeed, in any jurisdiction anywhere.

To give you some idea of what I mean, let me outline for you certain basic facts and figures, in which I am sure you will be interested. I shall use 1964-65, the first year of the department's operations as a base, and relate the figures of that period to the expectations for which this budget provides.

Just to give a few figures, Mr. Chairman: in 1964-65, the total enrolment was in the neighbourhood of 44,852. For 1968-69—and these are estimates, of course—82,022. Post grade 13 undergraduate students, 1964-65, 37,085; estimated for 1968-69, 68,441. First year students, 1964-65, 13,552; estimated for 1968-69, 24,652. Graduate students—a very interesting increase—5,421 to 9,768. And percentage of age group, taking the 18 to 21 age factor, in 1964-65, no matter how one might debate statistics, I think the percentages will end up roughly the same, 11.8 per cent; and the estimated for 1968-69, 16.9 per cent.

I have figures here that will be included in this presentation relating to the individual institutions (see appendix). But I shall move on to the total amounts for university operating grants in 1964-65, $42,376,000 and the estimated this year $201,949,102. The capital support, $45,600,000 in 1964-65 and this coming fiscal year, $125 million. The student awards from $4,955,069 to $32,086,000, and the number of students assisted from 8,654 to 50,000. And the teaching staff from 3,247 to 6,718.

Consistent with the growth which these statistics reveal there has been, as might be expected, significant physical expansion on the 17 separate campuses of our 14 provincially assisted universities. Since July 1, 1964, over 200 building projects have been approved for provincial support and the results are clearly visible to anyone who would care to visit any one of our institutions of higher learning.

Given our geographical proximity to the University of Toronto, I need only remind members of this House that, as they glance westward when they approach these Parliament buildings each day, they see a changing skyline, now dominated by one of the largest medical science buildings ever constructed. It is an excellent example, Mr. Chairman, of what I am attempting to describe.

Since the events of the last half decade have taken place in such abundance, perhaps it would be worth reminding you, as another case in point, that in June of 1964, that a relatively short time ago, neither Brock nor Trent Universities, Scarborough or Erindale Colleges, nor the York campus of York University had yet been opened and that both Guelph and Lakehead had only recently received full university status.

More important, however, than the physical make-up of any institution, are the faculty and students who occupy such premises and the programmes that are offered within them. While the physical expansion has been undertaken to deal with the increasing number of students, we have, at the same time, allowed for not only the necessary growth of well established programmes and courses but for significant additional developments as well. As a result the range of offerings now available is most comprehensive.

These initial comments on recent achievements have been of a relatively concrete variety, several of them quantitative in nature. But we are aware that all significant aspects of higher education cannot be measured in such terms. That is why, during the period in question much attention has also been given to many other important factors including the relationship between government and our universities.

The appropriate role I believe of government in higher education is an issue that has concerned legislators and members of the university community throughout the western world. It is an area in which, in my opinion, Ontario's record stands second to none. Members will be well aware that as early as 1959 the government took steps to establish an impartial body that would assure our universities that their interests would be considered in an objective and sympathetic fashion and that academic freedom and university autonomy would be effectively safeguarded. Like any vital organization, the advisory body then established has evolved in a manner consistent with changing needs and, since 1964, has undergone a number of further significant changes. Most important among these has been the addition of academic members to the committee on university affairs. This arrangement has now reached the point where a majority of committee members are or have been active members of the academic community. Equally significant was the appointment, in 1967, of Dr. Douglas T. Wright, former dean of engineering at the University of Waterloo, as the first full-time chairman of this important organization.

Chief among the committee's goals has been the establishment of an effective working relationship with the committee of presidents of universities of Ontario, the body which may be regarded as the legitimate collective spokesman for our provincially assisted institutions. The fruits of that relationship are to be seen through reference to a number of the more noteworthy accomplishments of this last half decade.

In this regard I need only point to the development of the formula to guide the distribution of operating grants to our universities and colleges as a primary example. In addition there was the jointly sponsored study of graduate work in Ontario which, despite initial reports to the contrary, has had and will continue to have considerable influence upon this important area of our university system. Even more recent are the steps taken to develop regional computer centres which, it is believed, will offer to our institutions of higher learning the ultimate in computer service. As well, a jointly sponsored space utilization and inventory study is now underway which, hopefully, will lead to a similar approach for provincial capital allocations to universities with some of the same features as the formula for operating grants.

Dramatic increases in enrolment, unprecedented levels of support and effective co-ordination of effort are all very tangible examples of what has been accomplished during the last four or five years. Yet they do not tell the whole story. For they are only steps on the road to ensuring our primary goal—that there will be equality of educational opportunity in this province at all levels. And paralleled with this quest is our effort to ensure that the educational programmes are of the highest quality.

No one would claim that perfection has been attained in either of these areas. Neither need we apologize for the record that has been established. It can be this province's proud boast that despite the unparalleled increases in demand for university places, no qualified student has failed to find a place during this decade in one of the provincially assisted institutions.

At the same time, despite the obvious difficulties caused by rapid growth, despite the very real challenge of finding qualified staff in the face of worldwide competition and, indeed, despite the very sharp debate which continues as to the appropriate forms that the university education should take, there is wide agreement that the quality of our university programmes is high. One needs only to travel to other parts of this country, to various parts of the United States, and across the ocean to Britain and the continent to begin to appreciate the fine reputation which our universities and their graduates enjoy. The results of our determination, therefore, are clearly evident and

we can hopefully look to continued improvement in the years to come.

I said in the beginning of my remarks that this review of University Affairs in Ontario, during the period in which the department has existed, would be relatively brief. This is not because there is any lack of material to which to turn. But, for this occasion, these comments will suffice. For those whose appetites have been whetted, however, I commend to your reading the first report of the Minister of University Affairs which will be made available to you in the very near future.

Now I press on, for I realize full well that in this day and age there is very little mileage, in any sense, in dwelling too long in the past. For no matter how notable our accomplishments of prior years may be, it is to the future that we must now look. It is to the future that we must give our attention and our energies.

What does the future hold in this particular area? If I were to employ the language of the Hollywood press agent, then I might be content to tell you that it offers drama, excitement and a good deal of suspense. Yet I proceed on the assumption that the members of this House are interested in something of a more specific nature. And so, to the best of my ability, I shall attempt in the next few minutes to project the course of higher education in the remaining years of this decade and the early years of the next.

First, the most obvious characteristic of our provincially assisted university system will be continued expansion. The 73,805 students of this year will increase to 82,000 next September, and consistent with our well established pattern, places will be available for all who are qualified within our existing institutions. In keeping with the department's earlier estimates, we continue to anticipate an enrolment of over 100,000 by 1970-71 and further growth of approximately 10,000 students each year, through at least the first five years of the next decade.

Such growth should allow the Minister of University Affairs of 1975 to talk of a university enrolment double that which is now found in this province. By that time, the relative number of young people in the 18-21 age group attending university should be approaching 25 per cent and, I would expect, their counterparts in our colleges of applied arts and technology may be pushing toward a similar level. For those who have felt that we have lagged too far behind our neighbours to the south in terms of opportunities in education at the higher levels, these should be encouraging statistics.

Increasing enrolment may be the most inevitable part of our development but it brings with it a demand for additional programmes which in turn require new staff and facilities, both of which we must make every effort to provide. I have said on numerous occasions in this House that, while we must always seek and encourage highly qualified persons from other jurisdictions to undertake teaching careers in our universities, we cannot rely upon meeting our requirements for teaching personnel in this particular way.

We have the responsibility to provide for ourselves and this we are succeeding in doing. In looking to our past achievements I did not refer to the Ontario graduate fellowship programme, but the record here speaks for itself. It is one of our most successful ventures. It is no coincidence that the inauguration of this form of graduate assistance and the upsurge and growth of our graduate schools have run parallel courses. Given this well established foundation we can expect that this growth in the graduate area will continue at a pace probably in excess of that of the undergraduate level.

Obviously, all candidates who receive masters' degrees or Ph.Ds will not enter the teaching profession. Nor will all who undertake graduate work remain in our own province. It would be naive if we were to think otherwise, and selfish if we were to expect it. It is clear, however, that when the many we shall retain are combined with the persons we shall continue to attract from elsewhere, the strength of our university teaching staff will be assured.

In the latter regard, I must say that Ontario is proving exceedingly attractive—the real province of opportunity—to people from other jurisdictions. One need only look at the lists of recent staff appointments, as I have had an opportunity to do, to see how clearly evident this fact is. I think it speaks well for our institutions and for the province which supports them.

From time to time, I have heard it suggested that 14 universities is really too many for a province of seven million people and a university enrolment of 80,000 students. As a result, say the advocates of fewer institutions, we not only have institutions that do not operate as effectively or economically as they might, but even within some of the larger institutions there are faculties that reflect the same characteristics. I am willing to concede that this indeed may be the case at present. But who would deny that each of our universities will have more than an

ample role to fulfill in the years that lie immediately ahead?

And I would interject here—while one cannot say for sure that there is any single cause and, of course, there is no single cause for certain student unrest in some other jurisdictions, there is no question that the lack of facilities in one or two jurisdictions were a part of the great difficulties they have experienced.

Given the time and careful planning that it takes to become established, would anyone suggest that we began a moment too soon to have our new universities established? From each of our universities I believe we can expect increasing efficiency in its operation. In this regard, there were what I consider important and meaningful words in the 1967 annual report of the Ford foundation—an organization which recently directed a substantial grant to the University of Toronto which has developed one of the most advanced studies on effective planning in North America.

The report, in part, reads as follows, and I think really is fairly relevant:

> Our current belief is that the next promising area may be in the field of support for those who are working to install new and better methods of management all along the line, both in raising money and in spending it. The subject is a sensitive one, and we have no desire to add our voice to those which are raised at intervals in protest against the "unbusinesslike" methods of the academic world.
>
> Colleges and universities are not businesses, and great damage can be done by a crude effort to apply the folkways of one to the problems of the other. On the other hand, effective management is just as important for the academic institution as for any other large and costly enterprise, and the best men—there are too few—and the best evidence—there is too little—combine to tell us that there is room for great improvement.

During the last four or more years, we have asked each of our institutions to plan its own capital development and to submit, for purposes of provincial support, its needs on a project by project basis. In each case, the institution has justified its requests by indicating, not only the way in which the new facilities would be used, but the increased capacity for enrolment that would be derived.

All such submissions have been carefully reviewed by the department's architectural services branch. Given the fact that our future needs were, and are, so great it has been obvious that every facility would be fully utilized within a relatively short period of time after it had been opened.

Nevertheless, given the magnitude of what has taken place, and what is planned for the future, it seemed that now was a reasonable time to reassess the situation. Further, recognizing that universities have found it increasingly difficult to find private support to meet their share of capital obligations, we must seriously consider the possibility that 100 per cent of the basis costs—and I emphasize basic costs—of required facilities will have to be met by the province.

If this is to be the case, then obviously we must have very clear standards of both space requirements and costs against which each university submission can be measured. It is towards these very goals that the committee on university affairs and the committee of presidents have undertaken jointly the space inventory and utilization study to which I referred earlier.

A private consulting firm is now co-ordinating the detailed work required in this undertaking and each of our universities is co-operating fully. It is anticipated that the results will be available sometime in late 1969, and will provide us with a much clearer indication than we have ever had about our future space needs and the standards which should apply in meeting those needs.

In the meantime, for 1968-69 each provincially assisted university has outlined its priorities of capital development and submitted these to the department. At my request, the committee on university affairs reviewed all of these submissions and related them to total provincial requirements. The recommendations which I have received, as the result of this careful review, have been reported to the various institutions and will, I know, ensure that our capital funds are effectively invested in university expansion during the new fiscal year.

It is obvious, and to some small extent frightening, to realize that if we are to continue to meet demands not only of expansion but of educational programmes that are consistent with the increasingly complex world in which we live, we must continue to make an extremely heavy investment in higher education. An effective and equitable distribution

of those funds among the various institutions will also remain essential, as well as the need for each university to be wise and prudent in the manner in which these funds are used.

The operating grants formula, of course, has been a most significant step towards ensuring equitable distribution. It is interesting to note in this regard that, just as nearly every other province has now followed Ontario's lead in establishing an advisory body on matters of grant distribution and university development, so now an increasing number of our sister provinces have either announced, or are giving serious consideration to following our example in terms of formula distribution.

I would stress for them, as well as for ourselves, that the formula which we are using currently is under constant review and we can expect, from time to time, changes in course weights and other related matters as new evidence comes forward.

Here again we should be encouraged by the degree of co-operation which exists between universities and the province. A joint subcommittee on formula financing continues to meet regularly and its counsel will be of importance in decisions reached prior to any grant announcement for 1969-70 and the years beyond.

There remain, of course, certain stiuations for which the formula is not applicable. It is in regard to these relatively few cases that the major concerns often seem to arise as to the adequacy of the grants made. This is probably not surprising since we are relating one subjective, although learned, judgment to another. Towards resolving this situation, the committee on university affairs has already undertaken certain studies.

There will be, I understand, an increasing tendency on the part of the advisory body to review, with institutions to which the formula does not apply, longer term patterns of need so that, with some fair indication of what funds can be made available, each institution can carry out its planning in a realistic way.

The increased support to our universities, both real and relative, over the initial years of this decade are without precedent. We have, for example, seen during the last five years increases in total operating grants to the provincially assisted universities of the following magnitude: for 1965-66 over 1964-65, 49.8 per cent; for 1966-67 over 1965-66, 32.6 per cent; and for 1967-68 over 1966-67, 99.2 per cent; while the grants set out in these estimates represent a further increase of 22.4 per cent over 1967-68.

The formula grant of 1967-68 allowed what was indicated to be a 15 per cent increase in the value of the basic income unit and the gain for this year is approximately 10 per cent. These latter increases, I would remind the House, represent an allowance for improvement in quality and for increased cost of living since, within the formula, adjustments are automatically made for both increased enrolment and changing mixes of programmes.

Yet, despite these significant advances, it is my opinion that our universities have every right to expect that they will be allowed to seek further quality improvement and, obviously, to meet increases in living costs. I believe, however, that it is only realistic to assume such advancement must be related to improvements in our economy. In this way the universities gain what should be regarded as their fair share of our economic improvement and wealth to which they contribute so heavily.

To give some indication of what lies ahead, by providing for the patterns of enrolment which have been projected, and allowing for a reasonable annual improvement in the basic income unit, we can expect that by the time that another five years pass, operating grants to our universities will have reached a level of $400 million.

As great as that figure may be, I hope and have every expectation that a healthy economy will allow us to sustain it. Indeed, I would remind you, as I have before, that such an investment is required if we are going to maintain a healthy economy. But the benefits of university education are not related solely to economic improvement. It contributes to human betterment and cultural development in the fullest sense. I will, therefore, be incumbent on all who are interested in the cause and welfare of higher education, to continue to explain and outline to our citizens, who must support this financial investment, that not only are these outlays of public funds necessary, but that the wisest possible use of these funds will be made.

I shall not dwell long on capital financing since I have already indicated where I believe the trends lie. We are now, and this has been made retroactive to July 1, 1964, providing 95 per cent of the approved cost of academic buildings and the related student facilities that are essential to a sound educational programme. Even if we increase that

amount to meet all basic costs, it should not be considered that this will do away with the need for private funds.

On the contrary, there will still be considerable scope for those who wish to support our institutions to do so both on the operating and the capital side. In a very real way, what we are again striving to achieve is something close to the formula approach, whereby private donors can readily see that their assistance is, in every sense, over and above what government is providing, not a replacement for it. Such additional assistance will enable the university to do many things that public support, no matter how extensive, can provide.

The area that reflects the largest relative increase in government support to higher education is that of student awards. This is a programme which is under constant examination both inside and outside the government service. Indeed, it might be said that it is a focal point of attention of our student organizations as it rightly should be. We have, as a result of constant re-examination, made significant changes from year to year in providing financial assistance directly to students, although the programme planned for 1968-69 is essentially that which has been carried out during the current year. That we have gone through this period of change should not be surprising, for we are, in a very real sense, into a completely new era, based on a quite new philosophy, of student support. What we are doing today has very little resemblance to the programmes of assistance which were prevalent only four or five years ago.

Again, we do not claim to have attained perfection, because in a period of changing circumstances, no such thing exists. But I do feel that for this particular point in time we have a very sound approach, the positive aspects of which we may have tended to take for granted while concentrating on the problems which have been found. But I am ready to invite members of this House to tell me where on this continent, a better, more equitable, programme of student awards exists.

I would go further and suggest that, when these comparisons are made in the context of the other forms of support which this province is offering, directly and indirectly, to provide educational opportunity for our young people at the post secondary level, there are not too many parallels. Whatever reasons might exist, therefore, why able young people do not proceed beyond the secondary school, I would suggest that lack of financial resources to meet the necessary costs need not be one of them for any citizen of Ontario.

Further, there are few, if any, programmes in North America, and we have looked at a number of them, that place less emphasis on the loan aspect of assistance than we do in Ontario. But I would stress that any programme of this type involves two groups of people about whom we must show equally great concern. The first group is obviously the student body whom we seek to assist. The second is the citizenry at large who finance the programme.

The changes that have been made this year have kept both groups in mind. We have attempted to ensure that the money allocated is placed in the hands of students who have financial need, not those who for any number of reasons would simply like to have such support. At the same time, because there has been speculation that some few students may have obtained assistance under false pretences, the department has undertaken discussions with the provincial auditor towards instituting new procedures so that we can continue to assure all concerned, students and citizens, that this programme is being carried out in an effective and proper fashion. With expenditures of the kind that are now involved, you should expect no less and we assure you that you shall receive no less.

I would add, however, that I do not think that any of us should content ourselves that the present patterns of student assistance are necessarily the final answer to needs of this kind. We shall continue to study the situation in Ontario as well as what is being done in other jurisdictions. In this regard, we intend to look particularly to certain new concepts such as the educational opportunity bank which was proposed by a committee of academics and other citizens under the chairmanship of Dr. J. R. Zacharias and presented to President Johnson during the last year. Whatever our approach, we must be prepared, as in other areas, to make an increasingly heavy investment in our young people, who, after all, hold in their hands the future of this jurisdiction.

Having made these observations about student awards, perhaps this provides a suitable opportunity to turn attention to more general comments about our students, present and future. Some would stress that we are dealing with a new breed of students today and must adjust to the fact. Others claim that students are really no different than those of the past.

I do not intend to become involved in this type of issue. I would simply note that whether or not they are a new breed, they seem to have taken interest in issues that, heretofore, did not seem to occupy the time and attention of young people and they are certainly using new techniques to display such interests.

Whatever the viewpoint, however, I think there is a matter of assigning credit where credit is due. And to my mind, we must give a great deal of credit to our students for creating concern and focusing new attention on the very important concept of what a university should be and the manner in which it should be organized and operated. For essentially, while we must constantly wonder, and quite frankly worry, and plan about matters such as salaries, buildings, and faculty, the basic question, surely, is whether or not the kind of education we are providing in our schools, including our institutions of higher learning, is really relevant to the needs of our times.

It is essential, therefore, that we take the time and make the effort to stand back and really look at ourselves and the kind of education that we are offering and decide whether it matches up to the needs of our society. And this, I would assert, is certainly one issue of which our students have encouraged us to take note.

I noted a year ago that if we believed in the idea of autonomy and academic freedom —and I shall have more to say about these matters later—most of the necessary discussion should take place among the members of the university community. Further, I would continue to stress that situations differ from campus to campus so that meaningful discussion can only be carried out on the basis of individual institutions. Despite the fact that some may not feel that such discourse is moving far enough or fast enough, it pleases me greatly that there are many indications that an important exchange of view and fruitful inter-action are not only underway but are extremely active. Indeed, there has probably never been a time when more people including governors, administrators, faculty and students sat down and expressed their various points of view as to what the university is all about.

In a democratic society, such exchange is a necessary predecessor to positive change and I think we should all be encouraged by these events.

The increased degree of student involvement and student activity, as it is being pursued on a wide variety of fronts, is, of course, disturbing to some. Student unrest or the movement toward student power is, without question, the subject of great public attention. Thus it would be unrealistic, indeed impossible, to conduct any debate on university affairs in the current era without giving some attention to this very important aspect of higher education.

But, in doing so, I think that there are a few basic observations that should be made:

1. What is taking place is, in every sense of the term, on a worldwide basis. From both sides of the iron curtain, from Asia and Africa, from Europe and South America and from our own continent, there has come over the last year an almost constant barrage of reports of student protest in various forms.

2. Those who are in the forefront of the movement, the so-called activists, form an extremely small percentage of our total student body. Yet, it should be noted that behind the 2, 3, or 4 per cent who form the activist group there is a large segment of the student body who feel enough sense of uneasiness and dissatisfaction with the world in which they live, and the educational programmes which they are being offered, to sympathize in varying degrees with the principles underlying what student activism is trying to accomplish.

3. Ontario students have, with very few exceptions, and there have been some, expressed their views and conducted themselves, including the visible means of protest, in what should be regarded as a most responsible manner.

4. In a democratic society, such as ours, the right to dissent and to protest is inherent and we should in no way be upset by the fact that people choose to assert their rights in this regard. Those who do become upset, I would assert, might better devote their time and energy to looking behind the protest, whatever its form, to identify that which has given it cause and the merits of the case that is being presented.

It should be clearly evident by now that there is a segment of our society, particularly among the young, and thus within the student bodies of our universities and other post-secondary institutions, who are greatly disturbed and quite dissatisfied with the nature of the world in which we live. One must concede these are circumstances which prevail which justify such dissatisfaction, circumstances which relate to a whole variety of social problems. For the students, this

necessarily includes matters related to the institutions of which they are a part.

Filled with a sense of reform and motivated by a considerable degree of idealism in many cases, there is a call for change. They may be joined and, at times led, by those who may be drawn not so much from any idealistic base as by the desire for power or influence. Because they are intelligent and articulate, such students have a very real flair for organization and for publicity whether it be by petition or press release, speech or campus newspaper, demonstration, or march.

Through these devices, they give us much to think about. But here, with all respect to Mr. McLuhan, I think we might be better to concentrate on the message rather than on the medium. One need not always agree with the basic philosophy which underlines student causes, or with what may seem to be the impractical characteristics that arise from idealism, in order to concede that there is room for improvement in our universities and in our society. But to simply say, as I have heard many suggest, that we need only wait until they mature and become more responsible citizens, is hardly the answer to the current situation.

What I would like to stress is that because, in Canada, we are an orderly, well behaved, indeed, if I might suggest it, a relatively conservative people, and I put this with a small "c" so as not to disturb members opposite —the non-student adult community may sometimes become very impatient and, indeed, rather annoyed with the various protests that take place. At times some will suspect that we have developed a group of professional protestors who spend most of their time chasing causes around which they can rally.

Others will advocate that since students are supported at extremely heavy cost by the general citizenry, they should be restrained in a firmer manner from some of their protest activities. But may I repeat, that in our democratic system all of our citizens, young and old, have certain fundamental rights that should not and cannot be denied. We need, therefore, to be patient.

More important, however, we need to look beyond the protest to the elements of our society which give rise to it and to decide what positive steps can be taken to remove the causes. In this regard I am in full agreement with those who say: If reform is required, let us put ourselves at the forefront of the movement, not behind the ramparts defending the *status quo*.

Yet while stressing the right to protest, I would remind those who seek to assert this right that, whatever the shortcomings they see in our society, be they reflected in the world at large, in our government or in our institutions of learning, there is a further and equally important democratic principle which relates to responsible conduct.

The laws of our land should and do allow ample scope for expression but they do not allow for violence in any form or obstruction of any type. Certainly actions of that kind in my view are intolerable in a province where the freedom of the individual is paramount. And certainly the last place where one should expect to find conduct of anything other than a responsible nature would be within that segment of our citizenry which has benefited from education at its highest levels. There is full scope within this country to work towards a better society. Those goals must be sought, however, with complete regard of the rights of everyone concerned.

The future holds a very great challenge for us to which all who are involved in higher education must devote time and energy. Recognizing in a realistic way the problems we shall encounter is certainly an important key to meeting that challenge. It is a future which, in my opinion, must balance many varied and important factors. For example—and I do not suggest that they are all encompassing. They reflect personal opinions; so, to my friends in the academic community, I would say they can add or substract to those I am suggesting.

1. Our needs for expansion and improvement against, and I do not want the term against to be misunderstood, the availability of funds;

2. The requirements of a growing economy against those of human betterment;

3. The needs of particular institutions against the needs of the whole society;

4. The sound tradition of the past against the innovation and creativity needed in the future;

5. The ideas we derive from other jurisdictions against those that are generated within our own province;

6. The needs of those who enter post-secondary education for the first time against the requirement of all of our citizens for continuing education;

7. The requirements of our elementary and secondary schools against the requirements of institutions of higher learning;

8. The requirements of our universities against those of other forms of post-secondary education;

9. The needs of society against the traditional autonomy of the universities.

It is impossible, Mr. Chairman, to discuss any of the basic problems which we face such as expansion, requirements for staff and facilities, government-university relationships, student activity and others—without recognizing that all such matters relate to the questions of academic freedom and university autonomy.

I would only stress that we are as firm in our conviction today, as we were four years ago when The Department of University Affairs was created, that academic freedom should prevail on our campuses and that our institutions of higher learning, as institutions, should have the greatest possible degree of autonomy.

There is, therefore, no more inclination in 1968 than previously to indicate who shall teach, who shall be taught or what shall be taught at any university in Ontario. I can say, without fear of contradiction, that academic freedom in this province is as complete as it has ever been and, so long as I have any relationship with this department, nothing will change in that regard.

I would maintain that, in regard to university autonomy, the government remains firm in its conviction that each institution should have maximum scope in conducting its own affairs. I have no desire to turn these remarks, which I regard as a report on our accomplishment and future requirements to the Legislature, into any kind of partisan statement.

If I felt otherwise, there would be ample opportunity to quote extensively from statements expressed on the other side of this House on previous occasions about the need to protect university autonomy, and then to relate those to some of the more recent requests I have received, both during the last session and the present one, in regard to "guiding" the internal affairs of certain of our universities and colleges.

If, however, in the debate that follows, someone would care to raise this issue, I shall certainly be pleased to discuss the matter at greater length. For I think all who are concerned with higher education in this province have the right to know where our various parties stand on what is, to me, still a very crucial issue.

As to our position, I need only point to the approaches that we have adopted, including the technique of formula allocation of operating funds—a procedure which allows the universities almost complete scope in deciding their priorities of expenditures—as well as to the other co-operative techniques we have followed in deciding on future courses of action.

What we are seeing in Ontario, perhaps, is the development of what Sir Eric Ashby of Cambridge University has termed "collective autonomy". This, in my opinion, may be more appropriate to the day and age in which we live, and should allow our institutions to maintain much of their traditional position in relation to the total society.

If, however, our universities are to retain this freedom, and if this province is to maintain the sense of balance to which I have referred, then it is obvious that together we must plan our future development with the greatest degree of care. Towards this purpose, last year I announced that I would appoint a commission on post-secondary education to examine in detail our needs between now and 1980. We have not been able to move as quickly in this regard to this important body as I would have hoped.

It has taken time to review with all concerned the proposed terms of reference that would apply. In fact there have been two or three suggestions as to re-orientation of some of the terms very recently. More important and more difficult has been the task of finding people of the very highest quality who are in a position to free themselves from their current assignments to devote the necessary time and effort to this undertaking. I am hopeful, however, that following discussions scheduled over the next two weeks, this whole matter will be finalized in a satisfactory manner.

In the meantime, we shall not be standing still. So far as our universities are concerned, the committee on university affairs will continue its role of examining university development and recommending policies which its members regard as consistent with our needs. I already cited the study of space utilization and management which will have a profound effect on the future of capital development. I have mentioned only briefly the steps now being taken to rationalize the acquisition and use of computer equipment through the establishment of regional computer centres.

While it would be premature to beat any drums on the merits of this approach, there is every indication that, if successfully instituted, it will give each of our universities access to the ultimate in computer power at the lowest relative cost attainable. Mean-

while, discussions are already underway to develop a rational approach to future library development. Here too, it is obvious that co-ordinated effort is required. Our universities, through the committee of presidents, have indicated they are willing to tackle this problem and we should look hopefully to constructive suggestions in the near future.

Reflecting on the accomplishments in the last four to five years, I think the people of Ontario have every reason not only to be satisfied but they should take some pride in what has happened. As important, however, is the way in which we have paved the way for future growth and change. Obviously there will be problems—very great ones—and we must combine the best minds and the best ideas available to meet and overcome them.

Not everyone will be satisfied, of course, with every step that is taken. The department has the most intelligent and most articulate clientele of any area of government. But then we have realized from the beginning that no decisions involving so many people, and indeed having such an impact upon our province, can be made without considerable public discussion. That is why Mr. Chairman, we welcome advice and all forms of constructive criticism. For we seek a common goal—the best university system that can be devised.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): At the outset I would like to state that I hold the position of an assistant professor of economics at York University.

For 1968-69 this will be a one-third time appointment.

Some members might believe that this teaching connection with a university biases my thinking and my remarks in the area of government-university relations in favour of the universities of Ontario. I have attempted to be objective in the preparation of these remarks. I am speaking not as a university teacher but as a member of this Legislature in my capacity as the official Opposition spokesman for The Department of University Affairs.

I would like also to inform the members of this Legislature that the hon. member for Peterborough, (Mr. Pitman), the NDP spokesman on university affairs, and I have discussed a division-of-labour for our opening replies to the Minister's statement.

This division-of-labour in our joint opening criticism will be clear when we have concluded our remarks. On most matters of basic criticism, our views tend to be similar. Any differences that may exist will come forth in our detailed criticisms of the Minister's specific estimates.

I would like first of all to discuss the existing framework in which the university policy of the government lies. Beginning in 1961 with the establishment of the advisory committee on university affairs reporting to the Minister of Education and especially since the establishment in 1964 of a separate Department of University Affairs albeit under the same person, the Conservative government of this province established a new framework within which government policies and the development of the 14 provincially assisted universities of Ontario, co-exist.

Various supplements to that framework have been added since 1964, notably "formula financing" in the area of operating grants.

The reasons for the creation of this new framework have often been stated by government spokesmen.

For example, when The Department of University Affairs was created in 1964, the Premier (Mr. Robarts), made the following comments in the House:

> The department will be asked to develop, in co-operation with the universities, methods of ensuring that full [educational] value—will be derived from the vast amounts of public money that will be required to be spent on university education over the next few years.

The Premier added that:

> The new department will administer all provincial grants paid to the universities and will maintain a constant scrutiny of the procedures and administrative methods by which this is carried out.
>
> It is contemplated that a very careful look will be taken at possible areas of co-ordination and co-operation among our universities.

I would like next to state that there is a need for university co-operation. There is no question that our provincially-assisted universities in Ontario must co-operate and co-ordinate among themselves in order to ensure, for example, that the $250 million in ordinary expenditure grants budgeted for in 1968-69 is well spent. This is public money and it must be wisely spent. For example, the establishment of 14 university law schools, one at each university, would clearly be an unnecessary duplication of costly facilities and a waste of the taxpayer's dollar.

I would like next to refer to what I consider to be the basic policy premise of the Conservative government. The argument of the Conservative government has been, and still is, that the degree of co-operation and co-ordination among our universities required

for financial efficiency could only be achieved by the particular framework the government has established. The basic premise of the present Conservative government's university policy is that it is the state that should and will decide what degree of co-operation is desirable and how fast it is to be made operative.

The creation of this special framework was, then, a response to the questions: "How will co-ordination and co-operation among Ontario universities take place?" And second, "Who will supply that framework and on the basis of what criteria?"

Next I would like to turn to what I consider to be the impact of the present policy and framework of the Conservative government. There is little doubt in my mind that the non-statutory creation of the government's advisory committee on university affairs to the Minister and the statutory creation of the government Department of University Affairs spurred Ontario's universities on to a somewhat greater degree of co-ordination and co-operation than they would otherwise have achieved.

It must be remembered, however, that such a conclusion is not testable.

Our universities might have achieved their present high level of co-operation and co-ordination without the framework established by the government. Nevertheless, I believe there have been some "efficiency benefits" as a result of the creation of the new institutional framework.

But there have also been undesirable "costs". And I think these costs will become greater in the years ahead unless a new framework is created. I think further that the efficiency benefits of the present framework are diminishing and will diminish greatly in the years ahead. We will get these benefits without the continuation of the present framework.

The main cost of the present framework is the continuing threat to the autonomy of our universities. This threat is the direct result of the policies of the Conservative government. The implementation of the government's university policy rests on the "carrot and stick" approach of the government and especially the Minister of University Affairs. This can be called "Ministerial benevolence". In a democratic society, the autonomy of our universities ought not rest on the benevolence of a Minister of the state. When a fundamental principle of a government policy and institutional framework is wrong, the government must be seriously questioned.

Let me put the matter bluntly. The basic goal of this government's policy is to bring about a more rational use of the public funds which the universities receive. This rationalization is to be brought about via co-operation among the universities. I agree with this goal. The means this government is using to achieve this goal is the continuous threat of saying, "You do this, or else". On principle, I flatly reject this technique. It is inconsistent with the goals desired.

The result is that today, while our universities are still autonomous, they are uncertain as to just how much autonomy they have and the nature of that autonomy. The Ontario university presidents have commented quite explicitly on this question of uncertainty. For example, in their joint 1966-67 annual review they say:

> It is . . . essential to clarify the role of the advisory committee on university affairs *vis-à-vis* the universities on the one hand and the Minister of University Affairs on the other. The committee acts in an advisory capacity to the government, and there is a natural desire on the part of its members to have its advice accepted on as many occasions as possible.

They concluded—and this, I believe, is a damning statement:

> This situation carries with it the danger that the committee may be tempted to tailor its advice to what it believes to be consistent with the government's own order of priorities.

These comments assumed the continuation of the basic framework established by the government. I question this framework both on principle and in terms of necessity. The desired results can be achieved by means of an alternative framework. However, before turning to this alternative framework and policy, I would like to state briefly why university autonomy is a vital ingredient, a vital need in our democratic society.

Dr. J. A. Corry, principal of Queen's University and the former chairman of the Ontario committee of presidents states the need most clearly. He made the following remarks on May 16, a few weeks ago:

> The university has meaning only as it supports and nourishes the life of the mind. Mind can thrive and renew itself only if it is free to range, to inquire without hindrance, and to report what it finds. The university is a collectivity. When it came, the universities wanted to guarantee continuity of inquiring, teaching, and learning, and also to provide a defense against the

outer world for men engaged in learning. This is the original mission of the universities. They more than any other organization have kept the tradition of learning alive and they are the best hope for buttressing the free life of the mind. Of course, they may fail.

It is clear enough in the last few months that we are approaching this crunch in more provinces than one. I believe that a society that puts an exquisite social justice above the claims of the free ranging mind, its nurture and education, will end by losing both. This, I believe, is especially true for the urban industrialized society that is coming to dominate our social landscape. If we are to keep its complexities from bringing us to paralysis, we must have great resources of highly educated intelligence as well as goodwill and passion for justice. We must be continually watchful of the propensity of our burgeoning technology to get out of hand and to debauch or destroy essential human values.

We need desperately social critics who are not only repelled by the impersonality of our massive productive apparatus and its materialism, but who also understand how it ticks and how to defend the human spirit against its assaults. Rightly understood then, the free university protecting the free minds within it is not in competition with the claims of justice, but an indispensable ally in the refining of justice in a complex society. The *status quo* must be kept under constant review. This can only be done effectively by educated intelligence imbued with the tradition of western humanism. If universities do not prepare such people, no other organization will.

What Dr. Corry is saying is that the search for truth in our universities is often, perforce, in conflict with the majority views and values of our society. This is a creative tension in a democratic society. Without universities free from the dictates of the state, we lose a necessary ingredient of democracy. The derogatory statements made in this House by the Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) last week concerning the views and criticisms expressed by Professor Mann in his book about some of the reform institutions in Ontario, are clear and present evidence of the threatened dangers to freedom of inquiry in our universities if, however, and only if, the present policy and framework of this Conservative government are allowed to persist.

The muted criticisms of this government's social and university policies by the presidents of our universities is an even more damning example of what has happened to university autonomy in Ontario under this government. Surely, individual university presidents should be among the leading social and government critics in Ontario. They are not. Why? Because they are fearful of Ministerial benevolence—afraid that they will lose the carrot if they criticize the stick being used on them.

Finally, we have a government Minister of University Affairs in this province who believes that one objective of our universities is:

> The provision of graduates whose attitudes are consistent with the free society in which we live.

This is from *Hansard*, June 5, 1967. I state categorically that this view, if forced on our universities, is not consistent with the university that Dr. Corry talks about; the *status quo* in Ontario means many people are not free in our society.

Thank goodness, sir, some at least of our graduates this year have attitudes that are not consistent with *status quo* Conservative definition of freedom in our society. Ontario is not "A Place to Stand" for many individuals and families in Ontario.

I would like next, Mr. Chairman, to turn to an alternative university policy and framework. The new policy and framework has two prongs. Both prongs are aimed at restoring meaningful autonomy, to our universities. Both are aimed at undercutting Ministerial benevolence and the atmosphere of uncertainty felt by our universities concerning the degree and nature of university automony.

The first prong, the establishment by statute of an independent university commission. The establishment of such an independent commission would eliminate the uncertainty universities feel concerning their autonomy. If such a statute were passed there could be no doubt as to what the chain of communication was between the universities and the state. It would eliminate the uncertainty I feel as a member of a free society about government intervention in our universities. The majority of the members of this commission would be composed of persons other than government-appointed members. This Legislature would approve the total amount of funds available from the public purse for our universities. The commission would decide on its allocation among the universities.

The establishment of the commission would eliminate both the government advisory committee on university affairs and The

Department of University Affairs. We can do away with some of the government bureaucracy that has built up. The secretariat of the present department might be transferred to the commission. The establishment of such an independent secretariat has been high on the list of recommendations of the universities' presidents for a number of years.

I firmly believe that the higher degree of co-operation and co-ordination achieved to date by the committee of university presidents, and its many research and working committees, by themselves, would continue with a change in framework from a non-statutory advisory committee to a Minister of the state to an independent university commission.

As a matter of speculation, I could see some further reduction in the degree of individualistic autonomy on the part of each university at the same time as the degree of collective university autonomy was clarified and strengthened. The essential point is that the giving up of a further degree of decision-making on the part of each individual university would not be to the state, as has happened in recent years, but to the committee of university presidents, for example, and to some extent the independent university commission. Such inter-university co-ordination and co-operation would, I believe, ensure the wise use of public funds without the technique of continuous government threats. I am convinced that this alternative policy, given the present high degree of co-operation and co-ordination among our universities would result in the proper balancing on the one hand the government responsibility for the expenditure of public funds and on the other hand of the independence of the universities.

When Ken Bryden was a member of this House, he said:

> There is frequent objection to the establishment of commissions. I think wholesale condemnation of commissions is ridiculous. There are proper areas where commissions should operate and there are areas where they should not operate. This is one area where we should have a commission.

He was referring to the university commission, and I agree completely with this former Opposition critic who understood this problem so well.

This, then is the first prong of the new policy. It would remove the dependence of the degree and nature of university autonomy from government Ministerial benevolence in the years ahead. It would, at the same time, achieve the desirable degree of co-operation and co-ordination among our universities to ensure the wise use of public funds.

The second policy thrust may be much more controversial than the first. And it may be open to a greater degree of misunderstanding on the part of the board of governors of the universities in Ontario, and perhaps some of the university presidents.

This second recommendation has to do with changes and reform of the 14 university statutes or Acts of the provincially assisted universities of Ontario. It is interesting to note that of these 14 university statutes of this Legislature, one university is operating under laws last revised, I believe, in 1957—eleven years ago. Seven universities are being governed under laws dated between 1960 and 1965. Five universities are being governed under laws dated 1965 and one university is being governed under laws last revised by this Legislature in 1967.

I believe this government has a responsbility in this area. It is an area which establishes the framework within which the universities exercise self-government. It is in this statutory area that the universities exercise their autonomy. Nothing in the university Acts must nullify the concept of the autonomous university as expressed, for example, by Dr. Corry. It is my belief that this Legislature must reform, in close consultation with the universities, the university statutes. I believe that certain reforms would strengthen the degree of autonomy of the universities by strengthening them from within.

When I say close consultation with the universities before changes are made in the university Acts, I mean close consultation not just with their boards of governors but with the Ontario committee of presidents, with representatives of the teaching staff and students and, perhaps, with representatives of the graduates of various universities.

I mean, therefore, consultation with the entire university community—the collectivity, as Dr. Corry calls it, not just a fragment. I believe that close consultation with only the boards of governors and the presidents would not be representative of the views of the universities.

It is my belief that the boards of governors of Ontario's universities, and their domination by members of the business community, have been a mixed blessing—often helpful in financial matters but equally unhelpful in terms of the reforms that must come about in the internal governing of our universities by all the members of our universities. I am fearful of a faculty revolt such as is occurring at Simon Fraser in British Columbia. I am fearful of the spread of student revolt.

Action, now, by this government and our universities in reforming the university statutes would, I believe, defuse the element of justifiable revolt on our campuses.

I firmly believe that the domination of our universities by members of the business sector—even though most of these men have made an essential contribution to the development of our universities in the past—must be seriously questioned as we look into the future. The business community must be represented on the governing boards or councils of our universities, but they must not continue to have such a preponderant influence. They should not be able, under the laws of this province, to perpetuate themselves in their influence year after year by reappointing themselves to their own boards.

I must emphasize that the general reform of our university statutes should not take place until after this Legislature has established by statute, the independent university commission and eliminated The Department of University Affairs and its foster child, the advisory committee on university affairs. Once the air has been cleared in this regard, constructive steps could then be taken to examine the question of reform of our university Acts. The intention of the government for reform within the context of university autonomy would be clear.

I would also like to emphasize that I am definitely not proposing a university of Ontario which would absorb the 14 universities now in existence. I am proposing an alternative policy both to the legislative creation of a single, all-encompassing university of Ontario and to the present framework of the Conservative government.

The second prong of the new policy, within the necessary context already noted, would be for this Legislature, on the recommendation, perhaps, of the education committee under the active chairman of the present Minister of Education, to pass minimum requirements that must be contained in each of the 14 university Acts. I repeat: These would be minimum requirements.

This policy would not result in 14 uniform university Acts, for each of the 14 universities in Ontario has a distinctive history, distinctive traditions, even somewhat different objects and purposes. There is a strength in diversity; there is strength in different traditions; there is strength in doing things differently, as long as the fundamentals are right and just.

One very real advantage in this proposal is that instead of having an uproar in changing each university Act separately—one at a time—on certain highly internal sensitive matters—and, in my opinion, there will be, in the immediate years ahead, intense internal pressures from within each university for changes in their respective Acts—we can carry out the basic reforms that will have to be made all at once, together, in close consultation with the various members of the university community.

The question of the reform of the internal exercise of power and decision-making within our universities is an immediate question. The government must face up to the "living reality", this hard if somewhat unpleasant fact of life. It cannot be swept under the rug: the rug has been rudely pulled away. This basic fact was made only too clear once again when the board of governors of Laurentian University came to the education committee of this Legislature only a few months ago.

The board members were articulately opposed in their proposals for changes in The Laurentian University Act by some members of the teaching staff and by some students of that university. In its wisdom, the committee thought that the problem should go back to the university, which it did. We ducked the issue at that time. We must no longer duck the issue.

My intuition tells me that the universities of this province simply cannot solve these basic questions about how they are to be governed from within themselves. The situation is, in my opinion, explosive. Action now by this government could defuse that explosion.

First, I think that, with the legislative establishment of an independent university commission, the Lieutenant-Governor in council should appoint three or four members of the community to each university board of governors or governing council. At present, nine university Acts of this Legislature have such appointees—varying from two to 32—and five university Acts do not. One of these persons might well be the local member of this House. The Minister of University Affairs talks a great deal about the relationship between his government and the universities, yet in this key area of government appointed persons to university boards of governors, he has not, to my mind, stated his views.

Second, I think that, with the establishment of an independent university commission, certain members of the immediate community in which each university is located, should be *ex officio* members of each university board

of governors or governing council. At present, only three university Acts state that the board of governors shall include the mayors of their respective cities, the warden of the county and so forth.

It is interesting also to note that universities such as Carleton, Guelph, Laurentian, Trent, Ottawa, Windsor and York all have in their Acts a statement that one of their "objects and purposes" is the "betterment of society" yet their Acts do not also specify that the members of their immediate society have a legal right to representation on their boards of governors. I think if we want to improve town-gown relationships, we should have written into each university Act, as they are already written into three Acts, that local representation by the mayor is ex officio and legal.

Third, I think that we must write into each university Act a minimum requirement that there must be some sort of meaningful teaching staff representation on each board of governors or governing council. I think that this step would meet, to some extent at least, valid teaching staff criticisms concerning the present way many basic decisions are made in our universities. The warning signs are up in Canada: Simon Fraser is but the first open flash. And at Simon Fraser the Canadian association of university teachers has censored the board of governors.

To a significant extent the conflict lies, I believe, in the conflict between social and educational values of the businessmen who dominate the present boards of governors and the social and educational values of the teaching staffs of our universities. While business representation is essential, what is at question is the degree of their influence.

This is a philosophical point if you like. I am concerned with the predominance of the "business ethos" and I think it is too powerful today in Ontario universities. This is a philosophical point. A value judgment. A normative conclusion on my part, but it must be thrown out into the open and we must discuss it fully in this Legislature. It is not however, essential to my present argument.

The following is the present legal situation with regard to teaching staff or faculty representation on university boards of governors in Ontario. Three universities have had written into their Acts by this Legislature that there shall be some sort of faculty representation on their boards of governors. Another five universities have had explicitly written into their Acts that members of faculty are legally ineligible to be on their boards. For another six university Acts, there is no reference to this matter at all.

What is at stake then, as in the first two areas, is not a question of principle, since existing university Acts contain conflicting principles.

In principle, members of the teaching staffs of our universities should have equal rights to representation regardless of which university in Ontario they teach at. It is rather a question of a struggle for political power within our universities, especially between the boards with a heavy business representation and the rest of the university. I want to underline that, I believe firmly it is true.

The fourth recommendation, Mr. Chairman, in this second prong of the policy, if you like, is this. I think we must write into each university Act a minimum requirement that there must be some sort of meaningful student representation on each board of governors or governing council. The Western Ontario University Act, 1967, states that the board of that university shall include one member elected by the student body who shall be either the holder of a degree from the university, or a former member of the faculty, and such member shall not at the time of his election be or have been within the preceding 12 months a member of the student body or of any of its affiliates. He may, however, be enrolled in a post-graduate course in any other degree-granting institution.

Note, however, that students elect a member to the board, but this person cannot be a student of Western University. None of the remaining 13 Acts of the provincially assisted universities in this province give students the legal right to elect a person—student or otherwise—to boards of governors. Western is alone in this regard. However, none of these 13 university Acts state that a student is legally ineligible for appointment to boards of governors which means that student could legally be thus appointed. However, it seems very unlikely that the five universities with Acts that explicitly exclude teaching staff from eligibility to their boards would appoint students to their boards.

Another aspect that should be considered in this general rewriting of university Acts is this. It should be noted that five of the 14 universities have now in their Acts provision for graduates of the university to elect between two and six graduates to their boards: Western 2; Queen's 6; McMaster 5;

Ottawa 2; Windsor 2. Of these 5 universities, Queen's excludes teachers, McMaster and Ottawa explicitly include teachers, and Windsor neither explicitly includes or excludes teachers.

I think this is an area where we could strengthen the community relationship between our universities and the community by having specifically written into each Act something to do with the graduate representations.

Surely there is justification for students in this province at our universities to have equal legal rights regardless of which university in Ontario they attend. Surely with the student riots throughout the countries of western civilization, this government must be aware that there is something basically wrong with the way universities in western civilization, including this province, are governed from within. University students must have the legal right to be on, or at the very least to elect people directly to, the governing body of their universities.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I would like to make my final recommendation to this government and my final recommendation is the elimination of double university government.

I think the time has come to seriously question the relevancy of the existence of present university boards of governors in Ontario. The universities can hire fund-raisers to raise their funds. The universities can hire experts to sign their contracts. You do not need men on boards of governors to do that.

Now is perhaps the time to establish at each university a governing council which would include the persons noted earlier. If a university is a collectivity, as Doctor Corry calls it, surely it should be governed in a collective manner.

I would like to conclude on this point with a direct quotation from an address given a week ago, June 1, by Dr. C. T. Bissell, president of the University of Toronto. He made the following remarks at the honorary degree ceremony at the University of Windsor. I shall read this quotation in conclusion. It is a direct quotation:

> Change initiated by the tactics of the extremists are not changes that will enable a university to grow and strengthen influence. Such changes leave a legacy of distrust and suspicion; in the process the mind of the academic community turns from large goals to tactical issues; and the university is weakened as an independent centre of dissent and criticism. I have suggested that the only protection against the sequence that disrupted Columbia University in New York City is a widespread concern in the academic community with political goals. Such concern leads to a response that is at one at the same time, conservative and radical: conservative in the sense that it reasserts the function of the university as a centre of intellectual activity; radical in that it is prepared to look critically and freely at the structure of the university. The real issue is not student participation and certainly not student power. I know of no senior university administrator in the province who does not accept the necessity for increased student participation at all levels of university government. The real problem is to find the form of representative and responsible government that assures the greatest strength and unity of the university. The modern university—and he is referring to Ontario—has not yet devised a central body that will command the allegiance of all members of the community, and that is why in a crisis we often have fragmentation, rather than this consensus. We need a body that represents all the constituents of the university community—staff, students, administration, alumni, concerned laymen—a body that speaks for and to the university, that commands authority and respect. The Columbia experience turns a theoretical goal into an immediate necessity.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Chairman, it is a very great pleasure for me to follow the hon. member for Scarborough East and make a few remarks on the presentation of the estimates of The University Affairs Department.

Perhaps I might begin on something of a philosophical note very much as the Minister concluded his remarks and suggest that we are faced perhaps with most difficult problems to overcome. We have, what could be called, the traditional role of the university to preserve knowledge; to transmit knowledge; and of course, to increase knowledge.

Yet at the same time, we find ourselves in a society in which universities are expected to provide much more. They are expected to prepare people for the business world. They expect universities to find means of increasing productivity, thus increasing the well-being of the people of the society.

We look to the university to provide men and women for the professions and in some

jurisdictions, and I am very happy to say not the jurisdiction in which we live, even the defence department decides on what is to be a major role which a university should perform. The irony is, of course, that the second group of responsibilities are the expensive ones. These are the ones which increase the budgets of universities across this province and continue to be a worry to the Minister before us. The irony is, that in order to carry out the secondary roles—that is, providing for our society—we must safeguard and give freedom in order to carry out the first. Yet, if we do not carry out these social responsibilities, we will no longer be viable entities in which the first and most important aspects of a university's role can be performed.

And so, as we look at this department, we realize that it is a "department of compromise", of cost and compromise. In essence, this is the price I suppose, of the freedom of university that it must compromise in peripheral areas sufficiently to provide for the needs of society. The great difficulty, of course, is to ensure that, in making this compromise, that freedom is not lost. This, I suppose, has been the historic problem in the short history of The Department of University Affairs.

Well, how can the government then carry out its responsibility; maintain the freedom within the universities to carry out its traditional role and yet provide the university with the means for carrying out its, what could be called, secondary roles?

This, of course, has been a problem across the country. It is a problem which we see in British Columbia and I suggest to you that, unless this compromise is effectively met, then we may see what has happened in other jurisdictions take place here. Perhaps we may find a Minister of the Crown reading a speech very much like the one which emanated from the jurisdiction of Saskatchewan just a few months ago. The Premier stated, in essence:

> —that the university will be obliged to make its financial requests to the Legislature in the same manner as any other spending department. This year the government must find $28 million for the University of Saskatchewan.

I am sure the Minister wishes he only had to find $28 million.

> The campus population is growing at the rate of more than 1,200 students per year. Thus it seems apparent that the cost to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan for these institutions will grow at an alarming rate.
>
> Our government is concerned by the fact that today the elected representatives of the people have virtually no control over university spending.
>
> Year after year with few details we, in fact, almost write a blank cheque. This was not too serious when only a few million dollars were involved. But today the university is fast becoming one of our largest spending departments.
>
> Under the circumstances, we intend at the next session to reform our University Act in a major way. Final details have not been worked out.

Thank heavens, the final details were never worked out in the manner in which the Prime Minister of Saskatchewan suggested.

> In essence, the university would be obliged to make its financial request to the Legislature in the same manner as any other spending department.
>
> For example, they will have to request so much for salaries, so much for travelling, so much for new buildings. I wish to emphasize that the government will not interfere with the internal operation of the university.

Well, of course, the final statement would be impossible on what has already gone before. My final quote:

> But from this time forward—there will be direct financial control.

So it can happen here in Canada. The freedom of the university can indeed be eroded by policies which can be made by a provincial government.

Universities are very expensive, and we in Ontario are very fortunate that we have 14 good universities. There are not many jurisdictions of which this can be said. Very often you find jurisdictions in which there are tiers of universities. They are centres of excellence, as one man has called them. Then you have fairly good universities, and at the bottom you have just "universities." And in these are concentrated those who do not have adequate educational background.

But we in Ontario have 14 universities, and I am very proud to say that all of them are universities to which one can send a young person in in this province and know that they can emerge with a bachelor of arts degree or a bachelor of science degree, which is a respectable degree, and one which will be considered so by people in other countries of the world.

And that, I think, is the situation we want to preserve in this province.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Great government.

Mr. Pitman: I suggest in my remarks to the Minister of Reform Institutions that the universities in many cases preceded this present government. However, I would concede to the Minister of Education that there are several universities which have not preceded this government. I would like to deal with this whole problem of insuring freedom for the universities, at the same time having to deal with these pressures which are placed upon universities by the society in which we live, recognizing that the expenses continue to mount radically year by year. It is quite obvious that the universities are not entirely happy. I am sure that the Minister will suggest that they never could be entirely happy.

One only has to read the press release from the presidents of the universities at the time of the announcement of the operating grants for 1968-69 to recognize the very real concern which these university presidents have.

The presidents "applauded the government decision to give education the highest priority in its pattern of expenditure for 1968-69," and "they recognized the necessity of restraining the rate of government spending in keeping with the province's resources." They, "felt bound," however, "to point out the implications for the social and economic progress of Ontario of failing to invest the sums needed to operate the universities on an appropriate level." I will read just another paragraph:

> The universities had conducted a careful analysis of what their operating costs were likely to be in 1968-69, and had made a joint presentation to the committee of university affairs showing the sums that would be required simply to maintain present levels of service in the face of rising costs. The operating grants just announced fall significantly short even of that minimum, and will not provide the means necessary for many needed improvements.

I know in the Minister's remarks a few moments ago he indicated the very real problems that existed in doing this. However, I do want to suggest that this kind of problem would most certainly have less political significance if the committee on university affairs was, as the member for Scarborough East suggested, replaced by a completely independent commission.

I notice the Minister himself used the word impartial; that as early as 1959 the government took steps to establish an impartial body. No one would deny that it has been impartial. But I think that the time has come to take the next step, and create a completely non-political body.

I think it was inappropriate last March when the chairman of the committee on university affairs, Dr. Wright, found himself in the position of having to defend the government because of the grants that have been given to the various universities. I think it was an unfortunate position in which to place that chairman. I think that this is the role the Minister himself must play in explaining the government's priority in spending in the various sectors of education, and I suggest to him that a grant commission would be a definite improvement over the situation which at present exists.

I know that in the report of the commission sponsored by the Canadian association of university teachers, or what is better known as the Duff-Berdahl report, the following statement was made:

> Although the advisory committee at present constituted seemed to have made a good start, we would like to comment before the custom becomes crystalized that the typical Canadian advisory committee differs somewhat in the nature of its membership from the highly regarded university grants committee in Great Britain.

The next statement is the statement with which I wish to take issue.

> It is doubtful whether university government relations have matured sufficiently in any Canadian province for the university grants commission precedent of having academic majority on the co-ordinating committee to be regarded as a viable model.

I would suggest to the Minister that it is time. That this is the next step to take because of the problem of ensuring greater freedom for universities. I think it is unfortunate too, when a university president feels that he should make a statement, as was made by the president of York University, in which he suggested that the universities were pulling punches:

> Ontario's 14 universities have begun to soft-pedal criticism of the provincial government because of their theory of biting the hand that feeds them. York University President Murray Ross said today that this

> gradual decline in taking pot shots at what the government does for higher education—

He said this in his annual report to the board of governors—

> —was a serious issue, because one of the important roles of the academic is criticism of public policy.

And as the Minister of Education would agree, if there is no criticism in the university, then indeed there is very unlikely to be criticism anywhere else in that society.

Then he went on to point out that York's institute for behaviour research would make great strides against problems—

> —that gnaw at and destroy the fabric of our social existence if only it had enough money—and if that money does not show up from somewhere our best social scientists would emigrate to the United States where there was money.

And so I hope that the Minister would take this under advisement: There is only one short step to go. It is a very short step to take before this present committee could be a completely politically independent university grants commission. And along with a university grants commission there must be some means of providing a longer range programme for each of the universities in relation to capital costs.

We must have a five-year forecast of what the needs of the province are, and I realize this is very, very difficult. I think nearly every report to the Minister has indicated the difficulty of doing this, and I do not in any way minimize those difficulties. I do suggest that the secondary role that I have suggested for the university can never be effective until this is recognized.

In the area of social services this was recognized two or three years ago, and a response has been made. And I suggest to the Minister that far beyond anything that the Ontario institute for studies in education has already done, must be done, before we can designate the areas of gravest need for the professions and business world, and for the productivity of this province. Only in that way can we provide for those needs within our universities.

As well as that, of course, the projection of the student needs must be a part of that plan. I am not at all sure that this can be done by the committee or commission which has been set up to examine higher learning, which is mentioned by the Minister in his final remarks this afternoon. I am not sure that this is the role of this committee, because this is a temporary body and it will last for some 18 months, as the Minister suggested.

And during that period of time, I do not think that the kind of in-depth work can be produced, and not being an on-going commission, this in itself would undermine any effort that it might make in trying to understand a matter of this complexity.

I merely point out to the Minister another section of the Duff-Berdahl report in which he suggested a need for the master plan.

> Each province which does not already have a long-range master plan for the development of higher education should embark in the next decade on this project as soon as possible. Some provinces may want to plan together on a regional basis.

I do not think that would be so in the case of Ontario.

> As mentioned above, we recommend that the master plans be developed under the auspices of the advisory committees, which are in the best position to integrate all the various plans and make good plans.

I would suggest that it should be done in relation to the university grants commission, but the plan should be the result of the joint participation of all universities in the province —and this is the important thing—there should be consultation with the governing bodies, the administration, and the faculty. I think that this is desperately important if the plans for the university are to have a relationship to the society in which they find themselves.

The great problem, of course, of a five-year plan is the accountability to this Legislature, to the people of Ontario. As the Minister recognizes, this government operates from year to year, and in many parts of this jurisdiction, of course, this is entirely right that it should operate from year to year. But there is no need for a long plan which would demand that the Opposition would give over to the government its right to question expenditure year by year, and I would suggest to the Minister that possibly this can be overcome.

First, of course, it will be partly overcome by the fact of a university grants commission, itself, being non-political. Second, I think that the five year plan which was put forward by this university grants—the advisory committee that is studying the economy—would be brought before the education and university affairs committee, and that those plans, not the details within each university, but

the plans for the province over the next five years could be explained in co-ordination with the needs of the province—as shown by the studies made by the Minister and his department and committees, and as indicated by the university grants commission.

It should be brought before the university affairs committee and from there to the Legislature and here, I think the whole question of public confrontation could be settled.

I do believe that a great deal of the anger and frustration which sometimes erupts within the universities is the feeling of frustration that they do not know exactly where they are going and they are not sure what they will be able to do from year to year. Beginning and developing a university or carrying on one with its long tradition both are very complex institutions, and the process is a very demanding exercise. It is made much more demanding if there is no assurance that the plans made from year to year have no viability and no relationship to the possible grants to come.

Now, I think that The Department of University Affairs has made a great step forward in the concept of formula financing, and this in itself takes some matters of money out of politics to some extent. However, even this has its dangers. For one thing, it does not look after the smaller university. It is recognized that extra grants are needed in order to allow these universities to cover what can only be called the basic costs and development which are, in many ways, the same for the smaller university as they are for the larger university, with many more students, and especially those with more post-graduate students, and many more who are in more specialized courses and who are in final years.

Therefore, the emerging university will continue to need further grants, and I would suggest to the Minister that the province must recognize that a university takes a long time to emerge. Someone has called an emerging university a university which is always in a state of "emergency", that is perhaps one definition. I think that the definition which is perhaps more acceptable and more approprate is that it is the university which is still growing, and still reaching, and the new universities in this province, for some time, will need an opportunity to reach and develop.

I would suggest that the last thing that the Minister would want to see would be a pseudo-university, or semi-university, an institution caught somewhere between a university and a college of applied arts and technology. I am sure that he would not want to see it. I would suggest to the Minister that the decision to create a university or new universities, a few years ago, was a political but wise and courageous decision.

I think that he is right in his remark this afternoon when he suggested that although critics have stated that we have too many universities, those critics are wrong. I think that for the province of Ontario, and the population that it will have and its economic needs, 14 universities are not too many at all.

But it would be sad if it had 10 or 12 universities and four or six pseudo or semi-universities, and so I do suggest to the Minister that the newer, emerging universities need his special attention and concern, and that of a university grants committee. I would hope that it would receive special attention from those appointed to that body.

I think that it is important that the formula financing should not be seen as a means of making all universities the same. A few days ago, we talked about the whole question of admission to universities and I suggested that there were some problems in the secondary schools which made admissions rather difficult. The Minister replied that in many cases, universities have not provided sufficient programmes for different kinds of students going on to the universities.

I would suggest that the way to get the greatest variety of courses and to provide for the needs of individual students of all kinds, is by having as many different kinds of universities as possible. It would be a sad thing, indeed, if, at the post-secondary level, there was a kind of levelling off, or sameness to the universities at the same time the Minister is trying to provide variety in jurisdictions at the secondary and primary levels in the new boards of education being created.

I do make a special plea that for all the formula financing which now is being projected for capital grants, thought be given to the necessary differences within universities which keep them alive, vital and will provide, in one way, one of the main defences against the kind of student unrest that you find in those jurisdictions where universities tend to have a monotonous sameness.

As well as that, I would suggest that we need to look at the problem of financing in relation to student power. I am going to say little further about student power, but I want to say this—that when you look at the students who are revolting or disrupting

society, whether it be in France, other parts of Canada, in Columbia University, or Berkley, there seems to be a certain oneness in the desires of these students, and that is the desire to retain individuality.

I would suggest to the Minister that you will not be able to achieve this struggle for individuality unless the grants of The University Affairs Department are sufficiently generous to allow the kind of student-professor ratio which allows, in itself, the kind of contact which must take place if young people are to feel that they are receiving an "individual" education.

In other words, I do not think that you can separate student power, the demands for student power, from these demands which the students themselves are making. In many cases, the demands they are making can be found in the most respectable reports, such as the MacPherson report, which was presented to the senate of the University of Toronto.

In that report, you find again and again the demand that we get away from large lectures, that we try to set up more seminars, that we try every means possible to bring student and professor together, that we try to get rid of the lack of individuality that takes place when students feel they are nothing but a number over in the registrar's office; when, indeed, they very rarely have an opportunity to say one word to the professor who has taught them throughout the year. These are not merely agitators, they are people who are in essence trying to achieve what we in this chamber would regard as legitimate goals, the increase of individuality.

I would like to say just a word or two in conclusion about the whole question of resources. Now, I recognize the Minister's dilemma. In his remarks at McMaster University last week, he turned the problem around and he said, "I recognize what the university needs are, but as a Minister of the Crown I must recognize also what the resources are."

He stated that these are the resources which exist and, therefore, he must in a sense find the priorities within the education system that would allow him to work within these resources. And I think this was a very sobering point to make before a university audience on that occasion.

I would suggest that the Minister place within his list of recognized values, the fact that the resources needed for the universities of this province rate very high in that priority, because they rate very high in terms of the kind of province we are going to have, the kind of productivity this province will have, the way in which it will establish new wealth. Therefore it can logically be placed very high.

But I recognize that the province of Ontario has moved in many different directions towards more colleges of applied arts and technology—19 of them—and towards teacher training or teacher education in the universities. These are very expensive thrusts within the various branches of his department. However, I do suggest that this whole question of resources is a very subjective decision. I suggest to him that the remarks of university presidents in this regard represent a very responsible comment. The resources which have been placed in the hands of the universities are not sufficient this year for them to grow as they feel they must grow if they are going to be able to carry out the wishes which this Minister and this government wishes them to carry out.

I recognize the priorities and I recognize also the desperate need that these priorities be given sufficient comment within this government. That is why I am pleased to see, in the remarks the Minister made a few minutes ago, the fact that within the next couple of weeks, I think he stated, he would be ready to appoint the committee on higher education.

I do not see it as fulfilling some of the expectations which some people in the academic world have suggested. I do not think it is going to solve all the questions which the university hopes. I do not think it can. This is why we made these other suggestions—at least I think you heard them from this side of the House this afternoon. But I do believe that this committee can point up what the priorities are, what the needs are, and will give the Minister a great deal of ammunition as he goes before his Cabinet and before his Treasury board in the placing of these priorities very high within this government.

I also must point out that sometimes whenever we discuss education and sometimes when we discuss anything else, I feel as though the spectre of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) hangs over this Legislature. Once again we find them having to see that these priorities are related closely to the chaotic and ineffective taxation system that we have in this province and in this nation.

And I would hope that very soon, when the committee on taxation sits down, that one of the problems it will deal with is this whole question of finding a means of providing for

the kind of priorities which the Minister himself said were so very important in the speech he made here today.

I hope it will mean a very great measure of support on the part of the Minister for the re-assessment of where we secure our taxes and the case of a more just system of taxation. I do not think even the mention of the Carter report is entirely inappropriate in the discussion of The Department of University Affairs.

I hope that, in re-negotiating with the federal government, there will be a new recognition there of its responsibilities for the financing of higher education in this and every other province in this nation.

I make one final statement on the whole question of student aid. I recognize that, until these resources are found, these new taxation sources are found, that the Minister cannot deal very effectively with this problem. He himself, I think, has indicated that what we have in Ontario is not perfection. Indeed it is not perfection. I would suggest it is doing exactly what he himself has indicated at every stage would be against his own goals and his own principles—that of providing for equality of educational opportunity.

It seems strange that we provide free education up to the age of 18 and after the age of 21. Somehow we have built a wall from the age of 18 to 21, which in itself affects those all the way down in our secondary schools and our elementary schools. I think it is desperately important for student morale—and here again it relates to the question of student power and the unrest among our students—but I think it is also important for student morale in high schools that we recognize that higher education is an investment by the province in these young people. I hope it will have a philosophical effect upon young people.

One of the things that always bothers me with charging young people fees is that they get some silly idea they have paid for their education. Of course, they have paid for a very small percentage of that education. And I would suggest that some of what might be called the less "social" concepts of young people towards paying income tax and to taking over a greater share of public expense, is the fact that they think they have an inherent right to what they have been able to earn.

Of course, this is sheer nonsense. In many cases, those who have the highest incomes have been subsidized to the greatest degree by the public purse. And I bring again this point that, in many cases, what you have here is a situation which allows young people to believe that they have somehow of their own gained an education and therefore do not have any public responsibility.

I am not going to read very much of this. I am not going to read what Professor Porter has said. I understand there are some in this Legislature who feel his statistics are somewhat inaccurate, but I would like to read just a comment from a study of Ontario grade 13 students as it has been presented in "From the 60's to the 70's", a publication by the committee of presidents of universities of Ontario in June, 1966.

> Professor W. G. Fleming found that 39 per cent of those who went on to university had fathers in managerial, professional, or executive positions, but only 14 per cent were the children of semi-skilled or unskilled labourers, although the labour force of appropriate age to be fathers of grade 13 students had 16 per cent professional, managerial, or executive categories and 31 per cent unskilled or semi-skilled.
>
> In university this bias was even more pronounced. A survey of Canadian university students, done the same year by DBS, that the fathers of 15.6 per cent were professionals, proprietors or managers, as against 15.4 per cent of the labour force in these categories; that 5.1 per cent had fathers who were labourers, as against 20.5 per cent of the labour force. This data was 10 years old, but again an analysis of the Canadian post-secondary student population of February, 1965, shows that the pattern persists.
>
> In Ontario, 56 per cent of the respondents reported fathers in the proprietary, managerial, professional occupations, compared to 23.3 per cent for the labour force in 1961. And 31 per cent reported combined parental incomes of $10,000 a year and over.
>
> Now the Minister knows this and he would agree with this report. All this proves is that the well-off white collar family's children are continuing to attend Ontario universities out of all proportion to their numbers in population.

It well behooves this jurisdiction to take the step towards what the Minister regards as perfection—that perfection being, of course, the end of the fee barrier for young people.

The province of Ontario's student aid programme still allows those who have the least to go farthest into debt. It still is a negative feature when it comes to the education of women, and it certainly is a negative feature

when it comes to the education of those who are in the lower incomes. I think that in some ways there are those who are worse off now than they were five years ago. I say this with all respect because there were a large number of fee-paying scholarships a few years ago—particularly given by the newer universities—which allowed a bright student, not a brilliant student, a bright student, to pay off his fees by means of a scholarship. Now that scholarship has been reduced to $150 because anything over $150 will simply be deducted from the award portion of the province's student aid programme. In other words, there are those who would have had their fees paid some years ago who now must put themselves into debt.

At the same time, we are faced with a very serious summer of unemployment for university students, and I just suggest to you that in all the talk of a just society, I think university students have a place.

I think it is unfortunate when this kind of an aid programme creates the feeling that there is some cheating going on among university students. I do not believe there is much at least, in my experience I have not found students who have cheated. I have found a great many students who have been in very dire need and I think that this is something which I am sure the Minister, once he has had an opportunity to place his priorities before this government, as soon as this province's taxation system has been made more just, and more effective, might consider this is one of the first advances that might be made on this point.

May I conclude, Mr. Chairman, by repeating what I have suggested here this afternoon:

1. The need of independent university grants commission;

2. The need of a five year plan which will be based on the employment needs, on the student needs, and on what in a sense is the full need of this province.

3. A recognition of the problems of the entire spectrum which can only be done by an immediate appointment of a commission on post-secondary education.

4. The end of the present fee structure and the present problems of the student aid programme which is, I think, detrimental to the education of so many young people in this province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just to reply very briefly to the observations made by the two hon. members, I would say at the outset that, in the main, once again they were constructive and, to a degree, helpful—the degree we will discuss as we go along during the course of these debates—but nonetheless, for the most part, they certainly would be helpful for the discussions that will take place during the estimates of this department.

Dealing with some of the observations in a general way, I think that I can say to the member for Scarborough East—I sometimes get these areas in Scarborough a little bit confused—but if he reads carefully, and in a positive way, with no suspicion, which I do not suggest he has, some of my own remarks in my preliminary statement today, he will find are not too dissimilar to some of the observations he has made with respect to the consideration of change that is necessary in the internal operational structure of university government.

I cannot specify here today, perhaps as completely as he has suggested in his remarks, just how this change should take place or what, in fact, it should be. He quoted from Dr. Bissell, from an address made to the University of Windsor a week ago, I guess, Friday—an address really that was not too dissimilar to the annual report of Dr. Bissell of a year ago when he was indicating then that perhaps there should be—if you could use this term—almost a single tier approach to university administration. These are things that obviously must be explored and must be brought about in an intelligent and logical way.

However, I do want to point out one or two areas in his remarks—not that I take exception to them because I am sure he did not intend them in this way. This is always a great problem, I find, in this department; you have to be so careful of what you say so that the academic community does not seize on a single phrase or word or sentence that, sometimes, if read in total, is more readily understood than if taken out of the total presentation you are making.

Now the member for Scarborough East categorically, he says, rejects the philosophy that his interpretation of what I enunciated a year ago where I suggested that universities have a number—and I listed a number, not just one—of specific objectives that fall within the general purview of their overall aims and purposes. And, of course, the member for Scarborough East referred to the provision of graduates whose attitudes are consistent with the free society in which we live.

We would have to get into a definition of what we mean by attitudes, what we mean

by consistency, what we mean by free society. I think in fairness one would have to read that particular portion along with items 1, 2, 3 and 4, and also in the conclusion of what I said, to attain any or all of those objectives. Of course it is essential that our universities carry out their work in an atmosphere of complete academic freedom.

But I suggest, with respect, that when one takes a portion out of a person's remarks that, perhaps, it should be related to the total, and this is particularly true and very difficult when dealing with these sometimes intangible situations we discuss in the academic community, of which I am not a part.

The hon. members who spoke here this afternoon are. They are very close to the academic community and obviously cannot help, and they should, reflecting some of the environment in which they live from time to time. But I say to the hon. member that he did not really need, at the beginning of his remarks, to indicate that there might be some thought that he was putting them forward just because of his association with a particular university. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, he does not need to make that point with me. I accept that he would not do it in this light.

I was just a little concerned, though, and I say this very facetiously to the member for Peterborough, when I heard his discussion about emerging universities, knowing that he is with one of those institutions—they do have very real problems which are hard to tackle and we do not know all the answers—I was wondering whether he was, to a degree, reflecting the particular cause of say, Trent, Brock, the Lakehead and Laurentian, but I see he is shaking his head, and I am sure he was not. But it is one of the very tough areas.

As I listened to the presentations here this afternoon, I think you could divide—perhaps the hon. member disagrees—the remarks of the member for Scarborough East, and the area, shall we say, of government university relationships as they relate to funds, questions of control, and then the other aspect which he relates, which I do not think need necessarily be related and that is the internal administration of the universities themselves, and the change in government that must evolve over a period of time.

As I say, I think in the latter area, perhaps we are closer to some agreement than we might think. In the former area though, Mr. Chairman, I think I should point out that while it is very popular on occasion to suggest that if you divorce everything from the government, or from the control of the Minister, you just automatically solve all your problems; this, Mr. Chairman, is not borne out by experience elsewhere.

What the hon. member for Scarborough East has suggested, and the member for Peterborough has supported—although the member for Peterborough, I must say, suggested this is the next step—that what has been happening has been right, and that the next evolutionary step is the divorcing of the university affairs committee from the department or from the government—and I say, Mr. Chairman, is this in fact realistic?

Is it, in fact, in the best interests of the universities themselves? Are we saying the advisory committee on university affairs composed, in my view, of competent people, is competent? Of course, Mr. Chairman, the member opposite can say—"well, some of them have had some political experience and background." But this surely does not mean they are not competent or able to deal with problems, where today—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): They all have the same political experience and background.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is not true and it has not been the case. Until a couple of gentlemen retired a year and a half ago, I think one could say that there was a wide variety of previous political interest represented on that committee.

Mr. Nixon: Not elected politically.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not know what position the senator is in. You are quite right, a senator is not elected. I would agree with the hon. member but surely it indicated, I think, a degree of political philosophy and I think, Mr. Chairman, that we have to be very careful not to say to ourselves that because these are appointed by government, they automatically then come under the influence of say the Minister, or the Cabinet, or the government of the day, because this is not necessarily the case.

Mr. T. Reid: It is a question of uncertainty.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will get around to the question of uncertainty. We never rejected a grants commission just out of hand. There has been a great deal of discussion. I am not saying what we have today in the advisory committee is perfection or that it is the ultimate. But I think even the members of the

university community themselves who have studied this very carefully, would relate the experience of the university grants commission in the United Kingdom as not being a complete answer. You know you can—

Mr. T. Reid: I referred simply to an "inpendent university commission."

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right, the university commission or grants commission are not unlike one another. All you have to do is read fairly recent material from the United Kingdom. This is clearly not the attitude of many elected persons. The *Financial Times* states:

> At the time of writing the offices of overworked, overpressed university administrators are being invaded by the officers of the controller and auditor general, duplicating in a large way scrutinies hitherto adequately carried out by the UGC. This momentous innovation which must, in all sorts of ways, affect to a disadvantage the standing of UGC.

This is what they are going through in the United Kingdom.

> It was enthusiastically recommended despite an overwhelming majority of expert opinion to the contrary by the public accounts committee chaired by a Conservative ex-Minister and it clearly reflects an attitude of distrust, if not hostility, fundamentally inimical to the atmosphere conducive to the healthy growth of university situations.

Mr. Chairman, that indicates the rigidity of the approach of the grants commission. It has not been all sweetness and light. I know two or three of the individuals who initiated it had a great deal to do with the development of the grants commission in the United Kingdom, and it is like everything else. When it is working in some other jurisdiction then you think this might fit your own purpose. You believe that this may make sense, but it does not.

Mr. T. Reid: You do not have to duplicate the United Kingdom experience.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite right. Whatever you do here does not have to be exactly the same, but the closest comparison a person can make between the recommendation from the member for Scarborough East and what has existed in the existing jurisdiction would be—

Mr. T. Reid: The Prince Edward Island model—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, with great respect, once again you are comparing, in this instance, potatoes with apples or something. I do not think you can compare the experience in P.E.I. with the problems that we face here in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: No, the point is that there are other models than the one you are referring to.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think that surely the experience in the United Kingdom dealing in dollars and numbers and so on, is more closely related to what we are going through here. And the experience there has not been all positive. They have had some difficulties. Mr. Chairman, I want to say very conclusively that I do not believe anyone in this day and age can say that this is the set pattern for the next 20 years.

I question, really, whether the so-called commission where total funds are allocated, say, by the Legislature—and this means that total funds are voted on the recommendation of Treasury to a commission which is independent, so-called, of political interference or influence—is not in any way going to solve the growth problems and the problems that relate to the universities *per se*. I say this to the hon. member for Scarborough East, that while all has not been easy I think I can fairly state that there have been no large "P" political considerations involved in the recommendations of the advisory committee to the Minister and the government.

Mr. T. Reid: It is the uncertainty you create.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the uncertainty exists no matter which mechanical way you do it because the uncertainty relates to the total number of dollars that are available. If the dollars available are voted as they should be, by the Legislature of the province of Ontario, there is no guarantee to the university community whether you have an advisory committee or a so-called grants commission, that the total dollars in the next year or the year after need necessarily be as much or could even not be less than what was voted in the previous year.

Mr. Nixon: What about the political references referred to by the presidents last year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, somebody has to make decisions and there are always going to be small "p" political suggestions in whatever is done.

Mr. Nixon: That is not what they are referring to.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that with the evolution of the formula approach, in the area of operating grants on the general basis, the advisory committee has been able to take this whole question of operating grants out of the area of small "p" political discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we are reaching a point with respect to capital allocations, where perhaps a comparable formula approach will once again resolve the problems that perhaps exist in the minds—and I suggest that it is in the minds on many occasions—of the university community with respect to the availability of dollars per capita purposes.

Mr. T. Reid: Why do you not let go?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not saying that over a period of time, and I say this in an evolutionary sense, alterations will not be made, but I do say that the grants commission, if one can relate it to existing experiences, does not necessarily provide the answer. It can build in a degree of rigidity, a degree of government involvement, as is happening in the United Kingdom, that the university communities themselves would be the first to criticize.

To say today that the move from the advisory committee to the so-called grants commission will be the panacea for the solution of our problems is wishful thinking. It really is.

Mr. T. Reid: I repeat: Why do you not let go?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, all right, all right—then a "substantial" improvement over the existing situation with respect to the function of the advisory committee. I also say this to the member for Scarborough East, and I hope he agrees with me, he is setting as a condition—a precedent—to the alteration, shall we say, in university administration, that the question of advisory committees, grant commissions—or whatever terminology is used—be settled before these other changes which may come about take place.

And I say with respect, Mr. Chairman, on the matter of the advisory committee—while it is important and we must always keep an eye on just how this should develop over a period of time—I really think the other area could be more important from the time standpoint. And I would like to think the member for Scarborough East does not reject the idea of changes that might take place being dependent on this other problem being solved. I do not think they have to be related.

Mr. T. Reid: Government initiates changes only if the statutory creation of an independent university commission precedes such action.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is where I guess the member for Scarborough East and I are going to disagree on the subject of changes taking place, because I do not think they have to be related.

The other points that could be made with respect to the suggestions from the member for Peterborough relate to the difficulties we experienced with the emerging universities. I think his assessment is quite right. We are interested in developing universities in this province that are all quality institutions. I think we also have to expect, Mr. Chairman, that all institutions will not achieve the level they set for themselves perhaps as soon as they would like to.

I think that within the university area and the whole field of post-secondary education, the question of priority, which is very tough to determine, must be recognized. At the same time, I say, categorically, there is no question that we wish to see the emerging institutions other than as first class universities. I only say that you do not achieve this overnight and I was delighted to hear his observation, because it is one that I had made myself, that we are fortunate in Ontario that a student who decides to go to university and cannot determine which institution to attend, is not prejudiced because of any choice that he might make; that we have good universities in this jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal, I guess that one might add. Perhaps these other points will come out during consideration of the details of the estimates. As I say, I found the contributions helpful although I do not necessarily agree with all that has been said. In my view, and I have now been living with it for some years, it is one of the very difficult areas of government administration—this whole question of how the universities should evolve over a period of time, the question of priorities, the relationship between government and our academic community.

I think that I can say this to the member for Scarborough East: In spite of the fact he refers to the stick and carrot approach, the benevolence of the Minister, I really think he would be pretty hard pressed to find any

specific examples that really relate to this type of situation. The possibilities of it happening, I do not deny, but the possibilities exist whatever system you use—who knows! I am just saying that, getting down to actual cases, I believe that the advisory committee and the reaction to their recommendations from the Minister and from the government have been of most positive nature during this past four or five years in this province. And I say this with some slight knowledge of what has gone on.

On vote 2401:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the Minister's opening remarks, his predictions, as to the increase in cost to support this department up until, I believe, 1974. In adding the $250 million that is essentially going to finance post-university education from this department to the $175 million that is to be spent from the university capital aid corporation, we get the grand total of $425 million. I realized from amendments to the statute and things that have been said in the estimates already, that some of the funds from the university capital aid corporation will be going to Ryerson and the community colleges; probably about $45 million.

At this time, I wonder if the Minister can tell us what share of the $425 million that is projected for post-secondary use this year would be balanced by a fiscal transfer from the federal government. He said he would have this looked into and perhaps this would be the time when he could tell us what he has been able to negotiate with the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, taking the two departments together and recognizing that capital is no longer involved in consideration of fiscal transfer we are talking in the neighbourhood of $220 to $230 million. This is only an estimate, because we have to have the auditors' statements from the universities. But taking this general area of operation of 50 per cent fiscal transfer for post-secondary institutions, we are talking in the neighbourhood of $220 to $230 million. Now this is a total for all post-secondary, so it relates to this department and to The Department of Education.

Mr. Nixon: Then the part that is applicable to The Department of Education would be for grade 13, community colleges, Ryerson, teachers' colleges. Included in that list, would there be any of the other institutions like the schools for nursing, and nursing training and so on, or would they all be under the Ministry's jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Nursing, of course, comes under The Department of Health, but that figure represents what we calculate will probably be transferred to this province. As I say, I cannot be pinned down to it. We are talking between $220 and $230 million in total.

Mr. Nixon: Well, I am quite interested in the predictions for the next few years. Are the predictions that the Minister has given us based on the studies made by the Smith committee or by the studies made by OISE?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the predictions with respect to student enrolment and also, to a degree, with cost are based on several sources of information—some of it going back really before the institute was founded, some of it the Smith committee reported and some from the institute. I think if the hon. member goes back through our debates in the last three or four years, you will find that I made reference on several occasions to material, prepared by Dr. Jackson when he was associated with OCE, concerning student numbers.

It is very interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, we really have been quite close to the projected student enrolments over the past four or five years. But once again, these are projections and the cost is something that perhaps will not be as accurate as will the student numbers. I think it may turn out to be a shade conservative, but it is fairly close to it—that is, the $400 million operating cost.

Mr. Nixon: I do not suppose that this is a time for any major policy statement, but the Minister knows that there will be the fiscal negotiations and agreement, hopefully for this year. Is he going to put forward again an approach through our representatives' meeting in the federal-provincial conference for more support specifically for education, or more fiscal transfers based on education? Or does he feel that the present situation is one that the province can adjust to if there is support in some other area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, if one looks at the total cost of education which the leader of the Opposition himself outlined —I think it was $1.5 billion as it related to the department's operations for this current fiscal year—I cannot say on this occasion what the total policy of the government will be.

As far as I am concerned, my responsibilities will be to indicate to the government that from the educational point of view, the resources we have at present certainly could be added to substantially by any form of fiscal transfer. When you see the projected growth that would take place if one were to even go part way toward accepting the policy of the leader of the Opposition—moving to 80 per cent at the elementary and secondary levels—the dollars are just so staggering that obviously there has to be either restructuring or more funds made available from the federal jurisdiction.

I really did not want to get into this, because I think it relates to total government policy, and I do not want my remarks to be interpreted as saying to Ottawa: If we have not got enough money, give us more so that we can do it. I think there are other occasions for that.

Mr. Nixon: Well, this is not the occasion for discussing the government's approach to the federal-provincial conference. That will come some other time in a session.

On the other hand, I know the Minister will agree that with the information that only he can provide, it makes the discussion a little more useful.

In vote 2401, we have the administration of the students' awards—the student awards branch, and the funds that are awarded by that branch come under another vote. Perhaps you want to divide the discussion. But one thing that would, I think, come under this vote is the small difficulty that arose—based on a statement by the chief student awards officer—that there had been some misrepresentation in the applications made over the past year.

It might serve to clear the air—and I must say that this has been done fairly well already—if the Minister would give us an account of what led up to the chief student awards officer referring to the fact that there had been some considerable misrepresentation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, from my knowledge of it, is after the statement in question was made by the awards officer in the department—which I think really was prompted from hearsay discussions or suggestions—that we contacted the various student award officers at the universities. While I am sure there may be exceptions to this, their reports to us indicated that there was no widespread misuse or misrepresentation.

At the same time, in any system of this size, Mr. Chairman, there are 50,000 awards or applications involved. I think we have an obligation, as I mentioned in my introductory remarks, to tighten up the accounting proceedings—all the procedures related to it—to see that there is not any opportunity for misuse.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that one can say the vast majority of student awards are related to those students who have legitimate needs. But as I say, in any system of this size we have an obligation, I believe, to tighten up procedures where we can, just to ensure that ther is not any misuse.

Mr. Nixon: Another matter of information regarding policy has to do with the meeting of the individual student's requirements to continue at university. I have always understood that public and private funds met, in general, about three-quarters of the cost that an individual year at post-secondary level would actually entail. Is that a broad, generally-correct figure?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would explain three-quarters of the actual cost.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, the actual cost—meaning one-quarter to be met by the student.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, it all depends, Mr. Chairman, on how we relate the earnings of the student during the summer months. If you are suggesting that this is his 25 per cent, I doubt that it comes to 25 per cent.

Mr. Nixon: Less than that then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would think so. I would think, Mr. Chairman, that really—take an example, if we can, of the student who has no earning capacity during the summer.

Mr. Nixon: Are there may of them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think that really the award that is available both in the loan and the grant portion, comes very close to meeting the average student's total needs. Now obviously we calculate into this the expected parental contribution. Also the student has to show that he was not able to obtain some earning—perhaps for health or some other reasons that prevented him from receiving any funds for summer work.

Mr. Nixon: I perhaps did not make myself clear. I understood that the total cost to keep a student in university for a year—on the average that is, it is more for medicine

you know—is something around $2,000. And I understand that public funds without student awards of any type would meet three quarters of that cost. Are these generally accepted figures?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, of course, Mr. Chairman, the figures never remain the same, unfortunately.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, well this is what it has been for a couple of years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Right. The cost, I think one could say, on the average, in the coming fiscal year will be close to $3,000, and that public funds grants will look after five-sixths of that cost.

Mr. Nixon: So he still has to find $500.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is exclusive of the student award programmes. That is the average. The average tuition fee is still, I think, in the neighbourhood of $500.

Mr. Nixon: Right, but with that in mind, it appears that our student award programme is moving—as the Minister predicted once that it would—to close the gap entirely for the funds that an individual student must find somewhere, either through his own endeavour or from his family or from the student award that would permit him to continue at university.

As I do some rough calculations, the extra money needed to do away with tuition entirely would not be much more than somewhere between $12 and $15 million. It appears more and more that the reason for not meeting 100 per cent of the tuition requirements of the students in Ontario is not simply a lack of funds. But something in the principle of the thing offends the conservative mind. I well remember the Premier speaking on this point during the estimates three or four years ago in which he expressed himself clearly that he felt that it would not strengthen the moral fibre of the students if this tuition requirement were done away with.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He said it was in conflict with the free enterprise system.

Mr. Nixon: There is a basic division of opinion here. I do not believe that the Minister has ever agreed with the Premier in this regard because of his urging, as far as the Treasury board is concerned, to have a better student award programme. We are not prepared to say that it is perfect by any means, because I believe that with a little more effort we could do away with tuition as we have accepted it and have been forced to accept it down through the years.

There has always been the statement made by those who have not followed the figures too closely that it would simply be an insuperable financial barrier. But I believe that the barrier is being eroded and worn down in size until the amount of money is becoming insignificant in the $2 billion budget under the control of this Minister.

While there is always a tendency for those of us on this side to urge the government to expand its services without expanding its tax base, still there is a matter here of some concern. Because the Minister has heard the arguments from this side and from less subjective sources that the present fee structure and tuition structure plus the cost of continuing education, are giving an unnatural mix to the students from this province and from outside this province who will make use of our post-secondary facilities.

I believe one of the barriers that stand in the way of making it a much fairer and more just approach to the attendance of post-secondary institutions can soon be done away with as we move in this direction. Surely the Minister can see that as a goal—and if he were to accept it as a goal, it would be a very valuable thing indeed in meeting much of the criticism that has been levelled at our system.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, may I say, my math and the leader of the Opposition's math are not quite the same. I would bow to his greater expertise, but as I calculate it if we have 80,000 students enrolled next year, and if the tuition fee on the average is $500, we are talking about a $40 million bill for this coming year.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but you are already needing almost $30 million out of student awards.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, because, Mr. Chairman, in the total cost we are talking $3,000 as the university's cost. This does not include the student's cost, which could be perhaps for living expenses, books and so on—a total of $1,500 if he is from out-of-town.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, beyond that. Of course, I am prepared to recognize, and the Minister knows that we put this argument from this side, that something has to be done to assist those students who cannot live at home and who cannot otherwise finance their living costs at university. But the abolition of tuition is almost a cornerstone of the argu-

ment and the abolition of tuition is something that I wish the Minister would accept as a reasonable goal.

It does not have to be political in any sense, but I believe this is one way whereby we could put some additional assistance in the hands of those students who are finding some difficulty in continuing their education.

There is still the attitude, that the Minister must surely recognize in a good many families that do not have a history of post-secondary education, that it is simply beyond them, and no matter how much preaching comes from political or other sources that advanced education is not denied to anyone and that it is available to everyone without regard to their financing, there is a psychological block, and I submit a real money block, to the continuation of education that we could move towards eliminating if we were to do away with tuition.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to carry on with what the leader of the Opposition says. I would like to quote from the student awards brochure. And I am sure the Minister would not accept this as being the case:

> While it is felt that in the first instance the responsibility for providing the necessary funds rests with the parent, guardian or immediate family, and/or the student—

Now, there is the philosophy which is stated in that brochure, that we are not investing in people in this province, that essentially responsibility belongs to the parent or to the student. And, therefore, education then relates to the financial ability of that parent or student. Now I would like to finish this off in the final sentence:

> In this way, all citizens of the province may be assured that all qualified students are being given equal opportunities in education—that available funds are being distributed to students on a fair and equitable basis.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I submit that that just simply is not the case and it has no place whatsoever in an official document of this government.

They are not receiving equal opportunity. That very barrier itself gives it an inequality of that situation.

I am wondering, also, if the Minister could tell me whether there have been any studies done in jurisdictions where loans have been an important part of student aid, as to the cost of recovering loans, and whether, in the long run, it would not have been better to have given the money in the first place rather than have the expense of carrying and then of recovering those loans.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we have not conducted this because Ontario has left the loan business, as of two years ago. So we have no way of determining the administrative costs involved in the loan programme. This is something that the hon. member would have to obtain from the federal authorities. Incidentally, you will find the phraseology slightly different in the 1968-69 brochure for the student awards. Perhaps you will not find it quite as difficult, but I say this to the hon. member—

Mr. Pitman: I am glad to hear that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not completely different, I assure you of that. I would say to the hon. member that one must accept certain priorities in this situation and recognize that tuition fees are increasingly a decreasing portion of his total costs.

This must be understood, and while I do not want to get into a debate with my friend from Scarborough East on the relative statistics, here or in the state of California, I think I am still right when I relate the total percentage in that state as they come from the various income groups within that jurisdiction. I think it still has validity, and this is based on a non-fee paying type of post-secondary institution that has been in existence there for some time—although this, too, is a bit of fiction.

Because while I say it is non-fee paying, there are certain ancillary fees that impose something of a burden on the students attending the University of California. There is no question that their fringe fees are probably higher than they are here in this jurisdiction. As I say, and I think the students themselves recognize this, the problems really are not necessarily related to the student ward programme *per se*.

The difficulties, if they exist, and I believe they do exist, start perhaps at the elementary or secondary level. Our statement is this, and I think it is valid, Mr. Chairman, that anybody who obtains or has the ability to enter a university has the financial resources now to do so.

Mr. Pitman: If he goes into debt.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think where we are having difficulty is perhaps where some students, in the early grade levels or secondary grades who, for one reason or another—and I do not know the reasons; with great respect I think Professor Porter has indicated some

of them, but I do not think it is conclusive in itself, I think he might agree with this—but the fact remains, that this student award programme is not directed at, nor can it solve, the problems that may exist at the secondary level. I think this is a different situation, and I think the students themselves recognize this.

We have said to the students of this province, we have said to the committee that is advising the department, "within the total dollars that are available, suggest to us ways and means of improving the programme". And I think in fairness they have had really pretty wide scope in making these suggestions. And as I said in my opening remarks, I do not say we have perfection. But we have not found, certainly in this jurisdiction, a better philosophical or practical approach to the provision of student assistance. And as I say I would be delighted if the hon. members know of schemes that are superior to this; we would like to take a look at them.

Mr. Pitman: Could the Minister tell me whether the cost of sending a student to a college of applied arts and technology, if the fees that are charged there relate in the same way to the total cost of education. Are the fees of a student at a college of applied arts and technology a quarter or one fifth of the total cost of education, as they might be at the university level? Because I do see a real problem here of social stratification, of sending the lower income or lower middle income people to a college of applied arts and technology and of those who are in the upper incomes continuing to be the major group who are in the university, just as we read in these statistics here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give the hon. member this information. I do not think it will be available for another year or two until we get greater stability in the college programmes. It is obvious that the cost of education at a college of applied arts and technology is substantially less than at the university, so are the fees. What the percentage of cost is related to fees at the colleges of applied arts and technology, and to have any validity in comparing this with the university, I think we are a year or two away before we can make this type of comparison. In other words, we are going through a phase where it is very difficult to make a valid comparison. Suffice it to say that fees are less, costs are less.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment on the last question raised by the member for Peterborough.

Information I have here is that for 1968-69, operating costs for a student at university are $3,237 whereas operating costs based on an estimate of 25,000 students in the CAATs in 1968-69 is $1,917. Now I will just refer those statistics to the Minister. I think they are from his own department or from OISE. The table that I have got is labelled table B6. I do not know where it came from; someone stuck it in an envelope and sent it to me.

And I think the question the member for Peterborough—

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is not valid either, because when you take these statistics from the universities, you have to include in it the cost of graduate work which you do not have in a college programme. This is why I think you cannot make a valid comparison as to the percentage a student is paying by way of fees to the college programme, as it relates to the university at this stage.

I can give you the total number of students, I can give you the total cost. But what validity this has by way of comparison, I question.

Mr. T. Reid: Right. But the member for Peterborough simply asked, the Minister, Mr. Chairman if he takes $3,237, which is the cost calculated by OISE, I understand, for a student for 1968-69, and put over that the tuition fee, which is about $575 now at some universities, you get a percentage.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The average is about $525, I think.

Mr. T. Reid: So you get a percentage. What the member for Peterborough wanted to know was what is some sort of average tuition fee for the CAATs, put that over $1,917 and what do you get? We are very suspicious over here, of course. In our minds is that the people in the CAATs might be getting less, or they might be getting more. We want to know what you think is equitable. Not whether it is another question of statistics. Answer the first question, the question of statistics.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, as I say, it is too early to determine this as far as the colleges are concerned, because we have not achieved a level of maturity where one can say this will be a continuing cost of the programmes. I think in two or three years we can come up with a cost because I think the figure will be higher. I think the cost of operation at the colleges, probably on a percentage basis, will go up in the next two or three years more rapidly than they will at the

universities. I think that this is understandable.

As the programmes themselves become more widely based, and the quality is upgraded, I do not think there is any question that thet percentage cost increase will be higher then. As I say, I think we are too early to make this type of comparison and have validity. I can give you statistics, but this does not solve the problem.

I am sorry, the average cost this year in the arts course—I was wrong—is about $485, not $525.

Mr. T. Reid: Could I just follow up specifically on this, Mr. Chairman? I accept the Minister's remarks, but it is difficult.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And also one other point is that we are talking mainly about this year, the first year of the college programme, or at least most of the students are in the first year. They will now be going into the second. There will be three-year programmes and, as the hon. member, I am sure, knows, it has been brought to my attention with great regularity that the cost of operation of the universities in third and fourth years are higher on the average than in the first and second years. This is why we cannot yet say, when we are dealing basically with first year students, that we have come up with a good average cost figure for the college programme, because we have not moved into the second and third year of operation.

Mr. T. Reid: Yes. We will get to this question about whether cost in third and fourth year should and ought to be—in a later estimate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not saying that. I am saying the universities say they are higher.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, we will question that one. I have some statements when we get to that area.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the member would like to withhold his questions for the time being.

It being 6 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.

APPENDIX

(See page 4164)

PROVINCIALLY ASSISTED UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO

	1964-65	*1968-69 (Estimated)*
Total enrolment	44,852	82,022
Post grade 13 undergraduate students	37,085	68,441
First year students	13,552	24,652
Graduate students	5,421	9,768
Percentage of age group 18-21	11.8%	16.9%
Full-time enrolment by institution		
—Brock University	124	919
—Carleton University	2,729	5,720
—University of Guelph	1,927	5,094
—Lakehead University	466	2,055
—Laurentian University	556	1,702
—McMaster University	3,312	5,657
—Ontario College of Art	883	1,050
—University of Ottawa	3,838	5,066
—Queen's University	4,029	6,234
—University of Toronto	15,207	21,345
—Trent University	105	973
—University of Waterloo	3,137	7,824
—University of Western Ontario	5,274	8,989
—University of Windsor	1,986	3,727
—York University	795	5,667*
—Osgoode Hall law school	484	
Total	44,852	82,022
Provincially assisted universities operating grants	$42,376,000	$201,949,102
Capital support		
Actually paid to universities	45,600,000	
Available	54,675,000	125,000,000
Student awards	4,955,069	32,086,000
Number of students assisted	8,654	50,000
Teaching staff	3,247	6,718**

*Osgoode Hall law school will be a part of York University effective July 1, 1968.

**Estimate reported by the individual universities as at November 15, 1967.

No. 113

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, June 10, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 10, 1968

Estimates, Department of University Affairs, Mr. Davis, concluded 4199

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wishart, agreed to 4237

Errata 4238

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS
(Concluded)

On vote 2401:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, a point of information. I have some remarks to make on the student aid programme and I know that we have been discussing this in these estimates; should I wait until we get to the specific estimate?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of University Affairs): I was wondering the same thing, Mr. Chairman. I have always been relatively flexible but I think, really, to give some order to it, we should wait until vote 2404.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, then I would like to commence my remarks on vote 2401 in the following context.

I would like to refer the Minister to the Prince Edward Island Act which he no doubt knows. I would particularly like to record some of the sections in it which I think are quite important, because, as I see the Prince Edward Island Act, which established a university commission for more property for the secondary vocation commission, it is quite different in terms of concepts from the Act the Minister referred to in the United Kingdom.

It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that concepts can be valid without application to the geographical, social and institutional setting. In this case I think some of the concepts in the Prince Edward Island Act are worthy of serious consideration by the Ontario government, when it moves—perhaps after the next provincial election in 1971-72—to establish an independent university commission. The section in the Prince Edward Island Act I would like to put into the record is section 3, subsection 2, and this is what it says: It says that there shall be three advisory committees established to assist and make recommendations to the commission in examining the role of post-secondary education in the province. Of course, in Ontario, I am talking about the university commission only.

The first committee is called the academic advisory committee. This includes representation of presidents of universities, perhaps some of the administrative officers of the universities, and members of the faculty or teaching staff of the university, some of whom would perhaps be appointed by the president, but certainly most of whom would be appointed by the faculty in the universities in Ontario. I think that would be a very valuable committee to have for the Ontario university commission.

The second committee is what is called the government advisory committee. This is interesting because it switches the roles around from the present situation in Ontario. In other words, under the university commission there is a government advisory committee, and this would be composed, in the case of Prince Edward Island, of the Premier, the Minister of Education, the Deputy Minister of Education, the Minister of Labour, the Deputy Minister of Labour, the Provincial Treasurer, and the Deputy Provincial Treasurer. So in that committee we could reverse the roles. We could have a very active government advisory committee to the commission.

Finally, the third standing committee of the commission would be the student advisory committee which is made up, of course, of student representatives from the university. The method of selection should be determined by the representative student organization. Here you have, I think, a somewhat different model with somewhat different concepts from the university grants commission in the United Kingdom. I think some of the concepts in the Prince Edward Island Act could be and should be seriously considered in this province.

One other section, Mr. Chairman, in the Act is simply this, section 3. There shall be at least one meeting annually when the directors, the academic advisory committee, the government advisory committee and the student advisory committee shall convene

to exchange views and information in order to assist the directors—that is, the directors of the commission—to carry out their functions. Those are a couple of the concepts anyhow, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to read into the record and pass on to the Minister of Education.

I would also, at this time, like to make clear and to underline the basic point I made in my previous remarks, concerning what I call the threat to university autonomy in particular or the uncertainty under which universities operate *vis-à-vis* the government with a quotation from the president's report, 1966-67, York University. This will back up the quotations I made in my prepared remarks quoting the committee of presidents of the province and other sources. This what the president of York University said in his annual report. I just want to underline this to the Minister. He refers to the problem of the success of the system that the Minister is establishing. Then he refers to the cause of this:

> This problem relates to the gradual decline in the universities of criticism of government policies and practices in the field of higher education in the province, that is Ontario. This is an unusual state of affairs, for one of the important roles of the academic community is criticism of public policy.
>
> The reason for this is not that there are inadequate grounds for criticism, for no system is perfect. The reason may relate to the close working relationship established among members of the Minister's department, the committee of university affairs and the many members of the academic community involved in the work of the committee of presidents. All are co-partners in a growing enterprise, conscious of its strengths and imperfections and co-operatively responsible for them. One does not criticize publicly one's own work or that of a colleague in a joint project.
>
> A more apparent reason may be that the universities are becoming increasingly dependent on the provincial government for their funds and for the attainment of various goals. There is a less than subtle tendency not to be critical of one's main source of support. However understandable all this may be, it deprives the public, the members of the Legislature and often the government itself, of the critical judgment of those who should be knowledgeable about policies and practices in respect of university development in the province.
>
> There is not, of course, a conspiracy of silence, but there is an inevitable dulling of sharp criticism.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, on this sort of general aspect, I would like to say a few things about the proposal this party has made concerning the co-ordinated reform of The University Act.

Now in this regard, I believe my notes were taken correctly from the Minister's remarks. I believe the Minister said words to the effect that he was very aware of the views of Dr. Bissell on the subject. He was very aware of these views over a year ago since the views were contained in Dr. Bissell's annual report last year. I do, however, think it is significant that Dr. Bissell repeated those views only a week ago.

Instead of the Minister just sitting on his hands for a year why did he not act on Dr. Bissell's suggestion which he stated he accepted and knew of over a year ago? Why was the acceptance of the need for reform not a vital issue in his opening statement to the Legislature?

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say of a general nature.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would not want to disagree with the member for Scarborough East. I guess, as I say, we retain some flexibility. But really, I think his contribution has been an effort, to a degree, either to substantiate or refute remarks made in the opening remarks; which is fine, I do not quarrel with this. I would only point out that, certainly we are prepared to look at Prince Edward Island and the legislation there; but the hon. member himself made an observation that we cannot always compare two jurisdictions. He said it was not valid, necessarily, to compare the grants commission in the United Kingdom with what he was suggesting here, and I do not disagree with this. No one pattern that exists somewhere is necessarily applicable in this jurisdiction, and I think the same applies to Prince Edward Island.

As I understand the situation there, and the hon. member can correct me if I am wrong, as part of the government policy they are talking about a single university for that province, that St. Dunstan's, and Prince of Wales are going to become a single institution. I understand the head of Prince of Wales, and my memory may be wrong, has been less than enthusiastic; that they have had a great measure of controversy over this and that the advisory concept that the hon.

member suggests is something in reverse, that what they are doing there maybe should be part of our system here.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure you if one could project this type of thinking into the thinking of Ontario I can envisage this occurring: three years from now the hon. member for Scarborough East saying to me: "Here you are on the advisory committee to this group, what in heaven's name has gone wrong?"

They are getting too much, or not enough –the exact same arguments would apply.

All I am saying–and I will not be repetitious because we have been through this in three other sessions–I do not say that the existing system represents perfection, I do not say the advisory committee and the concept that has been developed here is necessarily the final step on what will happen in the relationship between government and university; all I say is, and I think that the facts will record it and history will record it, the last four or five years represent the most significant growth in university development in this jurisdiction compared to any in Canada.

The relationship between government and the universities, while it is not, once again, perfection, probably is as healthy as can be found. And I do not care–

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Where did your modesty go?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought I was being very modest!

I say this from a purely practical point of view. I do not reject consideration of the grants commission or any other method that can better the situation or improve it. All I say is that no matter what vehicle is selected, the desire on the part of the member for Scarborough East who in some way completely divorced the operation of the grants commission from any government or legislative involvement–which in fact is what he is trying to do–is just unrealistic.

The same problems will come back and be debated here year after year. I can just see it now. "A grants commission appointed in 1969; X number of dollars allocated by the government to the grants commission; Toronto University does not get enough"–you think we will not hear about it in this Legislature? "York University does not get enough"–do you thing the hon. member, in spite of his desire to dissociate himself from that great institution in the northern part of Metro, do you think we will not hear about it in this House? Of course we will! And so we should; I do not quarrel with this. But let us not–

Mr. Nixon: You said you did not have a crystal ball.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not have one, but I can predict this much. This is very basic.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Have you been provoked?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Never, I have never been provoked, Mr. Chairman.

I am just saying let us discuss these issues, I am delighted to do so, but let us also recognize that the proposed grants commission–which is not new in itself, I say this with respect to the member for Scarborough East, this is not new. The member for Peterborough nods his head in agreement, he recognizes it is not new.

Let us not suggest that this is a solution and a permanent solution to the problems that I think are going to continue to exist. But of course, Mr. Chairman, I guess if we did not have problems there would not be need for some of us to carry on certain responsibilities.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I would like to say a few words on this.

I think there is a misconception. It seems to me that the responsibility of the Minister is to see that sufficient overall resources are available for the universities of Ontario; all the universities.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In whose judgment?

Mr. Pitman: In the judgment of the Minister and in terms of his relationship to this government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, but, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but here he is putting the Minister in the postion of making a judgment based on my own knowledge–

Mr. Pitman: No, based on advice.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I do not. I make my judgments based on the advice of the advisory committee on university affairs, and I present these to the government.

This is correct; this is the great difference. Really you are giving me far greater authority, or proposed authority, on your joint scheme than we have now.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, as it is now the advisory committee on university affairs makes a certain recommendation, the Minister goes before the Cabinet, or goes before the Treasury board, and is unable to secure sufficient resources. He then goes back to the committee on university affairs, and says there are not these resources, we are so many hundreds of thousands of dollars short. Therefore, they take the money and they distribute it in a certain way. As it is now, the individual institutions jump over the committee on university affairs and come directly to the Minister. It seems there is a confusion of issues here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right.

Mr. Pitman: Should the Minister be responsible for finding the resources? Then the university grants commission, as a completely independent body, is responsible for dividing the money which the Minister has provided for.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is exactly what has happened. The advisory committee on university affairs has determined the allocation. And certainly it would happen if you had a so-called independent grants commission. What is an independent commission? It is a commission appointed by the government of any jurisdiction as representative of the total public. I can assure you once again, with some experience because it has happened elsewhere, that if the grants commission did not receive sufficent funds, in the minds of the university, do you think they would be content and say, "Well, the grants commission has not done a job, and we do not like their allocation, but we will let it go at that"? Do you think they would not be on the doorstep of the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) the next day? Of course, they would.

Mr. Pitman: It seems the responsibility of the universities would be to make sure the Minister and the government realized that, in their opinion, the total amount of money which had been allocated to university education in this province would have to be increased for the sake of the economy, for the sake of the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we are talking about two principles. One is the total resource available; the other is the method of distribution. I do not care how you develop whatever technique you may wish or you may imagine. The total resource available, I think in the foreseeable future, will meet the expectations of the academic community or the university community. I think we might as well accept this, and it is not the function of the Minister, surely, in this mythical reorganization.

Surely it is not the function of the Minister with limited knowledge—no advisory committee—to go to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) or Treasury board in the Cabinet and say, "On the basis of my limited knowledge I think the university grants commission this year should have $300 million. We will let them decide how it is to be distributed." What validity is there in my judgment? If it is not sufficient, and chances are it might not be sufficient, do you think the universities are going to be content with the distribution by the grants committee?

Mr. MacDonald: I do not want to horn in on this, there has been enough of it already. I am not so interested in the mechanism, but the Minister says he does not want to be the man who wants to make the judgment. But this year the university presidents said they needed to maintain their necessary expansion, $340 million, and you exercised your judgment to $220 million or something like that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, let us be factual. I did not exercise my judgment to the Treasury board.

Mr. MacDonald: The Treasury board did it for you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, with great respect, the university affairs committee, in the same way as the grants commission would function, made recommendations to this government. They did not accept the overall request made by the universities. They never have. They made a recommendation to the government.

Mr. Pitman: There was no change in that recommendation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, there was a change in the recommendation, but not to the extent nor in the way suggested by the member for York South. I might also say, Mr. Chairman, it is the first time that any reduction was made. And the distribution was left entirely up to the committee on university affairs. Or, shall we say, the determination of distribution.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that what the Minister has said just now is in flat contradiction to what the presidents of Ontario have said in their report. I

would like to put this on record right after the statement he just made. On page 42 of their 1966-67 report, they say:

> The committee acts in an advisory capacity to the government and there is a natural desire on the part of its members to have its advice accepted on as many occasions as possible. This situation carries with it the danger that the committee may be tempted to tailor its advice to what it believes to be consistent with the government's own order of priorities.

The point I have made and we have made, that Ken Bryden has made in this House, that my leader has made in this House, is that you can do away with that danger by getting out of it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, in the practical point of view, you cannot. Let us be very practical about it. I am delighted to participate in, shall we say, theories, but the practice would be the same, whether you had a so-called independent grants commission or not; at some stage the government is involved in the total number of dollars involved. With great respect to the member for Scarborough East and the quotation from the university presidents, and I am always interested in the way these things are phrased from time to time—"this may happen", this might happen", "there is a possibility that this might exist"—but the fact remains that for the years that I have had the responsibility in this area, the recommendations of the advisory commitee have been accepted by the government until this year when they were reduced—really in a very minimum way, but they were reduced. The important aspect—and I think this is a relevant part, Mr. Chairman—was the determination of how the moneys were to be distributed after the reduction was left in the hands of the university advisory committee. It had nothing to do with the Minister or the government.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister described it as minimal and the reduction was, as I understand it, from $340 million requested by the presidents to $220 million—that strikes me as being a bit more minimal.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I recall it, the amount that the university affairs committee recommended to the government, which was discussed by the government and returned to the university affairs committee —and I think I am right in this—that the request for a reduction was in the neighbourhood of $4.5 million in the total budget—$4.5 million—and I think this, in the total context, is a minimum reduction in budget. $4.5 million that was the total reduction.

You cannot compare, Mr. Chairman, what the university presidents in total are asking for with the initial recommendation of the committee on university affairs. They made a recommendation to the government and this amount was reduced by $4.5 million.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, one of the things which I mentioned in my opening remarks had to do with the whole question of long-term financing. I would like to read just a small excerpt from the book "From the 60s to the 70s":

> In 1964 the provincial government changed its method of capital support to universities from grants out of current revenue to loans amortizable over a thirty-year period and placed the administration of the programme of capital support in the control of The Department of University Affairs. The committee on university affairs has not been consulted on capital development except for projects which are for one reason or another atypical. It has not therefore been in the position to take the over-view of the system as a whole. The experience we have quoted by different universities under this arrangement has varied widely, in some cases there has been nothing serious to complain of except delays, in others the planned and phased constructions scheduled have been interrupted or even stalled without adequate explanation or without any apparent consideration for the academic consequences.
>
> Apart from the uncertainty and frustration involved for particular institutions, this way of handling capital programmes precludes any knowledgeable academic assessment of the situation as a whole. One cannot really say that consistent and co-ordinated planning exists either individually or collectively. The principal victims of this impasse may turn out to be the students. It is the amenities provided for the student use that are x'd out of plans for new academic buildings as not qualifying for financial support.

Now, a few moments ago I mentioned the question of long-term planning over a four or five year period. The Minister did not reply to that in his remarks. I would be very pleased to hear what he has to say and what he feels the new committee might have to do with this question of giving plans to the universities for a four or five year period.

How does he propose to deal with the yearly estimates in that context?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared once again to debate the presidents' report of 1966-67 although I should point out that I think we debated it—certainly the leader of the Opposition and I debated one or two aspects of it a year ago at this time and I recall several excerpts being read to me from that same report. I do not mind going back a year but if the hon. member for Peterborough would refer to page 15 of my remarks as it relates to capital, because the presidents' report is not—and they would I think recognize this—accurate in light of what has happened.

In the meantime, each provincially assisted university has outlined its priorities of capital development for 1968-1969 and submitted these to the department. At my request the committee on university affairs reviewed all of these submissions and related them to total provincial requirements. The recommendations which I have received as a result of this very careful review have been reported to the various institutions and will, I know, ensure that our capital funds are effectively invested in university expansion during the new fiscal year.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, that is relevant, is the space utilization study—for want of a better term – that the university presidents had agreed and the university affairs committee had agreed was the best way to come to grips with the question of capital costs and capital planning. This study, Mr. Chairman, is currently under way.

Let us also face this fact: even under the considerations that were made recently for 1968-1969, there are going to be some institutions that are disappointed, and yet, Mr. Chairman, there will be a total of $125 million made available for capital purposes. I am sure, just because of the competitive—and understandably so—nature of these institutions there are going to be some who will say this not sufficient for us. I recognize this, but the committee had to make certain decisions and I think that they based them on a high degree of validity and conscientious thinking.

I have accepted their recommendations and this is the situation as it relates to capital. I say once again, with respect certainly it is not necessarily perfection, but I think it represents a great deal of thought on the part of the committee and the department in making an effort to see that the universities can plan and develop intelligently. Some of them will not be able to develop at the rate they would like, and I think this is something that has to be expected.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask this, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me we are having trouble here with words: "reviewed all these submissions and related them to total provincial requirements."

What is meant by total provincial requirements? Do you mean requirements in terms of manpower; do you mean requirements in terms of the needs of various professions, of business schools; do you mean requirements in terms of student enrolment? You see the question there is that the departments of the universities do not know what these requirements are—they do not know what you want in terms of these various areas. As a result there is no way that they can plan over an extended period.

The Minister still has not given me any indication that he recognizes the universities would like to be a part of the total planning. They do not want to simply pass on what they believe to be their requirements within their narrow purview and then have the committee tear them down and say, "This is not our requirements." They go to the committee and say, "Well, what do you mean by your requirements?" They say, "We do not really know; we cannot really tell you what our requirements are because we have not got all the studies and the results of all these needs in various sections of the economy." Some of the universities are completely and very confused as to exactly what the Minister really wants.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, what the Minister really wants—I am not sure how relevant this is as to what the Minister really wants—and I say that while there may be a certain degree of confusion, and I say it is minimum, the great problem is, as I stated earlier, that under an approach such as this, where resources will not meet the expectations of all the institutions, certain very hard decisions have to be made. This is going to cause some difficulties at some institutions, I recognize this; but then the alternative is, of course, to say to each institution, "Yes, you can proceed with every capital project that you have sought us to accept." This cannot work either, Mr. Chairman.

The universities recognize it and I say, with great respect, and perhaps the hon. member is closer to all these institutions than I am—I do not know, perhaps he is—I do not

think the confusion really exists to the extent that the hon. member suggests. I think they know. I am not saying they are completely content with it, do not misunderstand me. I am sure that with the recent allocation of capital there will be some that are unhappy about it. I do not dispute this.

Mr. Pitman: I do not want to press this too much further, Mr. Chairman, but the point is this, I think. The universities would like, rather than to be bringing things to the Minitser—or to the committee, I should say—to have them chopped down in terms of the resources and in terms of what appears to be provincial needs; they would prefer, I think, to be a part of the planning and see exactly where they did fit into it over a five-year projection.

I think the Minister realizes that building a university is extremely complex and you have got to look for your colleagues, look for your professors, two or three or four years ahead. You have to know how many you are going to have, in terms of buying equipment, in terms of hiring technical assistance. All of these things have to be done on a several years basis. In some cases I think it is a wasteful method if, for example, a university is successful in hiring and looking after its professional needs for a two- or three-year period and then discovers that it has to cut back on some capital project which would have made the best use of those professors and of that staff.

What I am suggesting is that if they could find themselves as part of a plant and could see where they were going, I think they would be far more willing to accept the suggestion which the Minister has made—that they will achieve the status or the size or the role of a full university over a more extended period because of the resources or lack of resources that exist.

In other words, I think what the university does resent is being given the expectation at some point that it is going to have so many students or certain capital projects completed by certain date, and then having them slashed back and then having to readjust the entire university for perhaps a two- or three-year period. Then, of course, as I say, you have a waste of both human and actual talents when you do this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this either because I think to a degree we are not that far apart. To say that the universities should be involved, we could not agree more and they are. They are, shall we say, not co-sponsors necessarily but they are very directly involved in the space utilization study which I think is very basic to the planning of future physical plants. I do not think there is any question about this and they are very directly involved in it.

But, as I say, you know we could go back into discussion of the recommendations on graduate study. There are some pretty specific recommendations there. The universities have accepted some. They have rejected others. It did not provide any panacea either to the problems that we face in the field of graduate work. All I am saying is that there is no easy, pat solution to these situations. I think really, that while we have some problems, I do not think that we have inhibited the growth of our institutions of higher learning. I do not think there are many, if any, universities really in the position suggested by the member for Peterborough—not that I know of at this particular point in history.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, could I just add a word on this one?

The Minister referred to the leader of the Opposition referring to the presidents' report last year. I think we should be clear that the Minister was probably referring to the report entitled "From the 60's to the 70's", whereas the report that we have been using here, the member for Peterborough and myself, I believe, is the publication entitled "Systems Emerging", which is the first annual review of the committee of presidents of universities.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought he was using the other report, but I am not sure. All right.

Mr. T. Reid: The point is that this publication came out in September, 1967 and of course, you could not have heard it being used last year. It is a much more up-to-date document.

In this document, on page 28, there is a discussion of this problem that the hon. member for Peterborough has brought up. The presidents refer to a committee of university officers concerned with capital financing who were engaged in a study for the committee of presidents. Of course, there probably was liaison with the Minister's department. They say that the study of the short-term problem—that is, I believe, from July 1, 1964, to June 30, 1969—the study of the short-term problem is now well advanced. They said this in September of 1967, many months ago. To continue with the quotation:

> And it is hoped that it will lead to a means of revising on an interim basis, the

current capital financing arrangement so as to enable the university to carry on with expansion plans for the next two years while a more sophisticated method of approach is developed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is in fact what has been done.

Mr. T. Reid: Is the report available?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes. The universities were informed of the interim approach on March 26, 1968. This was moving to the 95 per cent, the review of capital projects from 1964, to see if we could not help with the backlog of their financial problems. As I understand it, while once again there may not be complete acceptance as to total dollars, this interim capital policy has been accepted by the universities. This has been done. They were informed of this on March 26 and that relates specifically to what the hon. member is referring to.

I could be wrong, but I did overhear the member for Peterborough refer some time this afternoon to a publication entitled "From the 60's to the 70's" which is the one which the hon. leader of the Opposition did refer to in the estimates last year. I think the hon. member for Peterborough referred to "From the 60's to the 70's," I may be wrong, but he did.

Mr. T. Reid: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, we have pursued this type of capital planning as far as we can at this point. All we can do is say we hope that the government will come up—

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is an interim situation. We know and yet I think, in fairness, it is equitable.

Mr. Pitman: Can I take just one point on the same area as the hon. member for Scarborough East—I will give the floor back to him in just a moment.

It seems to me that all the planning which is talked about here is from one end. That is, what we are doing is space utilization and we are going to look at suitable enrolment. We are going to deal with all these problems but I never seem to feel that there is any co-ordination with the statistics at the other end of what we are trying to produce.

This, it seems to me, is what you have to co-ordinate. This secondary role of the university, which is much on the Minister's mind and which is taking most of the Minister's expenses, is the needs of the universities —the economic needs, the manypower needs which the universities are trying to fulfill. This is the kind of planning which never seems to get off the ground in the sole question of university planning.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, turning now to a slightly different area and a much more specific problem.

The Minister referred in his speech—page 18 of the copy I received—that we could expect to be expending $400 million for operating costs on our universities, I suppose colleges are included in that, in 1973-1974.

Can I ask the Minister how many students that is based on? That is, what is the student enrolment projection in our universities in 1973-1974?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, these projections—and I hope in an aside this afternoon I said these were estimated costs—relate to, shall we say, experience over the past ten years and projections that, to date, have been relatively accurate. As I recall my figures this afternoon, I suggested that by 1970-1971 enrolment would reach 100,000; it would probably continue to grow at a rate of 10,000 per year thereafter. So this means if we use the figure $400 million in 1975, we are talking of 140,000 to 150,000 students.

Mr. T. Reid: Just to follow up. This is a table and perhaps the Minister could tell me whether he agrees with these estimates. It gives the following estimates for university enrolments and operating costs:

For 1968-1969, an enrolment of 87,000, total operating costs for 1968-1969, $281.6 million. Then for 1975-1976—

Hon. Mr. Davis: What is the source of this?

Mr. T. Reid: This is a table entitled "Table B6—projected enrolment and operating costs of various educational streams."

Hon. Mr. Davis: From where, again?

Mr. T. Reid: This is one of the problems I have, Mr. Chairman. It just came in the mail to me and I do not know where it is from.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I cannot help the hon. member then.

Mr. T. Reid: The thing I wanted to know is whether your figures jibe with these.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not know if they do. You have figures for 1968-1969 of at least our projected enrolment which I gave in my opening remarks. You have the costs as set out in the estimates. How close they come to the material you received through the mail, I do not know.

Mr. T. Reid: For 1975-1976, you give a university enrolment figure of about 122,000, and total operating costs of $668 million.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do you know if this includes graduate studies as well? I used a figure of around 140,000 to 150,000, maybe something slightly less than 140,000.

Mr. T. Reid: Right. Do the Minister's estimates, say for 1975, include an operating cost per student of somewhere in the neighbourhood of $5,500? That would have an inflation factor in the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to be that specific. We are saying, and I think we are relatively close, a figure of $400 million for 1975. Once again, it is so difficult to make projections because one cannot determine whether certain areas of university education will increase in cost; whether new techniques will be found to reduce it in certain other areas. But I think we are relatively close at the $400 million figure.

As I say, it may turn out to be a bit of a conservative estimate because who can project really what the dollar will be worth in 1975? This is something over which I certainly have no control.

Mr. Pitman: I notice that the cost in the main office has risen almost double in the last two years; we are losing about 24 per cent just in this year. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what activities in the main office have been responsible for this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, of course one of the major items this year in the main office expenditure increases was the $100,000 for the proposed special committee on post-secondary education in Ontario. This is one of the significant increases.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if the Minister could elaborate on this committee for post-secondary education. I remember reading last year, I think, a statement that this was one of the most significant steps. I think I will read it from the *Globe and Mail*:

> Mr. Davis called it one of the most significant steps ever taken on higher education in this or any other jurisdiction.

I think you would have to admit it is also one of the slowest steps that has been taken. I wonder if he could elaborate on what he told us this afternoon as to why it has been so difficult to get people to serve on this committee.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is only part of the problem, Mr. Chairman. Part of the problem has been personality; the other complicating features have been really the terms of reference and the structure of the commission. There is a very strong point of view that it should be a very representative type of commission involving representatives from many areas of the academic community. It would not be serving on a full-time basis and, with perhaps three or four commissioners serving full time, then the total commission meets once or twice a month, for perhaps two or three days. This has been one method suggested.

It has also been suggested to me that it really should be developed on the basis of two or three individuals. This would involve, of course, having people forget about their present employment for a year-and-a-half or two years. There has also been discussion quite recently as to the orientation of such a study committee, whether we should be getting into one or two of the areas mentioned by the member for Scarborough East? Whether the straight statistical part of it is becoming—perhaps I should not say unimportant—but not as important as we felt it was when all of us were discussing this a year ago? Whether some direction should be given toward the structure of the institutions involved? I have found in my limited experience that it is very difficult to get unanimity in the university committee community—if not almost impossible—although I think there has been a very good relationship. I am hopeful in the next very few days to see if we cannot reach some consensus on the best method of proceeding on this.

I think this is very important—although I will not say, Mr. Chairman, that this is necessarily the only way to come up with some of these decisions or some of these recommendations. Nor will I say that the terms of reference should not be altered to include certain other situations—it is something, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see finalized very shortly. I am optimistic that we can. But, once again, I think it is very important that the selection of personnel and the terms of reference really be done in complete consultation with the university community because in order to have, I think,

the report—can be valid from the government's point of view; it might be valid from the total university community point of view perhaps—but I think to be acceptable to them in total it has got to be done in a way that makes sense to them as well as to the government. Now that is a very awkward way of phrasing it but what I am saying is that it has to be done, as has been suggested to me so many times, in complete consultation with the university community and the other post-secondary institutions.

Mr. T. Reid: One further point. Is the estimate of $100,000 for the special committee on post-secondary education in Ontario inclusive of all the research that will be done, or will the research arm of the main office be used to do some of the research for the committee? In other words, do we see in the items labelled research information branch an item to do some of the research for that special committee which is not included in the $100,000?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we anticipate that some of the resources in the existing research and information branch, a lot of the statistical information that is already available, and some of the work which will be ongoing, will be available to the committee. Also, I think it should be pointed out that the $100,000 amount estimated here relates probably to an eight-month period, not a full year's period of operation. Our estimates here are based on our fiscal year, whereas when you are discussing the estimates, grants and operating costs of the universities, you are talking about the university fiscal year from July 1, until the end of June, I think.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to follow up on the general rates of increase in the various items in the main office expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, if one takes the period 1965-1966, right through to the estimates for 1968-1969, that is a period of four years, 1965-1966, 1966-1967, 1967-1968, and 1968-1969, one gets the following results. I would like to state these and then ask the Minister to comment. It follows up directly from what the hon. member for Peterborough said when he asked: "Why is there such a rate of increase in main office expenditures?"

In order to get a consistent time-series, you have to net out certain items. For example, up to 1968-1969, the grant for the advisory committee on university affairs was included in the main office estimates. And for 1968-1969, it has been transferred to a separate estimate. So one must net that out. The estimated increase in the costs of the advisory committee on university affairs is from $50,000—and these are the estimate figures—in 1965-1966, to $75,000 in 1967-1968.

But we must take these out of the main office expenditures to get a consistent series. This is necessary if you want to compare the rate of increase in main office expenditures over a number of years. I have taken the option of excluding this grant from the time series over the number of years.

This is what one finds by taking this out, but, leaving in the $100,000 for the special committee on post-secondary school education—which occurs only in 1968-1969—we find that the main office estimates—and these are not the expended figures but the estimates only—in 1965-1966 are $282,000, increasing to $396,000 in 1966-1967, to $685,000 in 1967-1968, and to $1,006,000 for next year. This is a rate of increase between 1966 and 1967, and next year of about 168 per cent. It is halfway between doubling and tripling over a two-year period.

What I find interesting, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister in his statement today on page 17, refers to the tremendous increase in support to our universities, both real and relative over the initial years of this decade. In other words, he stresses the fact that university grants have been increasing tremendously. But the interesting point here is that when we compare the increase in estimates for his own main office, to the increase in grants to the universities, we find that the increase in the cost of the Minister's own office—his bureaucracy, if you like—is greater than the increase in the operating grants to university and colleges in Ontario.

I would like to draw this to the Minister's attention because the rate of increase in expenditure is not just for grants to universities; it is in his own bureaucracy. It is in his own main office. I would, therefore, like to ask, Mr. Chairman, what the reason is for such a massive increase over a period of two years. If you take the main office estimates you find that they are halfway between doubling and tripling in a two-year period from 1966-1967 to next year, 1968-1969. Salaries, for example, have more than doubled; maintenance costs have almost tripled in his office; maintenance costs have increased from $115,000 in 1966-1967 to $315,000—and that is a great deal.

There is, of course, the additional $100,000 for next year. But why, in heaven's name,

does the Minister's maintenance costs almost triple, whereas the operating grants to the universities and colleges have less than tripled. Is there any reason for this? Is it really necessary for salaries to more than double over a two-year period in his own office?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I could rely on the argument used by the member for Peterborough that this is an emerging department, the cost of emerging administrations are more than those that are established. I think that this might be a very valid argument. Perhaps the hon. member for Peterborough—

Mr. Nixon: You have used it for two or three years now!

Mr. Pitman: As long as I can use it, too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I can assure you, your colleagues at Trent do use this, and understandably so.

If one can relate it back, say one year only —and let us take it a year at a time— The increase is $240,000. Inclusive in the sum last year was $75,000 for the committee on university affairs which has been taken out. Included this year is the $100,000 for the proposed commission. When you look into the field of administration, actually our cost this year—for the administration branch of the department as I read the figures—probably will be $6,000 less than it was in the previous year.

And taking the accounts branch, Mr. Chairman, as I read the figures, we are roughly the same. There is a substantial increase, Mr. Chairman, in the architectural services branch and this relates, firstly, to the change in policy whereby we have had to review so many submissions, and secondly, because of the increased number of capital projects that now are coming into the department. There has been an increase, of course, in the student awards vote—some $20,000—and this once again relates to the substantial increase in the number of applications that need to be processed.

We have added, Mr. Chairman, and I think properly so in fact, I think some might argue we should have done it before—an information section to the department which we did not have prior to this year. This is included in the research branch, but it is a new service that we will be providing for the department, and I think it is valid. I think, Mr. Chairman, these account for the bulk of the increase in expenditures. The hon. member suggests that our rate of cost as it relates to the main office has gone up on a percentage basis more than total grants. I do not dispute this for a moment. But when you look at the total ordinary expenditure—$285,982,000—with a main office expenditure of $1,600,000, I do not think it is to far out of line.

Mr. T. Reid: One has to watch one's pennies as well as one's millions—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are very careful about pennies in this department. We try to administer it with the minimum number of personnel.

Mr. T. Reid: I would just like to know if I am correct in this statement. The public accounts do not give the actual amount expended for the various subadministrative units in the Minister's office. In other words, I could not find in the public accounts—perhaps I just was not able to find them—the actual amount expended for administration, for the accounts branch, for architectural services, for financial requirements, research and students awards branch. The thing that strikes me, if I am right in saying that the public accounts do not actually let us know whether you are within your estimates, not just on the top items, but within your internal administration, is that I find it very difficult to be an effective critic.

Why does this information not appear in the public accounts? If the universities were so sloppy with their accounts I can just see this governnment cutting their grants.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I cannot say why public accounts do not contain information in the same fashion as this. Here we are discussing the estimates as they relate to the breakdown we have provided for the members of the House on these various items. I am not in a position to say what public accounts should or should not do. I do not think this is relevant to the discussion. This is maybe appropriate on some other occasion. I cannot be any more helpful than in outlining the areas of growth as I see them, from last year to this year, under the breakdown that we have provided here in our own estimates.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if the Minister could tell me the number of students who are now in grade 13, and how this relates to the number of new places which have been provided in all 14 universities?

It seemed to me that last year there were lots of places—in fact, there were some uni-

versities which had difficulty in securing the total number that they had expected. I am wondering too, about these projections. It seems to me that the projections were made by the head of the OISE, and I think at one point there were six different projections, all on different assumptions. I am wondering just what changes have taken place in these projections as a result of the rise of the colleges of applied arts and technology.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will endeavour to get the current enrolment in grade 13. I had it here last Thursday.

So far, the projections—and I am not sure they were really six sets of figures, I believe there were at least two sets of figures or projections—have been within, probably, one or two per cent over the last four years. I think it is also fair to state that last year there was a surplus of university places in this province. The extent of the surplus was not really significant, in that some institutions adhered very strictly to their admission requirements. Some, and I think appropriately so, became a shade more flexible. As a result the actual number of admissions was not too far off the projection. I think we were somewhere in the neighbourhood of 36,000 this year, and we are using this as the basis for projection this year. We are really using in most instances, the universities' own projections.

I would say though, that this could be an interesting year—I will be very frank about it—we do not know whether the change in the procedures in grade 13 may add some additional students who will be entering university. If it does, I think it is a good thing, and I believe that the universities can physically accommodate them. I think there will not be that great a difference but if there is any, I think it will be, shall we say, on the increase, rather than on the decrease. And I think this is a very helpful thing if it happens, but this is one time when, Mr. Chairman, I just cannot accurately say what this June will determine. This is something that we are going to have to live through.

Mr. Pitman: I think this is the point I was trying to make the other night in relation to the part of education estimates, that actually the so-called 60 per cent, which previously had been a 60 per cent created by The Department of Education, would now be created by each of the individual schools. This might create some very real problems.

The Minister does give the impression that he feels that universities are keeping out people who should be in the university. Is this—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did not intend to give this impression, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to be misunderstood. I am saying that last year, some of the universities took a somewhat more flexible approach to university admission. I do not want to go back to The Department of Education debates because I think we discussed this to a degree there. I think the debate really centred around—and I expressed this point of view then and I still express it—that no single criteria should be used as the basis for admission to any institution. I was hoping we were reaching a point where total student records and other forms of evaluation would be helpful in determining a student's admission to a post-secondary institution. So I am not saying that some universities are too high in their standards, or some are too low. I think there has to be a flexibility on the part of the universities, and I think some of them demonstrated this last September.

Mr. Pitman: On the architectural services branch. In your remarks this afternoon, I think you said all such submissions have been carefully reviewed by the department's architectural services branch. Am I given to understand that in this departmental branch, there is a far greater degree of reviewing of the various buildings? Is there planning of the various buildings, and to what extent is there an attempt to create a degree of sameness in the kinds of buildings that are placed on the various campuses across Ontario?

It seems to me that one of the things that we have in Ontario is campuses that look very different, and have a pleasing difference. I am wondering to what extent this department may be imposing a lack of variety?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The architectural services branch relates costs of individual projects to similar projects at other institutions. This is one method of comparison. The architectural services branch has not dictated a uniform design for, shall we say, laboratory facilities and what have you; they have not done this.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I might ask, to what extent the OISE is heavily involved, both in the research of information and any other aspects of the work of this main office.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would say that the institute is not heavily involved in research as it relates to the operation of

this department, other than in the area, of course, of statistical projections. This is their main area of interest. It is quite different from The Department of Education, where the research with respect to changes in curriculum, teaching methods, techniques, and so on, is a very necessary and valid part of the department's involvement. But in matters of curriculum and so on, I think it is not an area of involvement for The Department on University Affairs.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I might bring up a matter which interested me. Some years ago, I think the Ontario institute for studies in education was about to initiate a study of the failure rates in the first years in Ontario universities, and the Ontario institute did not carry through this project. I am wondering why, and also if, the Minister would regard that as a valuable piece of research for this institute to carry on.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Really, we should have discussed this last week. I do not know of this project, but I shall endeavour to find out for the hon. member, whether it was proposed and, if it was, why it was not pursued. I quite frankly do not recall it. I shall endeavour to find out for him.

Mr. Pitman: I am sure there was one meeting held, and after that one meeting, it appeared that the Ontario institute of studies in education became very disinterested in that particular project. I am not sure whether the board of governors decided that it was not such a good idea, or whether there was some pressure from the universities, but whatever the reasons—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think that if this did happen it might be the universities who were not enthusiastic. I do not know; I will find out.

Mr. Pitman: Fine.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would like to isolate one aspect that has been discussed earlier, because it is the one aspect that worries me most about the whole university affairs development. There has been considerable discussion in the last year as to whether or not we did not make a mistake through over-expansion to 14 universities in this province. I agree with the Minister and others in the debate earlier, that we did not over-expand. If we did, it was certainly for only a short time. With the increase of students coming up, those facilities are going to be needed to the full, and the over-expansion period will be, at worst, for a very brief period.

Further, the Minister has indicated that because of the limited resources that are available, the capital expansion programme has been expended. The universities presumably, as of March last, know that that capital expansion programme is going to be extended. But then the Minister made this comment, and this is the one that I want to zero in on. He said that as far as he knew, no university was stunted in its development—or words to that effect.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think I used the word inhibited.

Mr. MacDonald: Inhibited in its development.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They will not agree with me on this.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not certain that I agree with you. We have had the benefit in the House of two Opposition spokesmen—who are involved with universities—and quite frankly, I welcome this. I welcome members who can come with a detailed personal knowledge, whether it is from business or looking after the emotionally disturbed or working in a university.

An hon. member: Or farmers.

Mr. MacDonald: Or farmers, right—any group—particularly if there is a genuine dirt-farmer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not say this to be facetious but I have never found the member for York South at a loss to contribute quite constructively to the university affairs.

Mr. MacDonald: I am always most suspicious of the Minister when his blandishments point in my direction.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I mean it, anyway. I wish people would not be so suspicious.

Mr. MacDonald: What I wanted to isolate in this general discussion is the contention that the emerging universities—concerning which hon. members for Scarborough East and Peterborough might be a little inhibited—are being stunted in their development. If one examines the statement that was put out by the university presidents, they point to the reduction of the grants—a reduction

beyond which they expected, and which they, I think, had some reason to believe, would be available this year.

They point out the result of larger classes, in reduction of already insufficient opportunities for enriching contact between faculty and students. They point out—and this strikes me as extremely important—"Particularly serious is the effect the level of grants support will have on libraries. The libraries of the Ontario universities are deficient, not only in the extension and costly corrections needed to support graduate studies, but even at the basic undergraduate level." Then they point out: "New programmes already under way will be slowed down."

Setting aside the extension of the capital expansion over more years, if you are slowing down the regular programmes, if you are "inhibiting"—and I use the Minister's term—the development of good libraries; if you are creating bigger and bigger classes so that you reduce the kind of enriching relationship between the student and the faculty; it seems to me you are—I will use my word now—"stunting" the university development.

This is what disturbs me, because it seems to me the government was responsible for what might be described as the political decision of having 14 universities. The government places itself in an invidious position, if at some stage in the process of development, the government suddenly says: "Well, we discover we have not got enough resources for you to develop into a full-fledged university in an adequate period, so you have got to be inhibited for a few years." I do not think this is fair to the universities. I think the responsibility is back on your step—because if you made the mistake in saying some five or six years ago, that we are going to have 14 universities rather than 10 or 11 or 12, it was your mistake. I do not think the universities should have to pay for it now. And I think in the long run, it is not wise that they should have to pay for it. Now, is my proposition an unfair one?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would be the last one to suggest that the member for York South would ever be unfair. I say, that I think he is perhaps using information that relates to operating grants and translating this into the area of capital as well.

Mr. MacDonald: No. No, I was deliberately setting aside the capital moneys and the slow down in capital expansion. These are operational grants and the inhibiting results they are having on the development of the existing university and its programme.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can only say this with respect to operating grants: The recommendation from the committee took into account the emerging situation with respect to these new institutions. In fact, York is still included as an emerging institution, and special grants were made available for four or five institutions. There is no question about this. It was also indicated to them—for purposes of future planning—that this matter, of course, was subject to review, but that certain principles would probably be applied over the next two or three years, so they would have some idea of what is involved.

I do not think there is any question that some of them feel that they could logically utilize more resources this year. I think the committee feels, and feels very strongly, that this still gives them the opportunity to develop as a viable first-class institution. Now, in these matters of judgment, Mr. Chairman, I do not question for a moment that initially when the universities—the emerging institutions—calculated moneys they felt would be coming, they felt they were inhibited.

Also, when you get into the area of capital resources I am sure that some of them feel this way this year as well, I do not know. I have not discussed this with them individually, and yet it is interesting to note that we are providing—even with the problems we face as a province—$25 million more for capital this year than the universities have in fact been able to spend over the last two years. When I say over the last two year, I think it was about $100 million last year and this year we have allocated $125 million, so that there should not be too much inhibition. I am not saying, though, that they are all content. I would not say this.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, having isolated the problems of the emerging universities, I am not going to belabour the point. I was worried about it, and the Minister has not completely allayed my worries, but I will leave the matter rest. We can examine it next year.

But one final and rather small point that has always intrigued me. Two or three years ago, when we attempted to have our annual discussion on the closing of the door to university entrance by cutting off at 60 per cent, the Minister on one or two occasions made rather tough statements that students should not be kept out. McMaster, as I understand it, accepted students with a 55 per cent

average, as an experiment, to discover how much greater the failure rate would be in that group as compared with those who came in at 60 or even 65 per cent. I have been puzzled by my difficulty—and maybe it is my own fault—in getting a real assessment of that experiment. It seemed to me that the experiment must have failed so badly that even McMaster has not been very explicit about the results—or perhaps again I am wrong. Can the Minister enlighten me on exactly what was the result of that experiment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I cannot enlighten the hon. member on exactly what the result was. Now that he brings it to mind, I intend to pursue it myself to a greater degree. I understand though, that the experiment was not overly successful. In other words, it did not solve many problems.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned a few moments ago that it could well be that the new approach to matriculation examination would possibly result in a small increase in the number of students accepted at university next year. University entrance is something that is giving some concern, I believe, and that is the basis of assessment at the universities on what students will be accepted. I agree that the decision of the registrar or the admitting officers has to be as broad as possible and that the background of each student should be in a form that can be put before them.

We know as well that the universities are bemoaning to some extent the fact that there is not one set of marks that will give them an up-to-date assessment of the applicant. The Minister is also aware that here in Ontario there is some effort to develop an objective assessment of the ability of a student for continuing education. Also the committees of Ministers of Education working together across Canada have a programme—or some federal office of this type has a programme—that may very well provide an examination that would assist the universities in making their assessment on something more than just a provincial basis. Thus, students from one province to the other would have sort of a standard approach.

I wonder if the Minister can enlighten me and the other members of the House on this matter. I understood that at one time there was sort of a competition as to which approach the public moneys under the Minister's direction would be used to support. What assistance are we giving universities in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we are not directly giving universities assistance. We did discuss this, I felt, to some extent during the estimates of The Department of Education in reply to a question by the member for Peterborough with respect to the SACU tests. These are the national tests that are being developed where there are some final difficulties at the moment. As I said then—and I am still in this position—I cannot indicate what the extent of our support will be because of their present financial difficulties.

Mr. Nixon: SACU?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Service for admission to colleges and universities. This is the national—this is an independent organization that was initiated, really, I guess by the association of universities and colleges of Canada, in Ottawa. This is a national organization comparable to the college entrance boards in the United States.

We have in Ontario, though—because we were not sure just how far the national scheme might or might not go—been developing through the Ontario institute the OACU tests, which once again are comparable to a degree at least to the college entrance board examinations of the United States. I would think—and I am just guessing this and some of the members opposite would have a better idea than I have—that universities this year will be using the student record, their recommended situation from the individual high schools, and the OACU tests as the basis for admission for this coming September.

I would think they will be using all three criteria and where they will give the greatest weight I do not know. If I could offer any suggestion, I would really think that the recommended marks or position, from the school might be given some more weight just because the school has had a greater exposure to, and interest in, the particular student. As I say, I am no expert in this.

Mr. Nixon: I am sure the Minister will remember—and this has been mentioned before but it fits in here I think with some relevance—the fact that the grade 12 matriculation came to have a value depending upon which school had granted it after the departmental jurisdiction in control had been removed. I am quite sure that the Minister is right in urging, as he has done, that the universities put as much emphasis on the teachers' rating as possible.

Yet there is no doubt that the reason they might balk at giving this rating the emphasis that we would wish is the fact that certain

school systems tend to achieve higher levels of excellence than others. I do not know what can be done to level this out, whether or not it should be levelled out. But I believe further that there would be quite an advantage to students in this province if they were to have at least one objective rating from a source that was outside the province.

For that reason, I think we ought to continue to at least consider giving support to this organization with national jurisdiction so that we can give our young people the advantage of, perhaps, having a test or a recommendation of a type that would be acceptable to universities in other jurisdictions than our own.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask the Minister—there was some very real concern in the universities last fall when it was discovered that various universities would have to appeal to each individual school in the province in order to receive the grade 13 marks. I think the answer the university registrars received was that for this year they would receive the marks from the central office of the department, but that from then on each university would have to expect each individual school to send marks. It would seem to me that, in view of the number of schools, this is an unacceptable way for each university to have to operate.

I am wondering whether there has been any agreement on this matter with both the schools and the universities?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we are going through this transition period and I think practical implications will dictate what is going to happen. I think there was some suggestion, initially, that there should be a central registry of these marks from which they would be distributed to the universities.

I think from a practical point of view, because of early admission policies of some institutions, that the marks from the individual schools will be made available—and I am just saying this— to the institutions rather than to try and centralize it all. I think this is the way it probably will resolve itself in the next year or so.

Mr. Pitman: I think the great fear was the universities will have to contact each individual school in order to get the marks for each individual student who might apply. I think the universities would prefer to have some kind of co-operation with the department to get it from a central source.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, while the department is quite prepared to do this, I think with the policies of some universities where, in fact, they are granting early admissions based on, say, grade 12 or certain other testing or admission techniques, then, of course, the question of a central registry becomes relatively academic. While we do not want in any way to inconvenience the universities, I think, from practice, that the student marks—or the total school marks—will be submitted with the student application, which is perhaps the best way to treat it. We have no objection to a form of central registry in that we want all these results anyway, but there are several universities admitting, I think, even now on the basis of the grade 12, and the Christmas and Easter grade 13 results.

Mr. Pitman: Will the department be collecting the marks for all the schools?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The universities are already getting them.

Mr. Pitman: Yes, I realize that, but I would like to ask the Minister whether in the future it is the expectation that the department will be collecting the marks from the grade 13 year into university and will they be recorded in the department? I was under the impression that the principal would simply send the name to the department who would then simply mail out a piece of paper, saying—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure yet just what we are going to want for our own research or statistical information. It is not relating to the granting of the certificate that we may require in one year, say, total provincial marks in certain subject areas, so we can have some idea of the experience across the entire province. Our own policy in this regard certainly has not been finalized.

Mr. Pitman: I am wondering if the architectural services branch also deals with student housing?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Student housing, Mr. Chairman, is dealt with under a vote relating to The Department of Trade and Development, under the Ontario student housing corporation.

Mr. Pitman: Perhaps I might just ask this as a general question. It arises from the "System Emerging," a document which we have been dealing with; in the last sentence on page 39, the second paragraph:

> However, it would appear that full carrying charges and amortization can be met out of charges to students only by

raising residence fees substantially above current charges for student accommodation.

Does the Minister have any plans, any policies, to try and keep down the costs of residences across the province? I think last year this matter of residence was discussed at some length. I do not want to repeat what was said at that time, but I think the Minister indicated that from this point on, with the housing shortage in Ontario, it would become quite obvious that the universities would have to build residences; residences would have to be found beyond the availability of private homes. I am wondering exactly what the Minister's plans are in relation to this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think really the most equitable way of dealing with this, without getting into the question of subsidizing the total residence facility where some students may need it more than others, is to take into account any increase in residence fees in the cost to the student when we make the calculation of assistance under the student award programme. I think this is probably the most equitable way of dealing with it.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2401?

Mr. T. Reid: I was wondering whether I should restrict my remarks concerning the position of the new universities to vote 2402.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes. I think really that this is probably where we should have been on most of this discussion.

Mr. T. Reid: I will leave that for the moment then, Mr. Chairman. But I would like to return to the discussion I was having through you, Mr. Chairman, with the Minister about the need for an Opposition critic to have the actual expenditures for the various sub-items in the Minister's department. I realize this is not his responsibility and perhaps my request should go some other place. I would like to let the Minister know that it would make my job as a critic much easier if I had the actual amounts expended on the sub-branches in his department. The reason this is helpful to an Opposition critic, Mr. Chairman, is as follows.

When one compares the estimates to the actual expenditures for the years in which the actual expenditures are available, one can find out very interesting things about the operation of the budgeting procedures of a department. For example, in the main office expenditures there seems to be a consistent bias in that, for some items, the department keeps asking for more public funds than it expends; whereas in others, again in the main office only, the department and the Minister keep asking for less public funds than they actually expend. Now the latter—the concept that it asks for less public funds than it really expends and needs, means that persistent Treasury board additional grants become necessary.

Let me give some examples of what I mean in this context. For example, in the main office salaries in 1965-1966, the estimate was $172,000 and only $150,423 was expended. This is an error of 13 per cent. In 1966-1967 there was an even greater error in the same direction. That is to say, Mr. Chairman, the Minister comes to this Legislature, asks us for more money than he actually expends – he does it repeatedly.

Hon. Mr. Davis: At least we are spending less than we are asking for, which is not always the case.

Mr. T. Reid: And for next year, in the terms of the salaries in the Minister's main office, I would like to know whether we are being asked to approve yet another padded figure of $561,000. Roughly 13 per cent, $84,000, is pure pad. Let us look at another persistent bias in the other direction—main office maintenance. In 1965-1966 this Legislature approved $85,900 and this government spent in that year $135,851, an error of $48,000—or almost 60 per cent. The same error, Mr. Chairman, was repeated in the next year. In 1966-1967, there was an error in the same direction of even greater magnitude. What is up in this department? For next year we are being asked to approve $315,000 for main office maintenance. Is this Minister going to go back to Treasury some time in the months ahead and ask for another $150,000? If so, what is the use of us being here as legislators approving his expenditure?

If a university persistently submitted such, and I use a colloquial word, "rotten" estimates year after year, what would the Minister do? He would tick them off in public for not being efficient. I think we have a right to ask the Minister why he allows the perpetuation, or these persistent biases, in both directions. Surely his budgeting procedures, surely his forecast of staff and maintenance should be much more accurate than they are. I think this is bad budgeting and I would like to know when the Minister is going to become efficient.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I will accept the question in the very good spirit,

of course, in which it was obviously not intended, and indicate to the hon. member that it is not always possible to predict accurately the total moneys spent. It is significant that in most of the situations referred to by the hon. member that at least we have spent something less than the moneys we asked for. I think one could fairly state this would not necessarily be the case if the universities received more by way of grants than they actually needed. I do not think the Minister would have an opportunity to tick them off because I would be confident they would find some way to expend them. This is the great advantage in the formula, you know, because I do not have to get involved in that sort of situation. The one item to which the hon. member refers once again reflects the fact that when you prepare estimates your programmes are not necessarily finalized.

This government, Mr. Chairman, and this will perhaps sink home to the hon. member as he spends more time with us, does make changes. It progresess, it makes alterations and, from the time the original estimate was prepared for maintenance in the one year as it related to the then proposed programme until the actual fiscal year was completed, the amount spent was quite different because of the introduction of the student award programme.

There was, of necessity, an increase in the amount of main office help required a year ago last summer, to expedite the number of student award applications. This was a very legitimate and logical increase in expenditure in that particular area. I am sure the hon. member would support it and agree that these things are not always predictable. We have been relatively close in our projections, and in case there is no alteration — which there may not be in the public accounts statements for next year—I shall endeavour to get as good a breakdown of these expenditures for six items as possibly they relate to the moneys we are voting, hopefully tonight, so that he will have them for our continuing dialogue a year from now—or whenever it may take place.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow up another point and this has to do with the Minister's policy with regard to some of the aspects of the Acts under which the universities operate. Let me outline the facts on this.

Four provincially assisted Ontario universities have incorporated, or have had incorporated, in their Acts—in the case of Queen's, a charter—references to education in accordance with Christian principles, or university management based on Christian principles, or a distinctively Christian university. Ottawa University includes Christian principles in its explicit section on objects and purposes. Laurentian and Windsor refer to management based upon Christian principles. Queen's University has a statement that the university shall continue distinctively Christian.

Mr. Chairman, most universities including Ottawa, Windsor and Laurentian, which I have just mentioned, have statements in their Act that "no religious test shall be required of any professor, lecturer, teacher, officer, servant or student." These universities are Laurentian, Ottawa, Guelph, Carleton, Lakehead, Toronto, Wateroo, Western, York and Windsor. Trent and Brock do not refer specifically to students but do refer to any member of the university, which presumably includes students. That is to say, for most of the universities there is no religious test "on paper" in the university Acts except for one university.

A point I want to underline here, Mr. Chairman, is not whether or not a religious test at one university is being applied. The point is simply this that it is in the legal charter and this concerns me.

I should note that McMaster University makes no mention whatsoever of a religious test, or of no religious test. I do not want to be misinterpreted at all in this House, because these are "paper" statements, I am not suggesting at all that they are being implemented in fact. But the Queen's University charter states twice that "the trustees of the university shall satisfy themselves of the Christian character of those appointed to the teaching staff." There is also a specification that the chancellor of the university shall be "chosen without reference to his ecclesiastical connection except that he must be a Protestant."

I would like to ask the Minister if he might, when he thinks about this—we are talking about university education—I would like to know if he is happy with these statements, these paper statements — particularly about the paper statements in the Queen's charter that the trustees of the university shall satisfy themselves of the Christian character of those appointed to the teaching staff. I am worried about that. It is on paper, and also the reference about the chancellor having to be a Protestant. I was wondering whether we should not refer this to the commission of human rights.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member wisely and appropriately pointed out, these are paper situations at some of our institutions of higher learning. I do not want to minimize them, of course, because the hon. member obviously thinks they are of great importance or he would not be raising them here. There are more significant problems at the present moment with respect to our universities and to possible alterations in their structure. While I do not minimize this at all, I must say that I have not given this matter a great deal of thought up to this moment because, to date, I do not think this has ever been a practical problem at any of the institutions that I know. I think, in fairness, one can say this.

The hon. member refers to Queen's University which—as he well knows—was established by Royal charter, quite different from the other institutions. It dates back to 1841 and I would think that Queen's University, in their alterations to their charter, probably just accepted what was there—perhaps for matters of tradition, who knows? But I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that when one looks at it from a practical point of view, as the hon. member himself observed, that this is necessarily the most significant problem we have with respect to any alteration or restructuring of the university legislation.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that this is again one of the things that might be considered when the Acts are revised.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister whether he is concerned, whether he has a policy, or whether the council of education Ministers in Canada or whether he, in that role, as a member of that council, is thinking about participation of this province in the establishment of a world university?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not believe that the council itself has—well, I know it has not—given any thought to this or whether any members of the council have, or have not, or even whether this should be a function of the council. Quite frankly, the matter has never come up. I do not say that consideration should not be given to this. I do not know. I certainly have not, as chairman of the council, asked that this be put on the agenda for any of the meetings.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like then, to take this opportunity of giving the Minister some views on this concept. I think it is a proper role for his department and I think Ontario, under his leadership in particular—as he really is quite an outstanding gentleman—could really press forward in this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course, I will have to get from you, your definition of "outstanding".

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to say that the first thing the Minister should consider is the question of whether or not there is a need for a world university.

In my opinion, national systems of university education are often severely limited. Many national universities, which claim to be truly international, do not, in fact, have opportunities for continual confrontation of the varieties of national truths and values which are often taken for granted, rather than subjected to critical analysis. There is a wide gap, I think, between the ideal of the scholar of full intellectual inquiry, and exchange among persons of all fields of knowledge, and reality. Often the reason for this limitation is the result of ideological barriers to participation in various national universities, particularly, through admission policies and the national value judgments reflected in the curriculum.

Two examples illustrate the extent of these barriers. The Friendship University in Moscow does not admit persons from nations belonging to the western and military blocs. It is also partly a reverse exclusion, because some of the western bloc countries would not grant visas to any of their citizens wishing to study or teach there.

On the other hand, the international Fletcher school of law and diplomacy in the United States, a Tuffs-Harvard project, has a course—economics 5A—which is entitled "comparative economic systems" which has as its subject matter: capitalism, socialism and totalitarianism with the USSR as the example of totalitarianism. This is a national value judgment which would be unacceptable at a truly international world institution of higher learning.

While it is true, therefore, that many national universities have students and faculty members from many other countries, this does not mean that their coverage is universal in scope. They are not world universities.

Furthermore, because a national university has non-academic barriers to entry, its own national culture and value system which form essential ingredients of a national ideology, tend to dominate the ethos of the university. One implication of this is that foreigners, particularly from the politically-uncom-

mitted, so-called economically-undeveloped countries, attending such national university, are open to indoctrination, along with their education, by the culture and political ideology of that nation. This may or may not be intentional but it seems—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. May I ask what vote we are on?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2401.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I cannot see anything in here that has to do with the subject that the hon. member is speaking on.

Mr. T. Reid: The Minister is not complaining? I am just trying to bring to the attention of the Minister an item of policy which he might follow up. If the Minister thinks this is out of order I will be delighted to leave it.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, this may, or may not, be intentional, but it seems inevitable in any national university, no matter how open or free the discussion, such bilateral academic exchanges tend to strengthen the existing political blocs. In a world university, no single ideology or culture must dominate.

I believe that a proposal for a world university can only have a realistic chance of permanent success if it starts by offering something non-cultural, non-ideological and non-political, that all nations of the world want and need. That is, in the area of science and technology. At a later date, when each country is committed to seeing that the experiment works for its own benefit, the social sciences, and eventually the humanities, could well be added. By that time, hopefully, a standard of continual, academic, international co-operation and understanding and a desire for knowledge, apart from ideological viewpoints, could have been created.

In the field of science, the international centre for theoretical physics, the antarctica treaty, the international geophysical year, as a few examples, have had participating scholars and experts from diversed political and ideological blocs. Their success lies in the fact that the participating nations believed that they would benefit from participation. Financial commitments followed as a result.

The theoretical physics centre, for example, in Italy is serving the interest of the participating nations. It is encouraging good physics, not just in one field, but in an inter-disciplinary manner. The results—some of which were decisive achievements are shared among the participating nations. The centre has already laid the foundation of an active and prolonged co-operation between physicists from the so-called east and west.

During 1965 and 1966, for example, two groups of plasma physicists from the US and the USSR, some 25 senior men, collaborated for a full year. The centre has helped physicists from the economically underdeveloped countries who, after a long period of silence, have begun to write and publish during their one to four month visits to the centre each year. The creation of this opportunity of remaining in touch, while they are permanently employed in their own countries, might persuade some of the best physicists in these countries not to seek permanent exile abroad.

The individuals who proposed the physics centre are very practical men. They are also far-sighted: "One could hope that a successful theoretical physics institute might possibly set a pattern for future united nations university."

I believe the world university could start with theoretical physics at the core of its academic programme. Other sciences, relating to problems such as increasing agricultural yield, should also be given an essential place.

Another increasing non-political field of learning is the area of administration and management.

As A. M. F. Palmer stated:

> If an intelligent observer from Mars or Venus should come and examine all large contemporary industrial concerns, public or private, in the United States or Russia, as working enterprises, he would notice their overwhelming sameness.

This is the central argument that John Kenneth Galbraith brings to the fore in his recent book *The New Industrial State,* Galbraith maintains that wherever technology, planning and organization are features of the productive process, the management of the enterprise is "a technical matter; ideology is not involved."

More and more, what one would expect to be a sensitive, ideological area, in countries with different political and economic systems, is showing great possibilities for study, exchange of information, and technological co-operation. A world university in this province, Mr. Chairman, could well be able to start with a faculty of administration at the core of its academic programme.

What should not be attempted at the beginning, are subjects which are heavy with national, and international, ideological propositions. Any attempt to include political science, philosophy, history and aggregate economics in the initial curriculum, would severely prejudice the chance of the idea of a world university being translated into an institutional and living reality. Part of the reason why it would be most difficult to include such subjects in the initial curriculum of the world university, is the non-universality in the curriculum programmes of national universities.

Too much of North American education, for example, including education in this province, in the humanities, is tied up with the maintenance of national and provincial cultural traditions. Much of this is necessary and important. However, when the attempt is made to visualize curriculum texts for a world university, the width of the gap is starkly apparent. There is very little in common, even in the way of definition to build on. In science and technology, however, there is a great deal in common, particularly in terms of common definitions to build on.

The argument that I am making to the Minister for an initiative on his part, both as a Minister of University Affairs in Ontario, and as chairman of what might be called a national council of university Ministers, ends with a truism. The idea of a world university is a good one; a world university is needed but it can only work if all nations want it to work. If it is based on the *de facto* operating principles of the United Nations, it has the same chance for ineffectiveness and failure due to partisan politicking and exclusion of certain countries.

The idea of a world university has to be put on a practical basis. I suggest that the Minister of Education in this province is very adept at this type of arrangement. It must be within every country's interest to see that it does not fail. Unfortunately, the desire for peace is not enough to get the proposal accepted, financed and established. There must be a practical basis for intellectual dialogue, learning and research. This will increase the chances of a willingness to study other more sensitive areas. The progression should be for mainly sciences and technology to the social sciences, beginning, perhaps, with anthropology, psychology, and then into economics and political science to the humanities. Depending on one's view of the university, the fine arts may or may not have a place. A parallel progression would be from a heavily research-oriented centre to a more balanced research and post-graduate student university.

Mr. Chairman, Alfred North Whitehead once wrote: "Any serious fundamental change in the intellectual outlook of human society must necessarily be followed by an educational revolution."

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the speaker if his statement is just about finished?

Mr. T. Reid: I am right in the middle of the last sentence. I would like to repeat that quote because the Minister might not have thought of it. Alfred North Whitehead once wrote, Mr. Chairman: "Any serious fundamental change in the intellectual outlook of human society must necessarily be followed by an educational revolution."

Perhaps for once this process can be reversed. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister would report back, next year, that he has taken this proposal and pushed it in Canada.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, what are the functions of the architectural services branch?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I really think I answered this, perhaps while the hon. member was out, and he would—

Mr. De Monte: I was here, but I did not hear the answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, very briefly, the architectural services branch reviews the projects submitted to the department for approval for capital support. This very generally is what the architectural services branch does.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, does that mean that it specifies certain materials or specifies—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it does not involve itself in specifications *per se*. It does not prescribe to the universities that they must build of certain materials and so on. We do not get into that determination.

Mr. De Monte: What type of a determination do they get into? Do they get into a certain square footage per student, or certain size?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We get into, basically, the total cost of the facility, as it relates to

facilities at other institutions and, of course, to the number of students to be served by that facility.

Vote 2401 agreed to.

On vote 2402:

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): One point, Mr. Chairman, on a question I raised some time ago. In the north we have the greatest potential for mining engineering going and yet, of our universities in the north, we do not have the facilities to offer either one of these courses. The Minister suggested, at the time that—I believe it was the board of governors or some group—would not give the sanction to this being located in the north. But, controlling the purse strings as he does, and because we have the most ideal area for mining engineering, and because in all other courses the students from the north have to come south except for arts, I was wondering if the Minister would use his good office to induce the heads of the universities to allow the offering of mining engineering in the Nickel Basin?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I will not prolong this discussion because, once again, I am faced with this very conflicting point of view from the members opposite. I am told that, on occasion, I have refused the characteristic approach that we should have all this completely divorced from government and then, in the next breath, one of the hon. members is saying, why do you not use your good offices to force an institution into a particular faculty or area of study.

Mr. MacDonald: Not "forced," you are exaggerating.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right. To, shall we say, "encourage," "push," "shove," or whatever term you may wish to use.

I replied to this question on an earlier occasion when, as I recall, it was indicated that Laurentian University had shown some interest. They were told, at that time, to make a formal submission to the committee on university affairs, and to the best of my knowledge, this submission has not yet been made.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, this vote under item 1 contains more than $200 million in grants for operating costs. Would that sum include a certain amount which would be repayable to the government in payment of principal and interest relating to previous loans made by the university capital aid corporation? And if so, how much would return to the government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, item 5 relates to the amount that is being paid to the universities to be returned to the government, some of it by way of interest and some by way of capital for the item referred to. The first item relates only to operating grants which are divorced from the debenture situation.

Item 5 is the $23 million which is paid to the universities and which is returned to the government.

Mr. Nixon: That would be simply a bookkeeping entry—$23 million?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is $23.2 million.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, under the grants to universities and colleges, I gather there is a new $42 million library being built at the University of Toronto; I was wondering if the Minister could say whether this is included.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That, Mr. Chairman, is not included in this, at all. The $42 million to University of Toronto library resource is part of the capital programme. It does not relate to the grants for operating costs.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the problems I have in understanding this particular vote, 2402. Would there not be some reflection of the financing of this building in this vote next year.

Surely the Minister has to make grants to the U of T and the U of T has to pay interest on the debentures. So surely this would explain why there has been a doubling of the item "university debentures for capital purposes" between 1966/1967, 1968/1969, that is for an estimate $9.4 million in 1966/1967 to an estimate for 1968/1969 in the Minister's budget of $23.2 million. Would some of that building not be reflected in—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the facility has not yet been started, and it is doubtful just how much of this would be, in fact, completed during this current fiscal year.

The reason for the increase of course, to the $23.2 million, is the interim policy that I informed the House about a few minutes ago, relating to the capital programme,

where it has been necessary to go back to 1964 to pick up certain situations, to resolve our capital problem there. This reflects itself in the increase to the $23.2 million. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, I would have to check this out in detail, that there will be sufficient amount of money spent by the University of Toronto on their new library centre in this current fiscal year, to reflect any substantial amount in the $23.2 million.

Mr. T. Reid: In future years, this is an item that will be building up. It gets to the point that I am concerned about. I know that the Minister is reluctant to make 5 year estimates but can he give us some idea, on this side of the House, what that item 5, "university debentures for capital purposes" might grow to, by 1973 or 1975? The rate of increase is fantastic. We know on an index with 1966/1967 equal to 100, the estimate for next year is 249. That is a percentage increase of about 150 per cent. Well, with the universities, particularly the so-called emerging universities, having to borrow so much from the capital corporation, I believe, and having to pay interest on that which they have to receive back, in part, from the provincial government, in terms of operating grants, because interest payments are operating costs, is this not one of the items that is just going to skyrocket?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this item obviously is going to increase as the number of capital projects increase, and the total investment increases. It is only a projected figure. By 1972/1973 this item could be in the neighbourhood of $70 million. This is the money that is paid to the universities. And—as the leader of the Opposition points out—it is to a degree a bookkeeping entry which, in turn, is returned to the capital aid corporation. I am not sure that the leader of the Opposition will recall during our debates in previous years enthusiastically endorsing this method of doing it and yet—

Mr. Nixon: Oh, no, you will have to do more careful research than that. We said—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, maybe you—

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, far from enthusiastically endorsing it, we—it is our opinion over here that it is a needlessly complex and useless procedure.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I said that you did not enthusiastically endorse it.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, all right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I said you did not, I did not say that you did. I thought I misinterpreted you; that you were going to endorse it.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow up this particular item, the grants of operating costs to the universities in particular. Again, when we look at the publication titled "Systems Emerging," which is a new piece of information in the Legislature, we find the following statement. Since the formula, this refers to the operating grants formula, on page 25, is

> not suitable for both emerging universities and established institutions, the emerging universities receive, in addition, grants based on examination of actual needs. In the fully established institution, the formula grant alone is not sufficient to cover new undertakings such as a new faculty or school, and special supplementary grants are made to support such projects. Special provision is also made to the two universities in Ottawa and Laurentian offering instruction in both French and English.

Well, that statement was made in September of 1967. Then we find that after the grants were made last year, the university presidents issued a press release dated March 13, 1968 which reads—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Grants for this year.

Mr. T. Reid: Grants for the current year, and my arguing point—which is relevant to the argument now—is that I would like to know what the Minister has done about many of the criticisms that he has received this year, in his estimates for 1968-1969, that we are being asked to approve? I am particularly interested, for example, in what he has done about "the unit," and what the measure of that unit is. But I would like to record the problem that the emerging universities feel that they are experiencing.

The press report on page 2 said this about the grant that has been made during this current year:

> The whole university community in Ontario regards with concern the effects that the inadequate level of provincial support will have on the development of the new universities. These universities were established in recent years, with strong encouragement from the government of Ontario to round out the facilities for higher education throughout the province and to bring a university education within the geographical, and thereby to some extent, the

financial reach of thousands of potential students. Financial stringency for the newer universities will mean not simply a slowing down in their capacity to absorb the growing number seeking higher education, but will also place severe limitations on their ability to introduce much needed new programmes – including projects of special relevance to the region—and will delay their progress towards that variety and breadth and excellence that a university education in Ontario has come to mean.

The reason that I bring this up again is that in the first publication which is dated September 1967, the universities were hopeful that the new formula would be fair to the emerging universities by the addition of special grants. Then, in their press release of March 13, 1968, they come out very hard, in very careful language stating that really it is the new universities that are getting caught in the crunch. There are a number of other statements that one could put on the record, and I will just refer the Minister to them, I will not quote them at length.

In the president's report of Carleton University for 1967, he makes the same point, very quietly, and very sedately. In the 1966-1967 report of the principal of Queen's University, the same point is made on page 14, that the basic unit is lower than they wanted, and this really hurt. He says this:

> In February 1967, it was announced by the Minister of University Affairs, that the value of the basic unit for the first year of the formula, 1967-1968, would be $1,320. This was less than had been expected, and it was disappointing that for the first year of the formula the value of the basic income unit was set at a level which would put many universities without significant other income, on short rations.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister's comment on this. I know that he has obviously come to some resolution in his own mind. The formula is an improvement—is a step forward—there is no question about that. But how is he dealing with this very difficult problem of the emerging university? He knows full well the difficulty of applying a formula to universities that started at different base levels, with different numbers of students – universities that have different growth rates.

In other words, the formula must not be his panacea, for his government's involvement. There are problems to it. How is he facing up to those problems?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, we have never suggested that the formula is a panacea to the operating grants to the universities. In fact, it has been made abundantly clear that in several statements I have made and in communications to the universities, that we recognize that the formula itself does not solve the problems of the emerging universities. Further, it does not solve certain problems within existing and older institutions in certain specific areas. We know this. No formula ever will. With great respect, no formula devised by a grants commission would either, because it gets down to a question of judgments. To deal with this problem, there has been a subcommittee of the committee on university affairs set up. The advisory committee will be meeting with three of the emerging universities shortly to discuss this problem—but just so one can keep this in perspective—let us consider some of these institutions, with relation to the formula basis.

Brock University receives a $1,274,784, estimated grant. On a special grant, they receive $1,393,972, which means that they are getting 100 per cent more special grant than they are getting under the formula. Surely this is a recognition by the committee of certain special needs at that institution?

I am not saying that they are completely content with it, or that it does not create problems. This was a valued judgment made by competent people, as to the relevant needs of these institutions. I could go to Trent—a delightful institution—$1,335,857 is estimated under the formula and an additional special grant of $1,387,940. You can go through the other emerging institutions and find comparable figures. I do not like to get into individual comparisons between institutions, but I think there is a very clear indication here, that the advisory committee has recognized the very unique position of the emerging institutions. While the institutions themselves are less than satisfied, I think to suggest that something has not been done, or that we are not coming close to a rational approach to it, is not quite accurate. As I say, the university affairs committee have appointed a subcommittee to deal with these institutions and to attempt further to develop approaches in succeeding years that make sense.

It is a very tough area. It is very difficult and they are value judgments. In the final analysis somebody has to make them. Either it is the university affairs committee or a

proposed university grants commission, but the same judgment by competent people is still required.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask a question on this. How long does a university emerge, that is, how many years do you suspect that these special grants will be continued in such a way that the formula of financing will not be a destructive influence on the hopes and the future of these universities?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, of course I think one has to retain a degree of flexibility. Once again it is only an estimate, but I think the university goes through an eight to ten year growth, or emerging period. Whether this changes over a period of years, quite frankly I do not know, but I would say between eight and ten years.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to ask a specific question. Last year the basic unit was $1,320 —What was the basic unit this year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is $1,450.

Mr. T. Reid: That is an increase—okay, we will forget that one. I have got my slide rule.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I notice you had your slide rule earlier today. I was wondering just what wonderful permutations and combinations you were trying to work out for me. I saw it actually work, did I not? The slide rule, I mean?

Mr. T. Reid: Yes. I was wondering if the Minister could clarify a comment on the statement by the president of Carleton University recently, where Carleton disagreed with aspects of the weighting procedures that differentiate sharply between honours and general degree students in the second and third years? Under our system the two categories receive practically the same attention and occasion similar costs in these years.

The Minister knows the unit system very well, of course, but I would like to bring the following problem to his attention. If you differentiate too sharply between the honours—that is the four-year student—and the general degree students, in the second and third years, and you give the university a higher grant for honour students, I think that this could harden the transferability between the three- and the four-year programmes in the universities. For example, at York University we have a system whereby students do not enter the university into a three-year or four-year programme in the arts faculty. The student comes to York in his first year and is part of the general student population in first-year art. He is not differentiated at all. Then, if he manages to get what we call a "C" I believe, he has the right in the second year to register in the honours programme.

Even then, we find that our second-year students, who are in a three-year programme or a four-year programme, taking, for example, second-year economics – there is a general introductory course in economics. They do not become differentiated. The thing that worries me, just in the second year aspect, is that somehow you will build into the university accounting system, the preference for students registered in the honours programme. There will be pressure put on student advisors to persuade their advisees to register in the honours programmes. The university can say they have got more honour students than necessary.

In other words, it interferes directly with an academic function of the university. I have been a student advisor—students come to me at the end of their first year—we talk about what they want to take in the university. If I feel any pressure on me to try to persuade those students to enter into the honours programme so that the university can have a higher unit grant, then I think this is a direct infringement on the university autonomy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, of course, a man of your integrity would not persuade them to do it if you did not think it was right. Is not this correct?

Mr. T. Reid: No, this is not the point. The point—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it is, Mr. Chairman, a very valid point. What the hon. member is saying is that there are people in the university community who would persuade the students to take a course not really related to their capacities, in order to receive extra support by way of the formula. I do not think that people in the universities will do this.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, unless the Minister is rising on a point of order— The point is very simple. There is a definition in the grant formula that states that for students who are registered in honours programmes the university receives more money for their education. I am saying two things. I am

saying first of all, that it does put a pressure on the university to try to get more honour students if they want more money for badly-needed programmes. You know how these things work?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not know.

Mr. T. Reid: Secondly—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not operate there.

Mr. T. Reid: Secondly, it is, in a sense, encouraging something which is not, in fact, correct. In other words, take York and perhaps Trent too. There is no difference in the costs of educating a student registered in an honours programme in arts, compared to a student taking a three-year degree programme in the second year in arts. There is no difference in educational costs. Why is that built into the formula?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well because—Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member is asking me a question I will give him—

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, is this, or is it not, a point of order?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, surely only one member has the floor at one time!

Mr. T. Reid: Is it a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was asked a question. I was just going to give him an answer.

Mr. Singer: Well, why do you not wait until he is through?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I just did not want to forget the question.

Mr. Singer: Surely you too must observe the rules of the House?

Mr. T. Reid: You sit down and keep quiet!

When it gets into the third year, in some of these universities—and remember, my remarks were based on a statement of a university president—the present Minister does not feel too responsible for him, which is good. But when you get into the third year, you get the same type of problem. In other words, in the third year it is still possible for a student who has registered in a three-year programme, to transfer to a four-year programme if he wants to. It is an unrealistic formula.

It applies to a traditional university—such as the University of Toronto, which is much more rigid. If you were trying to build into the universities a streaming system that Mr. Robarts has built into the secondary school system, I think you are doing a disservice to university education problems.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will now let me answer his questions—and I offer this in a very kindly way—he does make me—

Mr. Singer: Kindly Minister, we used to call him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes. There is no need to point. You know, when the hon. member for Scarborough East points so enthusiastically, I wonder whether I have got a spot on my tie, or what has happened. I can understand him when he is trying to make a point. I would just say this. The whole question of weighting is—as I said in my opening remarks, if the hon. member will read them carefully—one which has to be the subject of constant analysis and review.

The joint subcommittee of the advisory committee on university affairs, and the committee of presidents—while there may never be unanimity, as to the weighting that should be determined—has established the weights on the best consensus that they can find within the university community. It is really quite interesting to me to hear from the hon. member tonight, because this not the information that is supplied to us by many of the universities—that the honours programme and the third and fourth year really cost no more than the general arts programme. I am not sure it is even the position taken by his own institution, but I can check this out. All I am saying is that—

Mr. T. Reid: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order.

Mr. T. Reid: The Minister has implied that my remarks are based on my position at York University. I categorically deny that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I make it very clear to the hon. member that I am not, in any way, suggesting that his remarks are related to his position at York University. If I were going to do this I would have made this an issue right at the beginning. All I am saying is you referred to York University, not I. You referred to the third and fourth year programmes at York, as I recall your words—

Mr. T. Reid: It is not my university.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sorry. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that it is not the hon. member's university, it is not mine, it is not anybody's—he is quite right.

However, let us get back to discuss the weighting. The weighting, Mr. Chairman, is something that we all recognize has to be re-evaluated constantly because the whole concept must change with changing conditions within the universities. The formula approach is the one that is valid. It makes sense. The unit cost is the one that is also, I guess, most relevant to the total university community. The question of weighting is something that can be reviewed year by year, which it is. You will never get, once again, complete unanimity by all the universities with respect to the weighting because this just cannot be done. You have to take it on the broadest consensus that you can get. I think this is the only equitable way to do it and—just read my remarks—I suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member for Scarborough East, that we recognize the weighting provisions have to be reviewed. They do. There is no question about it.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could make a remark or two on this very point?

It seems to me that we are dealing here with a very real problem, not so much in terms of the weighting, but rather the whole question of relating the finances to the number of students in the institutions. I cannot help wondering whether there should not be some kind of a halt on this whole business of adding more and more students in order to get more and more grant money.

Now if I could just go on with this for a moment, because it is significant, I think. In other words, what is happening is, I think, the committee is encouraging universities to gather in as many students as possible because each one of these students represents some thousands of dollars. This is going to create some of the problems, at least, which we have seen in the American universities where you have too many students and a number of professors for the kind of facilities that are available in university.

Now there is a danger here that we are going to depersonalize the universities. We are going to do the very things with our universities for the sake of the formula financing scheme which we do not want to do. I think this is a very real problem. I suggest that the form of financing needs restrictions in relation to the fact that a university cannot have any more students than it can deal with, with a number of faculty and with the facilities which it has on hand.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something about the impact of this fact on decision-making within the university on academic programmes. This is a very important aspect. In other words, you set up differential weights. If the university has PhD students, it gets more grants per student than it does for first-year students. The same thing with MA perhaps with a differential grant depending on science and arts and this type of thing.

But the concern I have, Mr. Chairman, is that what has happened in the grant formula, is this: You have built-in incentives for the universities to go into honours programmes as opposed to three-year programmes; you have given them incentive to push forward in graduate programmes particularly—and perhaps the low cost graduate programmes. The same thing with the PhD programmes. I think the Minister must realize that the formula financing—the formual criteria if you like—for the calculation of operating grants—the basic division of the pot, if you like—between or amongst the universities is going to have "incentive effects." If you set up incentives in our system of a free enterprise economy, a response to incentives is going to take place.

The question I am raising here is: has the Minister really thought about the incentive effects? Is the formula financing simply based on what are estimated to be the real costs of educating students of certain types and certain years in university or, is the formula financing also partially based on a policy of encouraging universities to get into other three-year programmes? leave those for the CAATs; get out of three-year programmes; go into four-year programmes; encourage certain universities to drop undergraduate programmes in terms of the weight within their total efforts—such as the University of Toronto—and get into a graduate university? In other words, there are clear incentive implications to formula financing and there are different responses from among the 14 universities in Ontario.

I suspect—I do not know—all I can do is suggest a research project, Mr. Chairman, to examine the incentive effects of formula financing. I think one thing might happen. You will find the University of Toronto will go ahead because it gets reinforced through

formula financing into the area of graduate work even more so than now.

In other words, I think one of the dangers of this is—particularly in the context of my remarks and quotations about the problems of the emerging universities—that the University of Toronto is going to be reinforced by higher grants and they will get the money to go ahead. Thus, the emerging universities are being very subtly told: "Down, boys, stay in undergraduate work," and so forth, "but do not get involved in heavy commitments in graduate work."

It is an impossible question. If the Minister has some comments to make, I would like to hear them. If he has no comments to make, I would like to suggest that someone—some good economist, some professional economist pursuing economics full-time—should look into the incentive effects of the formula financing and the structure of university policy making.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman to conclude these discussions, two points must be made. One that I hope that I have made previously is that the weighting within the formula must be a subject of constant re-examination. We recognize this. I also suggest, with respect, that I sensed a certain contradiction in the hon. member's observations when he suggested the formula weighting led to an encouragement of the four-year programmes and graduate work and then he was complaining because the University of Toronto would be reinforced for graduate work to the detriment of other institutions.

This is not the intent—nor do I think it will, in fact, be the results—of the formula particularly as the weighting must be reviewed. Now I sensed this contradiction in the hon. member's argument. It may be that I should not have but I think if he reads *Hansard* carefully he will see that that contradiction exists.

The second point is this. The formula was devised in complete co-operation with the subcommittee of the presidents of universities of Ontario. It was not imposed on them. They not only understand the complexities of it and the problems inherent in formula financing, they were part of the formula that was developed.

While I recognize that there will be problems—there always will be no matter what you do—nonetheless, we have come very close to finding an equitable way of distributing total provincial resources to the universities of this province in a way that is generally acceptable. Once again, we have not achieved perfection but I feel we have made very substantial progress. I believe this view is shared by all the university presidents in this province, even including those of the emerging institutions who feel at this point in time that they have not received all that they need.

Mr. T. Reid: I will conclude with this remark, Mr. Chairman. The Minister referred to contradiction and I would just like to clarify this. In logic, it is called "a fallacy of composition" and the Minister made that mistake, not myself. The comment I was making was that, in general, the unit system results in a pressure on all universities to get into honours work and MAs and PhDs. Okay, that is called an aggregate argument.

The specific argument, the micro argument is that within that general outside pressure on all the universities, one university gets reinforced time and time again through this type of formula financing. This means all the universities try to get higher grants by getting into the areas where they get higher grants and within the university system, one university predominates.

Mr. Pitman: I wonder if I could ask a question on this vote.

There is a special fund available to universities for temporary accommodation. Could the Minister indicate specifically what that refers to and under item 4 research awards $750,000, what are the nature of the research awards under this vote 2402 item?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, during the course of the year, there have been situations arise where the universities have had some capital project delayed which they would like to have had available or because of strike problems perhaps, or other practical situations have been unable to occupy. We have provided every year a fund for temporary accommodation where the universities have been permitted to enter into, shall we say, leased arrangements for short periods of time. I think for instance, but I am not sure of this, York may become involved in this with respect to the new law faculty. I am not sure of this point. But this is the type of situation where we have provided assistance out of the temporary accommodation fund. It is, shall we say, a short-term measure to look after practical problems that have been created.

With respect to the research grants, Mr. Chairman, these grants were administered for several years by the Ontario research foundation. They were actually included in another

department's estimates, and these were transferred to The Department of University Affairs during 1966-1967. During the past year the committee on university affairs authorized the establishment of a study committee composed of prominent scientists who examined the programme of grants in aid of research and made recommendations accordingly. This is not, of course, in the total context of research, a large sum of money, but it represents those moneys, shall we say, transferred to The Department of University Affairs in the fiscal year 1966-1967.

Vote 2403 agreed to.

On vote 2404:

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, some weeks ago I asked the Minister a question in regard to the charges that were made by the director of the Royal Ontario museum in relation to the taking over of the financial support of the university by The Department of University Affairs.

At that time, I think, the Minister replied that he had not taken over at that point, therefore he felt that there was no necessity for any close liaison with the director of the museum. I am wondering, has the Minister taken steps now to restore some kind of sensible co-operation between his department and the museum? Perhaps he could give us a running commentary over what has taken place over the last few weeks, after these terms had been made.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the member for his co-operation but, as I indicated, really the channel or line of communication in the formal sense has been—and will continue until the legislation is introduced, which I anticipate will now be this week, setting up the ROM under its own board of governors—through the University of Toronto. This has been the formal line of communication. I would think when the legislation is passed, as I anticipate it may be by this Legislature, that the ROM will then under its own board of governors, function in a way that from many standpoints at least will at least resolve many problems except I must say this in advance—it will probably be one of those situations as well, along with our other institutions, where expectations will exceed resources for a period of time.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks under the vote for the Royal Ontario museum, on what I feel to be its very restrictive hours in which it is open to the general public. My first experience with these restrictive hours was many years ago when I tried to book tours for classes of children to visit the museum, and found out that by the end of April they stopped taking bookings for the months of May and June. This, plus the fact that it is only open from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday to Saturday, and Sundays from 1 to 5 p.m., shows that what with the population explosion and the increased number of school children that take excursions these days, the hours are totally inadequate to service the large amounts of classes that are desirous of visiting the Royal Ontario museum.

I would like to say at this time that the work of its board and staff and the quality of exhibits are such that every child in this province should be afforded an opportunity to visit the museum.

I think that if the museum was to open earlier in the day, and was to get with it and add evening hours—plus the fact that the McLaughlin planetarium is going to be open in the not too distant future—there would be a logical tie-in there to correlate it with the Ontario museum for evening hours. I think the visitors should have a new deal.

If the guides are overworked and cannot cope with the large number of children trying to see the exhibits there, surely university lecturers could be hired on a *pro tem* basis for the spring and I am sure that the added revenues from admissions of adults would more than offset the increased expenditures.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2403?

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps the Minister would like to comment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would be quite prepared to send a copy of the hon. member's remarks to the new board of governors when it is appointed which I anticipate will be very shortly for the conduct of the ROM. I would only point out this. I wonder, if you open before 10 o'clock, whether, apart from the Metro students, there would not be many students who from a practical standpoint will get there much before 10 o'clock in the morning in any event. Evening, I think, presents a different situation. I can only say that I think a resource of this kind should be utilized to the maximum if at all possible and I shall pass on the hon. member's very constructive suggestions to the board when it commences operations.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, no doubt one of the reasons the facilities of the museum have not been available as much as the hon. member would wish is that their budget has been seriously restricted for many years, as the Minister no doubt knows. Whether the fact that it is going to be constituted independent of the university will correct that remains to be seen. The Minister has predicted some continuing disappointment.

The passage of this Act, of course, will set the museum up as an independent organization with purposes that are somewhat similar to the Centennial centre of science and technology also in this city. Is it in the Minister's mind that the two will be co-ordinated in any way or will they be allowed, as I think would be appropriate, to maintain their individuality and their own courses?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think it is perhaps a shade premature to determine how co-ordination should take place. I do not think there is any question that there should be some form of co-ordination between the institutions of this kind in this province to see that there is no duplication in exhibits or facilities available to the public, but I am not in a position to say just how this form of co-ordination should take place at the present time.

I think one could also say that one could include the art gallery of Ontario in this type of approach too, because there are certain areas that could be common to the ROM and to the art gallery, or where certain divisions of responsibility over a period of time should be determined.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2403?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, on this vote I might add one further comment to that of the member for Hamilton Mountain in that many school children travel for four or five hours to reach our queen city and eventually attempt to get into the museum. I feel that possibly they should be given some priority during the afternoon hours and if you just add that to the suggestions that would be going to the new directorate I would appreciate it. Similarly, on the tours of the Legislature itself, we notice that the Toronto students have the prime times booked and they can readily come to the Legislature any evening and see it in session and possibly—

Mr. Nixon: Lots of room in the galleries now.

Mr. Paterson: —and possibly the out-of-town students should have some preference here. I would like the Minister to comment—is this new board of directors for the ROM going to involve itself in the direction of the Ontario art gallery and the Centennial science centre?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Chairman, I made this point clear to the hon. leader of the Opposition, that I think there has to be co-ordination among these institutions but the legislation that I will be proposing to this House sets up the ROM under its own board of governors. The art galley is under its board, as is the Centennial centre.

Mr. Nixon: You could be vice-chairman of them all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I have nothing to do with the art gallery.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2403?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): I do not know whether this would be in order at this point but I would like to make a suggestion to the Minister that he can pass along with the rest that he is piling up over there. That is that many students, certainly from northern Ontario, and northwestern Ontario in particular, do not get the opportunity to travel down to Toronto to see the Legislature in action—something perhaps which they can do without in any case—but they certainly do not get a chance to see the Royal Ontario museum. What I would like to suggest at this time is that the museum give some thought to a travelling museum, such as we had with Expo where they have a long trailer or a car with some of the exhibits that are presently in the Royal Ontario museum to give the people—not just the students—of northern and northwestern Ontario a chance to see some of the history that exists that we have in the museum.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, not to prolong this discussion—the hon. member for Peterborough has a 20-minute speech to make on the subject—I hope not. The museum has already obtained two of the Centennial caravans which they will outfit with exhibits and which will be made available to areas of the province that are not as accessible to Toronto as one might like.

Mr. Pitman: What I have to say, Mr. Chairman, will take about one minute. I want to pass along a suggestion for the new board of governors that I wish they would

get rid of those ratty looking Indian figures that are in the basement of the Royal Ontario museum. They have been there for at least 25 years, they are no longer authentic, and they are really the most disgraceful example of exhibiting the Indian culture of this country that I can imagine. I do hope they will do something about that. I can remember seeing them when I was trooped down there when I was eight years old and they are still there; they are moth-eaten and indeed, they are not even correct in some cases. So I would hope the Minister might pass that along to the board of governors too.

Vote 2403 agreed to.

On vote 2404:

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on vote 2404, I would like to make some remarks about student awards.

The purpose of the student awards, and I refer particularly to the Ontario programme, as outlined I believe in the pamphlet "Ontario Student Awards Programme, 1968-1969" is as follows:

> To ensure that every person with the ability and desire to pursue a programme of education beyond the secondary school level, will have sufficient funds to meet the cost of such an undertaking.

Then the pamphlet continues, I believe, with the following statement:

> While it is felt that in the first instance the responsibility for providing the necessary funds rests with the parent, guardian or immediate family and/or the student, the province of Ontario is prepared to supplement family or student resources as determined by an objective form of needs assessment.

Now, one judgment I would make in these statements is that the presumption is that education is a privilege, as opposed to a right.

I would also like to say, Mr. Chairman, that the loan factor discriminates against poor students. By "poor" I mean students who are economically poor. Loans are a deterrent to people in lower income groups. Donald Bethune, the director of student awards, is quoted as saying that student aid is a form of "welfare". However, there are many graduate students who sacrifice relatively large incomes in order to do further study.

Another drawback, Mr. Chairman, is that women who have received loans go into marriage with what amounts to a negative dowry.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are there any of them, these days, go into marriage with a positive dowry?

Mr. T. Reid: Another aspect, Mr. Chairman, is that I believe the private sector, or the business sector of the Ontario economy, profits from graduates who go into business. Therefore, in a sense, the taxpayers pay and business profits.

Now, the loans are supposed to be paid back beginning six months from graduation. Many students cannot pay so soon after graduation or discontinuance of study. For example, the costs incurred in setting up a medical, dental or legal practice are usually pretty high and the six-months' period is a hardship. So one of the recommendations I would like to make to the Minister is that perhaps this period after which a student must pay back his loan, that this period might be extended to some extent.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt and I hope the hon. member will not misunderstand what I am saying but any question of repayment or extension of time for repayment or really the loan programme itself is something over which I have no control. This is completely within the scope of the federal jurisdiction. I want to make this abundantly clear. We do not determine the length or the time of repayment at all. This is done by the federal government.

Mr. T. Reid: This is a very confusing area.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is no confusion, this is factually the case.

Mr. T. Reid: The facts are also that the two programmes are highly integrated and it is very difficult—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, but it is not that highly integrated. The federal government determines the repayment provisions; there is just no question where the responsibility here lies.

Mr. T. Reid: Your programme is a partial function of the federal programme?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, we have integrated the programme but the fact is we cannot make any determination of the length of time for repayment of the loan. This is an exclusive area of federal responsibility.

Mr. T. Reid: Right, Mr. Chairman, I accept this point and certainly this is something we should all bring up to the federal government.

An hon. member: There is your opportunity right now.

Mr. T. Reid: Who is that guy muttering in the background?

I would like to talk now about eligibility. I understand that the eligibility clause for the loan and the grant states that the parents of the dependent students must be residents of Ontario. Secondly, my understanding is that an independent student, who is a Canadian citizen or landed immigrant, must have been a permanent resident of Ontario for at least 12 consecutive months immediately prior to first enrolling in the academic programme for which he is requesting assistance.

Last year the regulation was that he must have been a resident of Ontario for 12 consecutive months prior to his application for an award. For example, if a married couple immigrated to Canada and the wife worked so the husband could study immediately, the husband would never be eligible for assistance under that regulation for that period.

There is also the question in terms of eligibility of the students who are in theology. Theology students are eligible for assistance only under the Canada student loan plan. Now, this gets pretty difficult to figure out, and the Minister will no doubt clarify the problem. The argument has to do, of course, with the church and state and church-related institutions.

My understanding is that the church-affiliated colleges can get grants and that students at a church-affiliated college cannot get grants if they happen to be enrolled in a theological course. A student in a three-year theological course could end up having to pay back $3,000, since the maximum loan is $1,000 per year. While a student in an arts course who received the maximum award would, under existing regulations, be paying back only $1,800. Again, there is the problem here of fairness of figuring out what it means.

There is another drawback I think to the award and some students have made this complaint. They complain The Department of University Affairs will not process an application without a social insurance number, and that it takes up to six weeks to get one if you have not already got one; the application is unnecessarily delayed. This is a question I think the Minister should look into.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who provides the social insurance number?

Mr. T. Reid: The federal government does.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Maybe the member should take it up with them as to expediting the availability of this number—

Mr. T. Reid: This is a valid point, Mr. Chairman, but I think the Minister should know that in his application form the social insurance number is required—

Mr. Nixon: Why do you need that?

Mr. T. Reid: —and that it is very difficult for students—because of the bureaucracy in Ottawa, if you like, and I admit there is bureaucracy in Ottawa—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member will not get any argument from me.

Mr. T. Reid: But the fact is that this does pose a hardship on students who do not happen to have a social security number. I am sure there should be enough flexibility in the Minister's programme, Mr. Chairman, for him to accept these applications without social security numbers. I do not even understand why he needs it. Perhaps it has something to do with checking the income tax statistics on the parents. Why do you need it?

Mr. Singer: Why do you need social security?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I was going to wait until the member asked all his questions, and I shall try to answer them, I am sure, to his complete satisfaction.

Mr. T. Reid: The Minister and I seem to have an understanding, Mr. Chairman. The last time I quizzed him I gave him questions one after the other. I decided I would give them all to him at once this time. Maybe he might get caught in one of the pellets.

In section 22 of the form that students must fill out, I gather that the students are only allowed the cost of one return trip home as opposed to two trips home last year. Presumably, if a student wants to go home at Christmas, he sort of hitchhikes a ride from Santa Claus. I would be interested in knowing whether I am correct?

Hon. Mr. Davis: He has a free trip home at Christmas and maybe he has to hitchhike home after the exams are over in April.

Mr. T. Reid: But I understand there has been a change this year from last year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right, they reduced it from two to one.

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, and I am interested in sorting out your valued judgment in making this decision.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I have a very simple answer for the member.

Mr. T. Reid: Now, in section 23 of the form that students have to fill out, Mr. Chairman, there are regulations governing what is meant by independence and I gather this year the regulations are much more stringent. An independent student is one who has completed four successful years of post-secondary education or is married before the beginning of the academic year or is 21 years of age and has worked for 12 consecutive months prior to first enrolling in this academic programme.

Well, hypothetically, here is one problem example: A student who perhaps failed a year, here or there, could be 24 years old and still considered a dependent. This is one of the peculiar things that happens when you carry regulations to their logical extension.

Or again, a student might have saved enough from part-time jobs to finance his first year of a BA programme. He then drops out, perhaps for financial reasons, and works 12 consecutive months in order to save some money to get through second year. This is, of course, assuming that he either had no parents, or did not receive any help. Even though he is self-supporting, The Department of University Affairs would consider him dependent, because his period of employment was not prior to first enrolling in his course. This is one of the things about red tape; when you get involved in too specific definitions you get involved in abuses to the system.

I think that there surely must be some effective system of appeal within the regulation so that a student who gets caught within the regulation and cannot figure things out, can appeal an unfair incidence of the regulations on him.

Let us have a look at sections 32 and 35 on the awards application form. The student whose parents refuse to complete sections 32 and 35 on family income, or declare their child to be financially independent, gets nothing. Last year, he would have received a loan to the maximum amount of $1,000. Now, I understand that the Minister may change this; it is not written in the brochure, and he may revert to last year's policy. But if it is not changed, a large number of students will suffer and I would like to recommend that the Minister change that particular aspect. Also, many university students object vehemently to these regulations. They say that this makes them tied to their mothers' apron strings.

Also, they say that because their parents control the purse strings, their parents can bring pressure to bear on them for them to take the courses that the parents choose. It sounds a little far-fetched, but I believe that it has occurred, particularly among immigrant families. I raise that with the Minister. Whether or not we can do something about it, in the regulations, I do not know. It is a problem, and if there is a solution or partial solution, I hope that the Minister and his departmental officials will try to seek it out.

I also understand that all students in community colleges are considered dependent. Is this correct? Perhaps you could check that out. It seems funny that if we are interested in adult education at the community colleges that we should, by definition, say that the students at these colleges are dependents. It just does not jibe, if it is correct, with the philosophy that the CAATs should have open-ended education for adult students.

There are some parents who are disturbed about filling in the form relating to their income. They feel that it is some sort of invasion of privacy, and is not relevant. After all, they are not the ones applying for assistance. Now, this particular objection I do not sympathize with, even though I think that the whole thing has to be revamped. Do you have this type of means test, or needs test?

Hon. Mr. Davis: If you want to borrow money, you do not have to answer anything more than if you were doing it through some other agency. Agreed?

Mr. T. Reid: Yes, I will just leave that because this is where I think criticism is a bit weak. Now, there are some particular points. In section 33, it asks for gross earnings. That is correct. Now, this does not take into account mortgages, car payments, etc., and does allow for income tax, uninsured medical and dental expenses, maintenance of dependant relatives, wedding expenses and school fees. Now, even the income tax department allows for union or professional dues, and I wonder if the minister's department should not allow for that? Other expenses that should be allowed, I believe, are insurance premiums, religious donations—since some families make quite heavy religious donations to their churches—pension plan contributions and so forth. In other words, there is an area, here, where there is inconsistency between the federal income tax exemptions and the exemptions of the Minister's department, with respect to the student awards programme.

I am not saying that inconsistency is all that valuable. I am saying that there are some more things that should be included in the

deductions from gross income. The aim should be to obtain a realistic estimate of a family's ability to contribute to a child's education, and not to set arbitrary figures which are often totally out of line with the actual situation. In some instances that I know of, a parental contribution amounting to one-eighth of gross income was expected. Very few families can contribute to that extent. It is that type of abuse of the situation, where the present regulations do not apply, with a value judgment imposed on the parent of how much they should have saved, or they should contribute to the education of their children that is particularly objectionable. I think that there are cases where it has amounted to one-eighth of the gross income, and I suggest, sir, with the greatest of respect, that this is out of line. As long as there are a few cases like this, there is room for improvement.

Now, married students do better this year than last. They are now allowed $25 per week for room and board, as opposed to $350 for the academic year. However, the baby-sitting allowance is totally inadequate. If the wife is working to support her husband through school, the family can deduct $500 per year for baby-sitting allowance, under present regulations. This works out to less than $10 per month for the calendar year; for the academic year of course it is higher.

Also, if the type of family has small children, a car becomes a necessity. Now, although it is not assessed as a resource, under the test applied to them, there are expenses such as insurance for the car which amounts to a considerable portion of their disposable income. I think that this would be a valid deduction for such families. I know that the transportation allowance would cover the cost of gas to and from these universities, but it just does not include the cost, as I understand it, of things such as car insurance. I think that this is a particularly valid one that might be included. Like the section for income of dependent students, these questions do not provide a realistic assessment of the situation. There is also the complaint about the regulation: "Must have completed four successful years." This has a moralist tone to it, and I think that it is out of tune with public policy. Some students, and I share this, think that it should be "years," not "successful years." As the Minister has often said, he is against the concept of failure in education, and yet his regulations refer to success in education. Surely this is a concept that we should be getting away from. This is a moralistic concept that we should be getting away from in the student award programme.

I would like next, Mr. Chairman, to turn to the summer savings and how the Minister's department treats these. Each student is expected to save a certain number of dollars from summer employment. An arbitrary figure is decided upon, depending, of course, on the year in university and the sex. This figure is considered in the assessment. This year, as last year, the summer employment situation is drastic, and a large number of students will be unemployed. In the Thermotex strike, students took jobs in a "finky" manner because they were desperate for summer earnings, in the light of the OSAP policy. It also forces students to take jobs which are not helpful in the course of study, but which pay more.

I think, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, that the principal criticism the official Opposition has, in that OSAP, in its present form, discriminates against low income groups. It is a burden to carry a substantial loan into graduate school, and many lower income students are prevented from continuing post-graduate study because they do not want to increase the amount of the debt. The reply to this criticism, which I am making of inadequate and stringent regulations which hit those who do not fit this norm, is that the students who do not receive a parental contribution, or do not have summer savings, and so forth, can appeal.

This is true, but there are the three important qualifications to the appeal. First they cannot appeal until after registration at university, so that many go into classes in September not knowing if they can afford to finish their year. This creates an insecurity, and this is something that is unnecessary, and an administrative bungle in the regulation, if it is true. This is something that must be looked into. The appeal must be shifted into a more reasonable way.

Secondly, last year the students very, very often waited two months before they received the decision on their appeal. This is an administrative matter. The Minister is aware of the difficulty that is caused the student. I would like to know whether he has smoothed out the administration's programme in respect to the decisions on the appeals, made to the department.

Thirdly, increases in the size of the award most often took the form of an extra loan, rather than a higher grant.

This apparently is justified, by the department, on the reasoning that the first respon-

sibility for providing funds rests with the parents.

Mr. Chairman, I think the student award programme has improved over the years. I think it is essential. I have serious objections to many aspects of it, but within that framework, without questioning the framework the Minister has established, I draw a lot of these particular complaints to his attention. I hope that before September comes around, some of these complaints will be dealt with, in an effective way.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just to reply very briefly on some of these matters. A number of those raised by the hon. member relate to alterations in regulations, not in philosophy of the plan. They have been made, basically, to live within the total dollars available for the student award programme. I am not saying that some of these suggested changes do not, in a period of time, make some sense, but we are talking now about, in total student awards a $32 million programme, related to some 82,000 students, for sake of argument. This is a generous plan, in fairness, and I think even the students recognize this. This is a pretty substantial commitment on the part of the public, with respect to student awards. A goodly number of the items mentioned by the hon. member do relate to an increase in benefit. The suggested alteration in regulation involves, with it, automatic increases in the amounts that must be made available. With respect to the independent student, I think the only main alteration that was made this year—and really, it did not become more rigid *per se*—all we are saying now is that it must be four years instead of three. I think, Mr. Chairman, this is not any greater rigidity; it is a case of extending it from the three-year to the four-year period.

There is no difference in philosophy between the independent student, whether he is in the community college or in the university; except in the community colleges, of course, are basically two- and three-year institutions. With the CAATs, the question of independence, after four years, becomes academic, because with very few exceptions, as I foresee it, they will not be developing into four- or five-year programmes. Thus, there is no basic difference between them; it is just that the four-year rule has application only in the university environment.

With respect to the appeal procedures, Mr. Chairman, there is no question that ways and means will be found to expedite these situations. But one must also remember that they relate very definitely to the administrative structure within the universities. The appeal procedures are initiated there. They must go through the universities themselves, and, while I am not in any way suggesting that they have not administered them with speed, nonetheless, it has been a new programme for them this year. The appeal procedures, I am sure, can be improved.

Although I do say this to the hon. member, I am not sure yet how you would appeal the problem of summer earnings prior to September until you know what, in fact, your earnings would be. I see this as being a very practical problem but I do not see the solution. I think that the hon. member, if he reflects, would also agree that it is pretty hard to appeal a situation until you know what it is going to be. I think that this is a very valid position to take.

With respect to the loan portion, Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out, and I think that this must be made abundantly clear, the administration is being integrated with our own programme. We did this knowing that quite frankly, politically perhaps, there was great merit in saying the federal government are the fellows who are making you repay your loans, and the province will be the good fellows, who are giving only awards, and have two completely separate programmes. This could have been done, but we thought that philosophically and administratively this was wrong; that we should endeavour to integrate the two programmes.

I think our decision was right, although on a strict political basis probably it was unwise. But we do so and I think that this really sets something of an example to other jurisdictions. Look at the student loan amounts, Mr. Chairman, as we relate them to other provinces. I won't give you all the figures, I will just tell you this; that the average loan amount in Ontario is less than any other provincial jurisdiction in Canada.

Dealing just momentarily with the question of the tables of parental contribution—I think the hon. member should know this—the tables have been developed really to get away from as much detail as we can on the forms themselves. The Canada student loan administrators hired special consultants to advise on what the deductions might be for a family earning "X" number of dollars. In other words, they attempted to strike an average area of costs or deductions and this is how the new table was established.

We have, along with the other provinces,

adopted the table established by the federal government under the Canada student loans programme, and this is how it has come about.

This was done really to get around a lot of the detailed information that might otherwise be requested.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that I have not answered all the questions from the hon. member. I shall review *Hansard* very carefully. I shall pass on his suggestions to the student awards committee for consideration, of course. I shall endeavour, if in my answers I have missed some of the ideas he suggested, to communicate these to him, and the understanding we have of them within the department, so he will have them for his own information.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2404. The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: Could I make just one short comment. I am wondering if the delays which took place in these awards have been straightened out. If next year there has been some indication, I do not want to go over what the hon. member for Scarborough East has stated about the awards, but I know that there are a number of young people who were really almost driven right up the wall over these awards last year.

I know some of the fault was the university administration, but I also understand that the computer went right off the rails in the department which was dealing with this thing. As a result, there were tremendous delays, even when the university did complete the forms. To complete this item, I wonder if the Minister could indicate his philosophy of student aid.

We seem to be dealing with two things. The Minister, I think, has not really told us whether, if the money became available, he would prefer to see the end of fees and the end of this barrier which still remains to free education in Ontario. In other words, does he have any philosophic feeling that this would not be a good thing if the money was available?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, not to get into any lightly philosophical discussion on this occasion, may I say my position has been, and is, that we should make every effort with the resources available to us, to see that any student in this province who has the qualification to attend university is not prejudiced from doing so by lack of economic resource. I think this recognizes that, basically, fees are not the only problem with respect to university costs.

Let us face it, the elimination of fees for some people who, quite frankly, have the resources, means that you then have to add resources to assist those who perhaps do not need the assistance. I think that this is a very fundamental approach, and one with which the hon. member for Peterborough, if he thought very carefully, might even agree. We are not talking about fees *per se*, we are talking about availability of resources. As I said earlier today, I think the problem that we face is not really basically with the students who graduate successfully from grade 13. I think their problem, perhaps, comes before that point in time, and does not relate itself directly to fee structure.

The other point, with respect to administration that I would make, is that we have determined this year that application forms must be in by October 31. This, I think, will negate a lot of the problems we faced in this past year because it was open-ended and students were making application well into the New Year. This, of course, was one of the reasons for delay.

Now the member for Scarborough East did ask one other question. I just want to make this clear. The only reason the social security number is listed on the form as being required is so that we can relate it to some form of documentation for computers to expedite the situation. We suggested this as being a logical way of doing it.

It does not relate to income tax or any other information we wish to find. It is just a way of identification of students because the majority of them probably will be beneficiaries of this programme for a three- or four-year period. It does give a continuing identification for the use of the computers, and we hope will expedite the whole question of the processing of student awards.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. E. Dunlop (York-Forest Hill): I should like to ask some questions and make some observations with respect to the Ontario fellowship programme. The Minister, in his opening remarks this afternoon, referred to the very great expansion in the graduate training programmes of our universities. I think since 1964-1965 to the present session the numbers of graduate students had approximately doubled from nearly 5,000 to nearly 9,000.

It is my understanding, however, Mr.

Chairman, that the Ontario fellowship programme is entirely, or substantially, limited to students in graduate programmes in traditional fields of art and science and that it discriminates against students in graduate programmes in the applied sciences, and in the professional schools such as engineering, social work and medicine. This difficulty is mitigated to some extent by the existence of national research council and medical research council fellowships.

But if the difficulty is as I portray it, I think that we are limiting the contributions which the universities can make to the productivity of our society. We are in great need of engineers with higher degrees. It may be, too, that even in the much-vaunted legal profession there should be some opportunity for people to take degrees higher than the LLB.

I fear that this discrimination against professional schools and the applied sciences is actually reducing the maximum contribution which the Ontario fellowship programme can make to the society which must support the universities and support this grant.

I should like to hear what the Minister has to say about this suggestion, that there is discrimination against those taking graduate programmes in professional schools, such as veterinary science and others, and that this is in some way a limitation upon the contribution which the universities can make to our society.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I have always taken the position that it is not a case of the programme discriminating. I am saying that it is a programme that has a leaning to certain situations. Of course, the original concept of the programme was to encourage young people to pursue their graduate work with the hope and the thought that a goodly number of them would find their way into the teaching professions at our universities.

This was the basic philosophy behind the programme, and while I know that the members opposite from time to time have constructive criticism to make, I think in all modesty I can say this has been an extremely successful programme here in this jurisdiction. Extremely successful. I do not think there is any question about it, Mr. Chairman.

However, I heard our colleague's suggestion of a year ago. While these things are difficult and any extension involves additional funds, perhaps he will be delighted to learn that the programme is being extended this year in the areas of applied science and the law, with the hope, of course, that the extension will provide personnel, some at least, for teaching positions within our universities. Thus a portion of his plea of a year ago has, in fact, been met, and an extension into the other areas that he suggests, if this is to be done, will be done in consultation with the Ontario council for graduate studies. It will relate to the availability of funds and priorities which the council, in consultation with the committee on university affairs, deems to be appropriate.

Mr. Dunlop: I was delighted to hear of the proposed extension, Mr. Chairman, into certain fields such as applied science.

I wonder if the Ontario council of graduate studies, which advises the Minister in the matter of the fellowship programme, has taken into account that many of the graduate programmes which they have not included within their recommended ambit for the Ontario fellowship programme, are among the more expensive schools which, under the grants programme, have a very high weighting. That is to say, they suggest, or at least the university advisory committee suggest, that the government should spend very substantial amounts on the support of these schools. The Ontario council on graduate studies suggests nothing should be spent to support the graduate students in these schools. This seems to be inconsistent advice that the Minister is getting. One from one side and one from another—all ultimately reflected in the spending estimates of this department.

The Minister has suggested that funds available to him for the Ontario fellowship programme are limited. Indeed, they seem to be limited in these estimates to some $5 million.

I would suggest that the Ontario council on graduate studies should think of making the $5 million that seems to be available—and the Minister should think of making the $5 million that is available—available on a competitive basis. This is not simply because people have chosen one form of graduate education rather than another. If any form of graduate education is worthy of the support of the taxpayer, it should be worthy of the fellowship support for its participants on the basis of their merit.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think one must keep in mind—but do not misunderstand me, I say this to the member for Forest Hill—that the council itself would not like to see

an extension of the programme. I am sure they would be delighted to see an extension but once again, it relates to the priorities and the availability of funds. One cannot get away from the initial concept and philosophy behind the fellowship programme which, I think, still has very real validity. That is, it was introduced to encourage students to proceed towards higher degrees so that they could, in turn, make a contribution to teaching at the university level.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2404. The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: I just have one final comment to make on this item and that relates to the effect which the province of Ontario student aid programme has had on the Ontario scholarships. It is my understanding that the Ontario scholarship programme will continue during the coming year and the grade 13 scholars this year will have an opportunity to receive one of these. They have been reduced to $150. Of course, the total effect of the province of Ontario student aid programme has been to—well, almost end—the increasing number of scholarships that were becoming available, simply because groups feel that there is no point in providing for scholarships unless the scholarship is at least $1,500 or something quite generous. There is no point in a scholarship which simply deducts from the province of Ontario student aid programme, from the award section of the aid programme, and then leaves the loan programme untouched.

I am wondering how this relates to what the Minister said a few minutes ago when he indicated that one of the major problems is not necessarily that of economics while a student is in university, but is rather a motivation problem farther back in high school. I am wondering, in our efforts to use the term democratize—that is, provide aid for everyone—a form of aid which includes both loan and award and our bursary type aid—whether we are destroying, or at least not encouraging, a degree of motivation for bright young people who previously could expect to receive a $500 Ontario scholarship and also the great range of scholarships which exist all the way from $200 to $300 up to $1,400 and $1,500. I think this has got a very real effect upon that motivational drive which perhaps existed farther back.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, once again not to prolong this, I think if the hon. member will pursue his own arguments to their logical conclusion, he is really saying, if I follow him correctly—that it is the upper and middle income group, particularly the upper income group—who are primarily the beneficiaries of university education. This means then, the bulk of the scholarship moneys have been going progressively over the years to the same group of people. If we are really concerned about need, and interested in getting more young people into the universities, then I think that these awards must be related to need.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot have it both ways. As far as the student award programme is concerned, you cannot have a scholarship programme duplicating at the same time, the student award programme. We do not discourage scholarship. If a student gets a $1,500 scholarship, we do not take it away from him. Surely, though, you cannot expect that the student will then receive an additional $1,500 by way of grant and loan so that he has $3,000 available to him?

As I say, it is not really the problem I think the hon. member visualizes. I think that there is still a place, and there will be an increasing place, for the private interest in scholarships for excellence, and as a means of motivation. But our philosophy with the student award programme—and I think that it is basically sound – is based on need, because we think that the private sector can move in the area of scholarship.

Now, touching on the Ontario scholarship programme for a moment, it partly relates to the student award programme, and also relates to the fact that, as I pointed out during the estimates of the other department, without the external examinations set by the department and marked by the department, it is very difficult to continue a scholarship programme on a total provincial basis. We are going to continue to do it on the basis of the recommendation of the individual schools.

The students will be given credit for $150 under this programme. At the same time it is not calculated in the total need assessment, because we have allowed $150 without any question of the assessment being made.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Minister, did they not suggest that it should be more? The Minister would have to accept the fact that there are now fewer scholarships being given by private interests than there were before the OSAP came into effect. It has the effect of lessening the number of scholarships. Now, I do not think that there is dichotomy here. I am not suggesting that the OSAP programme is wrong because it deals with the need aspect. What I am suggesting is that there is also the

problem of bright young people who need to be motivated for scholarship excellence and for achievement.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do they do it on the basis of money?

Mr. Pitman: I wish we could say no. But I think that we live in a society in which certainly awards of some kind, either monetary or other, play a very large part.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Right, but I do not think that they necessarily have to be money. I think that young people are motivated without the concept of certain dollar signs being there at the end. Maybe it is wishful thinking.

Vote 2404 agreed to.

On vote 2405:

Mr. T. Reid: I note that the world university service of Canada had a specific grant for 1965-66-67-68. Why, Mr. Chairman, was there not a specific allocation to the University Service of Canada in the estimates for next year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this area of grant has been transferred to the cultural exchange programme which comes under the first vote of The Department of Education.

Mr. T. Reid. So the world university service of Canada will be getting at least some regard—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes. I think that it will be somewhat larger this year.

Mr. T. Reid: Great.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. Pitman: I have one question on the last item—"miscellaneous." It turns out to be, of course, three times as much as the specified grants are. Has the Minister any idea where this money goes?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I shall very briefly give you an indication. I think that they are all very valid. Finnish student exchange, $1,000; Canadian association of physicists, $1,000; Ontario union of students, $7,000; world university service, $6,500; Canadian federation for university women—I will not read the whole list. Glendon College centennial project—I am sure that the hon. member for Scarborough East would say that this is a very valid programme. No question about it.

Royal Canadian institute, University college library and athletic society. Do you want me to read the whole list? These are the miscellaneous items, Mr. Chairman, that came in after certain decisions were made with regard to the main vote. This is the situation every year and chances are that these will all vary again next year. We will not have Glendon Centennial College for next year.

Mr. Nixon: But you will think of something else I am sure.

Votes 2405, and 2406 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of The Department of University Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that the committee rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I believe that tomorrow we will move to the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves the adojurnment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:20 o'clock, p.m.

ERRATA

Hansard No.	*Page*	*Column*	*Line*	*Correction*
97	3534	1	48	Kent—should be—(Canada)
97	3534	1	49	rate—should be—(rates)
97	3535	2	22	we want more—should be—(we do not want more)
97	3538	1	18	was—should be—(had)
98	3565	1	47	to—should be—(in)
98	3569	1	34	Quimet—should be—(Ouimet)
98	3572	1	23	take—should be—(check)
98	3587	1	28	add—(I)
99	3597	2		beginning with—Hon. Mr. Grossman at the bottom of the page and continuing to conclusion of first paragraph, column 1, page 3598—this is all part of quote from *Hansard*.
99	3598	1	4	remove—(not)
99	3607	1	43	Kingston—should be—(on King St.)
100	3652	1	11	gambit—should be—(gamut)
100	3653	1	4th last line	Trade union and industry advisory board—should be—(Trades and Industries Advisory Board)
100	3653	2	7	hand goods—should be—(canned goods)
100	3662	1	46	concussions—should be—(contusions)
100	3662	1	51	sued—should be—(used)
100	3665	1	2	Borne—should be—(Bowen)
100	3665	1	22	Hitwood—should be—(Hipwood)
100	3665	1	48	Walm—should be—(Bowen)
100	3668	1	26	Harlow—should be—(Harloff)
100	3668	2	20	and—should be—(in)
100	3668	2	21	Jailer—should be—(Jail)
100	3668	2	33	and—should be—(or)
100	3677	2	11	going—should be—(doing)
100	3677	2	25	Be it time—should be—(Bedtime)
101	3683	2	8	Institute—should be—(Institution)

No. 114



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, June 11, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

TORONTO
THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 11, 1968

Second report, standing committee on education and university affairs, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence 4241

Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 4241

Commercial fishing in Lake Ontario, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. Shulman 4242

Restrictions on correspondence of Millbrook inmates, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman 4243

Refugees coming to Canada to escape violence, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon 4243

Clergymen in politics, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. MacDonald 4243

Safety regulations in Quetico park due to drownings, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. T. P. Reid 4244

Replacing of municipal police by OPP, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Sargent 4244

Death of Patricia Miller, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Sargent 4245

Purchase and possession of firearms, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Sargent 4245

Wire tapping by police, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Sargent 4245

Removal of OPP detachment from Sarnia to Petrolia, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Bullbrook 4246

Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett 4246

Recess, 6 o'clock 4282

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This afternoon we have a large number of students with us. In the east gallery from St. Cecelia separate school in Toronto; in the west gallery from Humber Valley Village public school in Islington and in both galleries from St. Anthony's separate school in Toronto.

Later this afternoon, in the east gallery, the ladies from Howick women's institute, Wroxeter will be with us.

We welcome these young people here today.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence from the standing committee on education and university affairs, presented the committee's second report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment: Bill 140, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments: Bill 141, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, this bill I have introduced includes a number of major amendments to The Workmen's Compensation Act which are designed to improve benefits for men and women involved in compensable occupational accidents.

As you, sir, and the hon. members know, The Workmen's Compensation Act of Ontario was first approved in 1915 and it was considered a major step forward in social legislation at that time.

Since then, the governments of Ontario have ensured that our system is kept modern by amendments to the Act following the recommendations of Royal commissions of enquiry.

In June 1966, the Hon. Mr. Justice J. G. McGillivray was appointed a Royal commissioner to enquire into and make recommendations concerning The Workmen's Compensation Act.

The McGillivray report is a comprehensive study. The government appreciates the work which has been so ably performed and this bill includes recommendations from that report.

At this time, I would like to outline to the members of the House a number of improvements in the Act which the government proposes to make.

Substantial increases are proposed in the pensions paid to widows and children. And the increases apply to all such pensions regardless of the date of the accident.

The widows pension will be increased to $125 monthly and the pension for each child will be increased to $50 per month. Pensions for orphans will be increased to $60 each per month. The minimum payable to a widow with three children will be $275 per month regardless of the earnings of the deceased.

The burial allowance will be increased from $300 to $400 and the initial lump sum payment to the widow will be raised from $300 to $500.

Maximum earnings will be raised from $6,000 to $7,000 per annum for compensation purposes. Where there is a recurrence of compensable disability, compensation will be based on the earnings immediately prior to the lay-off due to recurrence or the original earnings basis, whichever is the greater. Provision is also made for permanent disability awards for serious facial disfigurements.

The waiting period before compensation entitlement begins has been gradually reduced over the years from seven days in 1915 to the present three calendar days. The amending Act provides for the waiting period to be the day of the accident only. Compensation payments will begin on the day of disablement following the accident.

The board's vocational rehabilitation programme has been significantly expanded in the past year to ensure the continuing success of this essential service. The limit on the amount of money which the board may spend annually will be removed.

The board has traditionally followed the practice of allowing the workman the right to choose initially his attending doctor or other practitioner. This right will now be written into the Act.

Where an employer's work injury frequency and accident cost are consistently higher than the average for the industry, the board may substantially increase the employer's assessment. In the amending Act provision is also made for the board to require such an employer to establish a safety committee at the plant level.

Mr. Speaker, these are the major improvements arising from the government's study of the Royal commissioner's report. The Ontario Workmen's Compensation Act is sound social legislation and the proposed amendments will enhance it.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the leader of the Opposition and the member for York South would yield the floor to the member for High Park who has an urgent appointment and would like to ask his question.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have an appeal at the workmen's compensation board which must be heard at 3 p.m.

I have three questions of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Is it correct that the united empire loyalists have an ancient claim to the fishing grounds east of Port Hope, as suggested by Dr. C. H. D. Clark, chief of the fish and wildlife branch in today's Toronto *Daily Star*? Will the Minister intervene to allow Mr. Walter Zilow to trawl in the fishing areas east of Port Hope? Inasmuch as alewive carcasses are a nuisance on Ontario's beaches, why does the department not encourage trawling for these fish everywhere in Lake Ontario?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for High Park.

Question 1: The answer is yes, many original land grants have shore rights and water lots and fisheries have been in existence since the first settlement.

Question 2: The department is not prepared to issue new licences for the eastern area of lake Ontario. The conversion of an existing licence for trawling would have to be considered on its merits, and on its compatibility with other fisheries. This would be the only way in which a trawling licence could be established in the eastern basin.

Question 3: The department has done everything in its power to establish a trawl-fishery for alewives and smelt in Lake Ontario. Most of the Ontario waters of the lake would be open to such a fishery, and we would hope that there are sufficient stocks of fish to sustain it. The initial steps would not be taken in the area presently covered by gill net licences.

Tenders were called for an experimental trawl-fishery recently and arrangements have been made to sell any fish taken. It would be our hope that any success in this departmental venture will immediately be followed up by the commercial fishing industry, as its sole purpose is to establish what can be done. It is by no means certain that intensive commercial use of alewives would stop the nuisance of dead fish on shore. For instance, there is a very active alewive trawl-fishery in Lake Michigan, and they still have dead fish.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary question. Could the department not allow trawling east of Port Hope at a depth that would only affect the alewives?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. member for High Park that I would be very pleased to have this Mr. Zilow come to my office and meet with my game and fish people. I am sure that together we can find—we hope anyway—a satisfactory arrangement.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Reform Institutions.

Following my complaint that a letter had been sent to Ontario jails instructing that visiting MPPs' conversations be written down and forwarded to the department, was a second letter sent to the same institution instructing that the first letter be removed

from the files and locked away by the local jail governor?

Will the Minister please rescind the instructions that visiting MPPs' conversations with prisoners be written down and forwarded to the department?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, while I think I could answer, I will take it as notice, and make sure there is not one word in my answer that could be misconstrued as misinforming the House. So I will take it as notice; and while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me? Yesterday the hon. member for High Park asked a question about restrictions on correspondence of inmates at Millbrook reformatory.

As a supplementary question he asked me: "Will the Minister inform us how many people at the present time the prisoners may not be allowed to write to?"

The answer is, at Millbrook there are 11 people to whom various inmates have been forbidden to write, and/or receive letters from.

Mr. Speaker: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, perhaps this would be a good time to ask the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions if the hon. member for High Park is on that list?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: At the present time, I could not answer that definitely, but I would think not.

Mr. Nixon: I see. I was just curious. Mr. Speaker, I have a question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would think he was one of the most prolific correspondents we have.

Mr. Nixon: Or as somebody said: If not, why not? Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier arising from a press report of one of his speeches.

Can the Premier tell the House what steps he has in mind when he suggested, in an address to the national conference on human relations in labour and management on June 6, that as Canada has become the new home of persons who have fled their own countries to avoid violence: "We can welcome to our country the refugees who want to escape such pressures and hopefully we can provide a haven for them."

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, from the quote just made there are a few words omitted. What I actually said was: "Perhaps as we have done in the past, we can welcome to our country the refugees who want"—so you can see, if those words are included which were in the text I was using, it could be seen that I was not proposing any long, or any new, form of immigration policy. I was just referring to what had occurred in this country in the past. I was thinking in terms of those Hungarians, for instance, who came here after the Hungarian revolution. I was thinking of the influx of Europeans into this country after World War II.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The Prime Minister was surprised by the headlines?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I was a trifle surprised, but I have a standing practice never to say that I have been misquoted.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Premier that I had no intention of misquoting him here. As a matter of fact, I think the attitude is a very commendable one, and it may very well be that some initiative on the part of this government could improve the situation.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well I am merely trying, Mr. Speaker, to explain exactly what I had in mind when I made the remark. I would be happy to supply a copy of the remarks I made because I find when I make certain speeches, I am wiser to have a text to work from than just say what I think off the top of my head. But those words were in my text, and they do change the meaning of that quote. I just wanted to make it quite clear.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister, submitted a day or so ago. When the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Winkler) told a Waterloo meeting, as reported in the Toronto *Daily Star* of Wednesday, that—and I quote—"dedicated clergymen should keep their noses out of politics"; was he expressing the official view of the Conservative Party?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the text of the speech made by the hon. member for Grey South, nor did I see the particular news report. I can only say that as far as the portion of the Conservative Party with which I am associated, we have had men of the cloth representing this party in the

House, in years gone by, and we do have presently. So perhaps, that is the answer to the hon. member's question. The hon. member who sits back here is an Anglican minister and sits on this side of the House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: Can the Prime Minister assure us that the hon. member for Grey South is attached to the same portion of the Conservative Party as himself?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Absolutely! All the way. He is a man I support, supported vigorously last October, and will support in the future.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Rainy River have a question?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests. Is the Minister considering the implementation and enforcement of new safety regulations in Quetico park due to the increased number of drownings during the past 15 months, which number in total 12, and due to the drowning of three Minnesota fishermen on May 17 on Basswood Lake on the Ontario-Minnesota border?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Rainy River, our records show that in 1967, there occurred eight drownings within Quetico provincial park. On May 17 last, three bodies were recovered from the Canadian side of Basswood Lake, which is international water. It is not known whether the drownings occurred in the Ontario Quetico provincial park or in the United States boundary waters canoe area.

In periods of high water, as at present, which cause extra hazards near rapids and rivers, all of our border crossing points issue special warnings when issuing the licence to travel. No specific new safety regulations are contemplated as persons using this park for canoe trips are considered to make such trips on their own responsibility. Our staff offers advice when dangerous practices are seen and when advice is sought.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question? As you may be aware, sir, perhaps you can confirm this for me—but the problem in some of these drownings has been because of overloading of canoes and boats. Would you be prepared to give your forestry officials the power to enforce regulations for minimum loadings for canoes and power boats used not only in Quetico park but in the province?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I would say that we could certainly make it known, but as far as making it compulsory, I do not think that it is within our competence or jurisdiction. This matter of boats, as you know, comes mainly under the federal jurisdiction, but we certainly would be pleased to try and make it known to those using canoes and boats that they should observe the federal regulations as they exist.

Mr. Speaker: I assume that the member, in directing the question to the Minister, meant the maximum loading and not the minimum loading as he said?

Hon. A. A. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, yesterday the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) asked a question which I would like to answer today. The question was: Now that the province has launched legislation authorizing the taking over of policing the municipalities, will the province take steps to amend the legislation and guarantee that officers and police presently in charge of enforcement be protected either by continuity of employment or financially?

My answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the legislation which provides that local law enforcement personnel may be replaced by the Ontario Provincial Police cannot at the same time undertake to provide continuity of employment or financial security. I would point out that the Ontario Provincial Police only take over policing municipalities at the request of the municipality; it is a voluntary proposal. If the municipality prefers to carry on its own police supervision, the OPP do not move in.

What we do, and I think I answered a question to this effect in the House a very few days ago, is make every endeavour to provide as much notice as possible, after the municipality has agreed to the policing by the Ontario Provincial Police force, to interview every member of the local force to see if they can qualify on training and other qualifications which are necessary to fit into the provincial police force. We have had considerable success although I must admit that a great many of the personnel who have perhaps been a number of years with the local force, do not qualify. But we do what we can to assist them in employment or in continuity of employment, and we encourage the municipalities to see that they are employed with considerable success.

The rest of that question, Mr. Speaker, the second part was: What right has the Ontario police commission to dispatch police to any municipality over the heads of local police authorities?

The right is contained in The Police Act, particularly section 50, subsection 1, and in sections 4 and 5; where there is inadequate policing, there is provision to have the policing done by the Ontario Provincial Police. Under section 50, again, the provision is that the provincial police will move in only on request from the local council, in a resolution, or a resolution from the local board of police commissioners. It must be passed by way of resolution and then a request made to the Attorney General or the local Crown attorney by the head of the council after resolution—or by the police commissioners—and then we will move in to assist. In the proposed legislation, which I am sure we will discuss, what is intended there—and I think perhaps the hon. member was a little confused—was that in sudden situations of an influx of people in a summer resort area or some other area such as that, there would be the power to assist without waiting on the calling of a council and the passing of a resolution.

Then there was another question by the same member, the member for Grey-Bruce yesterday, on June 7. The question was—what recourse has the family of Patricia Miller, who died of a massive overdose of a local anaesthetic administered by Dr. Saul Eisen, at Mount Sinai hospital on April 7, 1968? Second, what right does Dr. Samuel Leslie have to refuse attending that patient unless she is married?

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very disappointed in the way these questions were presented because they raise innuendoes and inferences which have no basis whatever in fact. One newspaper report did use the expression "a massive overdose" of anaesthetic but I am advised that the phrase that was used in evidence at the inquest was "a massive dose" of anaesthetic. There was testimony heard on that issue from experts that the administration of that amount of anaesthetic was perhaps more than might have been necessary, but it was not greater than the amount that has been given in similar cases without any ill effect to a patient. It must also be remembered that the patient lived for several days after the administration of that anaesthetic. The rights of the family are those of a civil nature and they can best be considered through their consulting a legal advisor of their own choice.

The second part of the question implies that a physician refused to treat this young girl. That suggestion or allegation is even more offensive, Mr. Speaker, because it is not true. The doctor in this case did attend the girl and did treat her. However, as he was going to be away at the critical time—this was a case of childbirth—he arranged for the girl to be admitted to the hospital as a staff patient and that meant that she could be admitted and treated properly at the appropriate time of birth and with the best care which the hospital could afford. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that that young girl was treated by the chief of anaesthesia from Mount Sinai hospital and there is no doubt, therefore, that she had the most competent and experienced help available.

The member for Grey-Bruce asked a further question on June 7. "What steps does the government plan to institute in regard to a gun control law, such as prohibiting purchase by mail and making guns harder to get?" The second part of the question, "Would the government consider a 'week of amnesty' for people to turn in illegally held weapons without prosecution?"

I have to answer, Mr. Speaker, that the control of firearms is a subject within the sole judisdiction of the federal authorities. I would point out that there was a bill prepared and before the House at Ottawa, which was introduced before Parliament was dissolved and will have to be introduced when Parliament convenes again. I do not know of any authority which will enable the province to move in this field. With respect to the matter of amnesty, that certainly is a matter which concerns the federal jurisdiction since it deals with a criminal situation. We have no authority to grant amnesty for crimes which may have been committed.

And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Grey-Bruce asked a further question on June 7: "How many cases of wire tapping were carried out in Ontario by police authorities last year?" Secondly, "What are the figures of current number of wire tapping operations carried on monthly by police officials in this province as of the date of June 7, 1968?"

I would say, Mr. Speaker, I do not have statistics on this. The police are not required to furnish such statistics—if they have them—to the Attorney General, and I have no knowledge as to how many cases of wire tapping may be carried on. I would like to note, Mr. Speaker, that evidence obtained by wire tapping has been held to be admissible as evidence in our courts. There is no law

at the moment making it inadmissible or making it wrong to get evidence in this way. I think the legal situation is that a court may, while it may be found admissible, a court may take into account the way in which that evidence was obtained—its weight or its value as evidence.

I note further that in Mr. McRuer's report on the inquiry into civil rights, he made some comment on this subject. It will be found in his second volume at page 938 and 939. This is what the hon. Mr. McRuer said:

> The question is one of balance and regulation. Where law enforcement agencies have reasonable ground to believe that means of communication are to be used for the advancement of crime, they should be given means to secure power to intercept messages.

And he went on to say:

> The control over the exercise of such power should undoubtedly be strict, but nevertheless the power should exist.

The hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) asked a question on May 28, on which I undertook to give an answer.

His question was: "Could the hon. Minister advise the reasons of the removal of the Sarnia detachment of the Ontario Provincial Police from Sarnia to Petrolia, particularly with a view to the following points?

Point one: (a) the volume of present traffic in the Sarnia area and especially the location of proposed Highway 402. (b) the population concentration of the area. (c) the history of the Ontario Provincial Police activity in the Sarnia area.

Secondly, would the Minister advise as to whether Ontario Provincial Police officials were consulted in connection with the removal of the detachment to Petrolia? Also what their advice was in connection with such removal. Would the Minister specify the officer or commissioners who recommended such removal?

My answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the Ontario Provincial Police responsibility regarding traffic does not apply within the limits of the city of Sarnia. The present location of the Sarnia detachment does in fact hamper the efforts of the police in getting to their area of responsibility. The growth of the city has come to include annexation of portions of the township of Sarnia. It naturally follows that as a municipality grows, so does the inaccessibility to the Ontario Provincial Police area of responsibility. In this case, the distance from the detachment headquarters out to the area where the provincial police are responsible is some seven miles.

Since Highway 402 is a controlled access road, it is policed by the Ontario Provincial Police up to the point where it becomes a federal property and forms the approach to the Blue Water international bridge. Currently, Highway 402 is only some two and a half miles in length. The proposed extension will follow, of course, in this area paralleling and slightly north of Highway 7, eventually terminating at London. This can be adequately patrolled by the zone system from the new Petrolia location.

Second part of the question: It is evidently apparent that the major population concentration occurs in the immediate Sarnia area which is not the area with which the Ontario Provincial Police are concerned. The central geographic location of Petrolia with concentration of personnel there will give adequate response to the duties in what is designed as a form of zone policing.

Then further, at the time the Sarnia detachment was first established, the boundaries of the city of Sarnia were much different than they are today. As early as 1961, the authorities of the county of Lambton suggested more adequate policing could be made from a central location in the county. The Ontario Provincial Police organization, in the county of Lambton, has been a matter of controversy for several years. But because of leasing commitments, relocation has been delayed until the spring of last year when an approach was made to Treasury board to provide new accommodation at a central location in Petrolia.

And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the Ontario Provincial Police were certainly consulted in the matter. It was upon the advice and recommendation of the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police that this new location and the new facilities are now being provided.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 20th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, in rising to present the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Man-

agement for the fiscal year 1968-69, I propose to review briefly, for the hon. members of this Legislature, the main programmes being carried forward by my department and to highlight some of the recent developments affecting these programmes.

In the past year, there have been significant developments in the exploitation of the petroleum resources of the province. In early 1967, the oil and gas rights to one million acres of the Hudson Bay - James Bay lowlands were leased for geological exploration. Activity so far has been confined to geophysical studies but I expect that at least one test well will be drilled next winter.

In southern Ontario, attention has been focussed on Lake Erie, where drilling has occurred with limited success since 1913. Last year, for the first time, all the available oil and gas rights, some three million acres, were leased from the Crown. Six new gas pools were discovered in the lake which will add appreciably to Ontario's ultimate recoverable reserves of natural gas.

In summary, a total of 156 wells were drilled in Ontario in 1967 and of these 59 were completed as gas producers and six as oil producers. In addition to the six new gas pools discovered in Lake Erie, seven similar discoveries were made on land.

The dynamics of growth and change in energy, as in all other sectors of the economy, demand a continuing review of our programmes and responsibilities. In the area of the safe use of energy fuels, we have been concentrating for some years on the preparation of new, and the updating of existing, codes of practice for the various fuels. While this work must, and will, continue we are now turning to the need to up-grade the qualifications of our fuel inspectors.

A new programme has been started to accomplish this aim and includes additional training in propane storage and handling; natural gas, propane and fuel oil utilization and appliance approvals; natural gas and fuel oil transmission and distribution; gasoline and fuel oil storage, handling and transportation.

It is my hope that this programme will increase our effectiveness in the field of safety in the use of energy fuels without increasing the number of staff involved.

It is my hope that this programme will increase our effectiveness in the field of safety in the use of energy fuels without increasing the number of staff involved.

The Ontario energy board continued its work in the regulation of the gas industry, and during the year held 82 hearings. These included such matters as fixing rates and charges, approval to construct transmission pipelines, pooling gas and oil interests, designating gas storage areas and other related matters.

Some of the highlights of the board's work in the past year included:

Approval of an east-west line of the Consumers' Gas Co., partly 30 inches in diameter and partly 28 inches, immediately to the north of Metropolitan Toronto, designed to meet increased demands for gas in this developing area.

Approval of a 24-inch line of Union Gas Co. between its Dawn 156 gas storage pool and its Dawn township compressor station, in order to obtain maximum deliverability from the storage pool.

Approval of a 20 inch line extending 17 miles south from the Dawn township compressor station, being the first stage of a looping of the existing 16 inch pipeline from Dawn township to the city of Windsor to meet increased demands for gas; and approval of an 84 mile 8 inch gas transmission line, previously authorized as a 6 inch line, by Twin City Gas Company from Vermilion Bay to Bruce Lake.

Of the 964 organized municipalities in Ontario, there are now 509, containing all but a small part of the population of the province, served by gas. Of these, the city of Sault Ste. Marie is the only one presently served by manufactured gas. The gas distribution system of Sault Ste. Marie was acquired last year by Northern and Central Gas Company and it is expected that this system will be converted to natural gas by the end of 1968, with appropriate rate reductions, when natural gas is made available at this point by Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Limited on completion of the Great Lakes project.

In southwestern Ontario, improvements to existing underground storage areas and discoveries of new potential storage pools, together with the forecast availability of supplies of natural gas from western Ontario and the United States, gives us every reason for optimism in our supply position for the next few years.

Looking now at the total energy picture, I am able to report to you that there was a significant increase in total energy demand last year, in spite of tight supplies of both

crude oil and natural gas from western Canada.

Total petroleum products sales were about 144 million barrels, an increase of about 5 per cent over 1966. Production from Ontario refineries increased by .5 per cent, whereas products from other provinces and the United States increased approximately 14 and 16 per cent respectively.

The fact that only a very slight increase in production in Ontario occurred was a result of insufficient pipeline capacity to provide for delivery of adequate quantities of crude oil to supply the demand for refined products. Consequently, imports of refined products rose sharply. The position is expected to improve greatly in 1968 with the completion of increased pipeline and refinery capacity now under construction.

Similarly, the relatively unchanged natural gas receipts from western Canada during most of last year necessitated continued increases in imports from the United States. The first phase of the new Great Lakes Transmission Company line was completed in the third quarter of 1967 and initial deliveries of gas, from the Michigan storage fields, commenced. With the completion of the Great Lakes project, at the end of the present year, substantially increased supplies of western Canada gas will be available to Ontario users.

As additional supplies of natural gas begin to move into southern Ontario, more gas from the Trans-Canada Pipe Lines will become available to better serve the requirements of northern Ontario. Further additional supplies are assured for the future with the ultimate looping of the existing northern Ontario line of Trans-Canada Pipe Lines, construction of which will commence in 1970 as a result of the conditional approval of the Great Lakes route by the national energy board.

A detailed route for the loop or second northern Ontario line has not yet been approved and when this matter is reviewed by the national energy board, I anticipate that the government of Ontario will wish to place before the board, its views as to which route will best serve the ambitions and priorities of the province for the development of its northern area. Hon. members will recall that we did draw the attention of the board to the importance of making available adequate natural gas supplies to the great Algoma area when the Great Lakes application was being considered.

At that time, while we were able to stress that primary natural resource development is of the greatest importance, and that this type of development generally requires large amounts of cheap energy, we found that we were lacking detailed information concerning specific industrial potential in specific areas. As a result, and to be prepared for the future hearings, I have initiated a study of the energy needs of northern Ontario, so that a realistic assessment of future proposals will be possible. This study is being conducted by the Ontario research foundation in close liaison with my departmental staff and is expected to be completed by early 1969.

Another development of natural gas in northern Ontario, which may be of interest to hon. members, is the construction of a liquefied natural gas plant presently being built by the Northern and Central Gas Company at Hagar, 40 miles east of Sudbury. This plant provides a storage capacity equivalent to 600 million cubic feet of natural gas and its main purpose is to provide for peak shaving. Another possibility, however, is providing a source of liquefied natural gas which can be transported by road or rail to isolated natural gas distribution systems throughout northern Ontario. An overall assessment of energy supply and needs in northern Ontario will provide a basis on which to judge the economic feasibility of such a role for liquefied natural gas.

To summarize energy requirements in Ontario, the total usage of natural gas in 1967 was about 280 billion cubic feet, an increase of roughly 15 per cent over 1966. There was no change in the demand for coal, estimated at a total of 16 million tons. Increasing consumption of coal by Ontario Hydro has tended to offset lost markets in other consuming sectors of the province. The demand for electricity in 1967 increased about 6.5 per cent over 1966, reaching a total of approximately 57 billion kilowatt hours. Ontario Hydro provided for over 90 per cent of this total.

The joint programme of construction of the Pickering nuclear generating station is continuing and the estimates include an amount of $9,650,000 which represents the province's share of the estimated costs for the next year.

I have also included in the estimates an amount of $750,000 to continue the rural electrification programme which has been of such benefit in many areas of the province, and especially northern Ontario.

In the field of water management, we are continuing our programmes through the conservation authorities and through the water resources commission. Dealing first with the conservation authorities, I would like to

report to you the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the select committee on conservation authorities.

Before doing so, however, I would like to take this opportunity of paying tribute to the chairman, the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. D. Evans) and his hard working committee for the outstanding job they have done in preparing this most comprehensive report. In all, 113 briefs were received and the committee held 99 hearings, which provides evidence of the very widespread interest with which the work of the conservation authorities is viewed by the people of Ontario.

Since the report was presented, the staff of my department has not been idle and a complete revision of The Conservation Authorities Act has been passed during the present session. The revisions incorporate many of the 127 recommendations made by the committee, others being matters of government policy, departmental procedure and authority regulations and practices. These latter recommendations are being put into practice in collaboration with the conservation authorities. By the end of this session, I believe that the great majority of these recommendations will have been instituted and this fact alone pays tribute to the value of the work of the select committee.

During the past year, the federal government has agreed to participate, under The Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act, in the Halton region water control plan and contribute 37.5 per cent of the total cost of $2,386,000. Construction of this project is now underway.

The Grand River conservation authority has submitted a brief on a comprehensive water control programme and discussions with Ottawa are still proceeding as to how this programme may qualify for federal assistance of a similar nature.

Two other conservation authorities, the Upper Thames and the Metropolitan Toronto region, have active projects under this programme. The latter has concentrated its efforts towards land acquisition for dam sites, in the face of skyrocketing land values, whereas the Upper Thames authority has been able to forge ahead with a wide-ranging construction programme. Under this programme, the Wildwood dam was officially opened on June 15, 1967, the Stratford project on October 24, 1967, and I am advised that the authority is planning an official opening ceremony for the Gordon Pittock dam this spring.

Under the ARDA programme, the Ausable conservation authority is proceeding with the construction of the Parkhill dam and reservoir and I anticipate that the facility will be in service a year from now.

Also under the ARDA agreement is the small reservoir programme, which has proven so successful. Last year, 19 dams were completed, 14 are under construction and 34 are in the planning stage.

The programme, in collaboration with The Department of Agriculture and Food, for assisting farmers to play their part in a water conservation programme by constructing farm ponds, has continued actively. The programme, too, receives assistance from federal ARDA funds and last year, close to 500 ponds were built at a total cost of nearly $500,000.

The river gauging programme which is financed jointly by the federal government, the provincial government and the conservation authorities, is continuing to expand and improve, and in critical locations, telemark recorders have been installed which transmit flood data direct to a central office in each case. The recent floods on the Lower Thames and Sydenham Rivers emphasize the need for vigilance and for the means of predicting, in advance, the degree of severity of flooding.

Using available data, the staff of the conservation authorities branch of the department were able to predict flood levels at Thamesville, Chatham, Dresden and Wallaceburg, two days before the floods arrived and, as a result, all possible precautions were taken in time to minimize loss. During the emergency period, as in previous years, a flood control headquarters was operated on a continuous basis.

Conservation authority parks continue to provide those day-use facilities which are so much in demand by dwellers in our urban centres. Over two million people visited these areas in 1967 and there is no doubt the demend for such facilities continues to increase. Another benefit of these conservation areas is in the outdoors education of children and especially city children. Many authorities are providing instructional facilities now and I hope that this programme will be expanded in the future in collaboration with The Department of Education.

Our junior conservationist award programme was again well supported last year. Eighteen students sponsored by a number of conservation organizations were enrolled and participated for six weeks in the field in actual conservation works being undertaken by the authorities.

During the year, interest in forming new authorities was shown in four watershed areas

and departmental staff have provided information and support in the preparatory work leading to the formation of new conservation authorities. Two of the four, namely, Mississippi and the lower Trent, are now in operation as our newest authorities.

A vital factor in the economic development of any community is the availability of adequate water supplies. With the increasing water use which is taking place throughout the province today, there is a corresponding increase in the volume of wastewater which must be treated before being discharged to the receiving stream. The provision of water supplies and the control of pollution continue, therefore, to form the basic objectives of the Ontario water resources commission in its responsibility for water management in the province.

This programme has been greatly accelerated during the past year as more and more projects are undertaken under the system of provincial financing which was introduced in 1965. A year ago, I was able to report that some 125 provincially-financed water and sewage projects had been initiated. As of December 31, 1967, this figure had increased to 184 at an estimated value of $120 million.

In addition to this major development in provincially-financed facilities, the construction of water supply and sewage treatment facilities undertaken by the earlier methods of financing continues unabated. This includes those projects undertaken by municipalities independently, as well as those undertaken by municipalities in agreement with the Ontario water resources commission, either on an individual or area basis. The value of such facilities undertaken in the past ten years has now exceeded the $1.25 billion mark. An estimated $157 million of this amount is being spent on projects undertaken on the basis of provincial-municipal agreement, involving the construction of some 397 water supply and sewage treatment facilities as of the end of last year.

In short, water supply and sewage treatment facilities are being undertaken throughout the length and breadth of this province —as far north as the town of Moosonee near James Bay and the town of Red Lake near the Manitoba border. The importance of this programme in furthering the development of the province cannot be over-emphasized.

I might add that in any municipality where sewage treatment works are contemplated, every effort is made to get the views of the local residents and to keep them informed of developments. The commission holds public hearings for this purpose and during the past year, 48 of these hearings were held. In addition, a total of 84 meetings took place between Ontario water resources commission staff and municipal councils on pollution control programmes.

Emphasis continues to be placed upon the carrying out of regional studies pertaining to water supply and sewage treatment needs. A major scheme involving five municipalities in the southern portion of Peel county is being worked out at the present time and further regional schemes are being developed elsewhere in the province.

Altogether, 15 regional water studies and three regional sewage studies have been initiated to date. In carrying out these studies, careful consideration is given to anticipated population growth, extensive data are gathered concerning available surface and ground water resources, existing water supply and pollution control facilities are carefully evaluated and a determination is made of the future requirements of the area in order that its orderly development may be ensured.

A major study of the Ottawa River basin is to commence this year in co-operation with the Quebec water board. Interim reports will be issued from time to time, and will include descriptions of existing water quality conditions and any planned major alterations by industries or municipalities which would affect the water quality of the river. The final report will set forth the complete findings of this river-basin investigation, including recommendations for future river uses and the limitations to be placed on wastewater sources.

The water quality survey of the Great Lakes undertaken in 1966, in co-operation with departments of the federal government and agencies of the United States government, under the reference of the international joint commission, will culminate in a comprehensive report being presented to the international joint commission. Consistent with our responsibility for the effective development of pollution control measures throughout the province, we will continue to give close attention to the reduction of pollution loads coming into the Great Lakes system, from the various watersheds which drain into it. As part of this work, we will continue to maintain a surveillance programme, including the use of aircraft patrols, to guard against the unnecessary loss or dumping of waste materials which may adversely affect the quality of these waters.

Pollution caused by industrial wastes continues to receive close attention. Increasing numbers of industries have installed, or are in the process of installing, waste treatment works within their plants, or arrangements have been made for the treatment of such wastes in municipal treatment facilities. A total of 65 certificates for industrial waste control facilities were issued to industries during 1967, involving the expenditure of almost $11 million.

Of the 1,800 wet process industries under active surveillance in the government's programme of industrial waste control, about 300 can be said to have inadequate treatment at the present time. In some cases, charges have had to be laid under section 27 of The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act. While many of these industries face problems related to poor locations, antiquated sewage systems, and technical and economic considerations of such a degree that pollution control programmes cannot be immediatey executed, our policy requires that suitable timetables be established for the reduction of waste loads to acceptable levels. In cases where new industries are to be established, standards are applied so that waste treatment and control measures are adequate at the very outset.

In the northern Ontario water resources survey being carried out in co-operation with the federal government, progress is being made in the collection of hydrological and geological data in the drainage basins under study. Twenty-four streamflow gauging stations were operated co-operatively with the federal government during 1967. This survey will have to be carried on for a considerable period of time yet in order that a comprehensive picture may be obtaned of the water resources of this vast region, both with respect to their quality and their quantity. When this data has been accumulated, the government will be enabled to formulate, more adequately, long-range plans for the development of the province and particularly of this northern area.

Under authority of the Act, the commission administers a water-taking permit system where such taking exceeds 10,000 gallons per day. During 1967, 525 such permits were issued; 375 were for irrigation, 38 were for municipal supply purposes, 55 were for industrial purposes, five were for commercial purposes and 52 were for recreational purposes. Seventy-four ground-water and surface-water interference problems were also investigated.

The regular laboratory analysis work of the commission has been augmented during the past two years by the large number of samples submitted in connection with the Great Lakes survey. Separate laboratories are operated for this purpose both in Toronto and in London. Research into nutrient removal has made considerable advances during the past year and further work is to be carried out in this area.

The decentralization of some of the commission's field activities is now being implemented. A regional office was established last September in the city of Kingston and the possibility of opening one in the city of London, to operate in conjunction with the London laboratory, is being investigated. Accommodation is being sought at the present time for a new regional office at the Lakehead to be opened this summer. Other areas of the province are being considered for the establishing of additional regional offices. With the importance of immediate attention being given to problems as they arise, the availability of services at the local level is taking on a new degree of importance.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my sincere appreciation and thanks, not only to the hon. members of this Legislature, but to all departments of government as well, for their co-operation, and to the members of the several commissions for which I report to the Legislature, the Ontario energy board, and the members of my immediate staff for their loyalty and support.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, this is the first occasion that I have had the pleasure of rising as the official critic of our party concerning The Department of Energy and Resources Management. I might recount some of the hon. Minister's remarks concerning the select committee on conservation authorities which you and I had the pleasure of serving on.

Possibly on behalf of that committee I would accept the Minister's thanks for our work. In discussing the activities of that committee with other members who have served on other committees, it was the unanimous opinion that it was one of the best select committees of the province. I will assure you, sir, that I enjoyed serving the province for those two hot summers, for many long hours each day.

We enjoyed ourselves, and I think a great deal of the enthusiasm that is related to our committee is, in fact, a reflection of those

who serve in the various areas of our province on the conservation authorities themselves. I was very interested in the hon. Minister's opening remarks where he indicated that certain geophysical work was being conducted on Hudson and James Bays, and that possibly one well is going to be drilled this season in that area.

I would appreciate it if, on the first vote, the Minister could comment further on this matter as to whether the jurisdictional disputes have been settled with both the federal and the Quebec governments in this regard.

I was also pleased to hear from the hon. Minister that more natural gas was to be available in the northern part of our province, and that he and his department were initiating an energy need study for the north.

I was somewhat intrigued, too, regarding the comments concerning liquefied natural gas, and the possible potentials that they have in the outlying regions of our province.

I am going to attempt to stay within the 20-minute time limit suggested for these debates. I feel that I can do this because we have discussed a number of the details of this department in the recent enactment of the conservation bill—a pollution debate that occurred here a week or so ago—and, of course, the opportunities that we have had in the committee and examining the affairs of Ontario Hydro.

But I must underline the importance of this department. Personally, I feel that this particular department is equally and possibly more important than The Department of Education with its tremendous budget.

It is very very important for the future of the people of our province. And this I must underline.

I would like to discuss first of all some of the energy policies of this government—policies that affect the cost and distribution of gasoline, oil and natural gas, and the dangers of pollution.

Here is the first suggestion that I would like to put to this government, which has the responsibility of looking after the affairs of a large province, that fronts on four of the Great Lakes.

These bodies of fresh water contribute so much to the economy, the recreation and basic necessities of everyday life. I feel that we should have a policy respecting oil and gasoline tankers that ply our Great Lakes. Naturally, this policy must be incorporated with our neighbouring jurisdictions.

The reason I suggest this is as most hon. members will recall. Two oil tankers broke up in the Atlantic Ocean in storms this past spring, with very very dire results to waterfront areas in the locations of the accidents.

There is the same danger with more dire possible consequences on our Great Lakes system. Our Great Lakes, those of you who follow history, have a real history of ship disasters and, further, the Great Lakes do not have the tidal action of oceans for dispersing oil slicks.

Since these two accidents this spring, I have had dreams, or premonitions, of a loaded tanker floundering on Lake Huron, above Sarnia, with an ensuing oil slick slowly moving down the St. Clair River, through Lake St. Clair, Detroit River, and into Lake Erie and the balance of the St. Lawrence system.

Think of the havoc that would be wrought to the water systems, the industries based on the need of clean fresh water, to the fish and wildlife of the seaway system. There would be utter chaos for millions of people who are residents of this area. I point out that this is just a possible danger, but one that we cannot afford to overlook. In this regard I would like to make two proposals.

One, an immediate programme of a standby base of trained personnel and equipment, solvents and chemicals to combat such an emergency should it ever arise; I would hope that it would not. Secondly, I feel that this province should have a long-range programme to provide the transportation of gas and oil to the north via pipelines.

It is my understanding that tankers going up to the Soo and the Lakehead are reasonably economical; possibly we cannot transport fuel and bulk any cheaper. Most of the fuel is transported through Lake Huron and Lake Superior to the major points for further distribution.

This, of course, is done over land in our northern hinterland that is sparsely populated. The higher cost of gasoline in the north has certainly been drawn to the attention of the House. This is not only a burden to the residents of the north, but a possible deterrent to further industrial development of the north, as well as a deterrent to the tourist industry on which the north relies so heavily.

I feel that this department should initiate feasibility studies regarding such pipelines, weighing the cost of such pipelines not only in relation to the economy in the north but more so in relation to the danger of pollution in the Great Lakes and the resulting

chaos to our greatest natural resource of the Great Lakes water system.

Further, most members of this House, as well as myself, are opposed to the extension of drilling for gas and oil in our Great Lakes. That is why I made the comment of Hudson Bay and James Bay. It is entering into a new era, but it is on our ocean waterways. I realize that all the Canadian land under Lake Erie has been leased since 1913 with drilling for production of natural gas over a 3 million acre-area as the Minister announced today.

Further, I realize the creation of extreme safeguards and the technological advances to eliminate possible pollution of our waters where this drilling is concerned.

Further, according to press articles, I understand that the state of Ohio has developed a set of standards or conditions under which exploration will be permitted in Lake Erie; approximately 35,000 acres are up for lease. I would appreciate having some assurance from this Minister that the regulations of the sovereign state of Ohio are least as stringent as those of Ontario.

Further, I would like to know if there is any pressure from Michigan to allow drilling on the other Great Lakes, such as Huron and Superior. Most important, I would like your reaffirmation of this government's position in not allowing an extension of drilling for gas and oil on our Great Lakes other than Lake Erie.

There are a couple of other policy comments I would like to make concerning the energy branch.

First, I feel that the abandoned well plugging programme should be done at no cost to the property owner, instead of, I believe, the approximate $300 fee as is the case now. I suggest this because the property owner of today is not necessarily the owner who received the benefit from this well. Over the many years of history in our natural gas industry, the province has received a royalty from these wells; and further, the current regulations demand that operators set aside funds for the eventual plugging of the abandoned wells.

The second point I would like to make is concerning the inspection of gas appliances. I do not believe that these regulations have been changed in the past few years. I believe the inspection should be done by inspectors right within the Minister's own department, rather than having a man assigned as the representative of this department on the staff of the gas company. I think we have debated this fully in the past few years concerning the abuses that it possibly could lead to in regard to salesmen, and various aspects in this regard.

Turning to matters relating to conservation, there is another matter relating to Lake Erie and that is regarding the dredges of Ohio registry which operate under The Department of Mines' permits. They are taking aggregate sand and gravel from the bottom of Lake Erie.

I believe there are still a few licences for taking sand and gravel along the north shore of Lake Erie. Personally, I am opposed to this taking of aggregate from our Lake Erie and other Great Lakes. This is a natural resource. It is very important for fish spawning beds and I have had representation made to me by many commercial fishermen in this regard.

Aggregate is certainly necessary for building beaches. Taking this from the lake, I feel, furthers erosion on the shoreline, plus the fact that these huge machines working out in the lake are possibly contributing to pollution.

I feel the Minister should take a look at this activity and make a policy decision in relation to the removal of this natural resource for a few thousand dollars and weigh this against the problem and total ecology of Lake Erie, the ecology about which we hear so much.

It is my understanding that the government of Ontario accepts little or no responsibility on international waters. This leads me to the problem of erosion along the Great Lakes and tributaries, the many rivers and streams. There are problems such as the Scarborough bluffs, erosion in the Niagara peninsula and down in my own county of Essex, plus erosion along our rivers and streams. There is loss of very valuable land in many instances. There is a loss of tax revenue, but most important this eroded soil contributes significantly to the pollution of our lakes.

Information that I have gleaned from the Royal Bank letters on conservation that I try to read quite avidly when they come to my attention show that in 1942, in flood stage on the West Humber, 2,400 tons of sediment per hour flowed downstream; further that soil drift, one acre to a surface depth of one inch, is equivalent to the addition of 700 pounds of nitrogen, 155 pounds of phosphorus and 5,380 pounds of potash. These are significant facts in the enrichment of our waterways.

This is a problem of conservation that our authorities are taking some remedial action. But there is this area concerning shore line erosion, it is still a gray area of jurisdiction between the federal authorities and the province and little, or nothing, is being done in this regard.

I recall hearing the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) suggesting that they were looking into the operation of the Trent water system. Certainly, during our conservation hearings, we had representation concerning the levels of the lakes in that area, and the handling of the whole water system.

I would suggest that, possibly, it might be a good exchange for this government, with the federal government, to take over the responsibility of this total system and give the federal government jurisdiction regarding shore line erosion along our Great Lakes.

I think that we would have the dollar benefit in the total regard. The reason I point this out is that I regret that this government has not acted on the recommendation of the 1950 select committee on conservation that dealt with this very matter, when they suggested that the role should be defined clearly with the federal government, concerning erosion along our Great Lakes.

There is one other matter in regard to erosion, and possibly one of your technical staff could bring me up to date on this outside the House. It is something that has bothered me in watching the operation of dredges and suction machines in our many harbours. It seems that they load up the sand and gravel from our harbours onto a barge and take it out into the centre of the Great Lakes and dump it. I wonder if it would not be more feasible to put this under a pressure hose and try and build up beaches or where there is erosion occurring in the immediate area of such harbours.

Now in relation to conservation, I think, probably, this topic has been pretty well covered in the debate concerning the new bill. I regret that in that bill, this province did not accept the principle of undertaking resource management on private lands. I feel that, often, this type of work is continuous with the authority work, and it would be a tremendous saving of capital expenditure, in this regard, by having the remedial works done on these lands without having to acquire them. I am sure that the individual property owners, in many instances, would help finance the cost of this work, and many would undertake the work themselves if they were given the proper technical advice. I feel that if this government is really interested in total conservation measures, it would adopt this particular principle.

Further, I am somewhat sorry that the province did not adopt the principle that the conservation authority be the clearing house or supreme authority, to be advised of all drainage undertakings. Well this is farm field drainage, ditching, municipal drains, draining of swamps. In many cases, I believe, these undertakings are made for specific gain, without considering the long term or side effects of such action. I believe that the conservation authorities themselves should have more power in this regard.

Probably one of the areas where the Minister's budget could be beefed up is in relation to conservation education. I believe there is some $94,000 being expended on this area.

Our committee enjoyed visiting the Albion Hills school and the two other schools that were operating in the province. I think we are relatively unanimous that this type of institution should be afforded the residents of the other areas of our province. We should teach our children conservation practices and how not to contribute to pollution. To teach them an appreciation of nature through the films and folders that are available to the schools. In this regard I would again turn to the Royal Bank letters on conserving Canada's resouces. I have a few quotes which are quite apt for this particular topic, and I quote:

> The meaning of conservation, say ecologists firmly, is not preserving everything but working to keep things in balance. Personal conscience—says one writer—is the beginning of conservation. Our hope is education. It is a problem for legislators who can take a long view, who should not just be looking to the next election or the next balance sheet but should be looking at the future of mankind—mankind in Ontario in this case. Any wrongs which nature made or nature commits she has centuries to repair but we, whose days are short, must walk warily, thus we become the victims of the wasteland we make. Conservation is a way of life for all people. Nature will give us the broad view that develops mental fitness and emotional stability.

I think this underlines the importance of conservation education.

Now, some of my colleagues will be dealing with the specifics of the Ontario water resources commission, and I think I merely need to underline, that pollution is the number one problem confronting our province and, possibly, all of North America. I feel that this province should take dramatic steps to assist industry in our communities in combating this very serious problem.

I feel that, in conjunction with the federal government, we should eliminate all sales taxes on equipment going into this battle against pollution. Municipal taxes on lands where industry is going to build pollution control centres should be eliminated, Fast write-offs on this equipment should be available. I think that this has been underlined in the House before, and will be later in the debates.

One thing that has bothered me as a member is the slowness in procedure in project development. Do we need more staff in that department to speed up procedures? In recent weeks, I have had discussions where I believe the department is moving into a break-even period in financing of up to 10 years instead of the old five year theory which, in fact, is going to assist our municipalities. I feel that this is good. It should be underlined and encouraged.

In relation to Ontario Hydro, I think the comments of my leader (Mr. Nixon) should be taken to heart by Hydro. We should not restrict our thinking to the nuclear plants that are being designed by Atomic Energy of Canada; that we should look elsewhere, and see what the potentials are, and what the benefits can be.

In conclusion I would simply like to say that this department has moved in the right direction over the past few years, but it needs to move faster and give more attractive stimulus to our municipalities and industries, in this unending battle against pollution.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, The Department of Energy and Resources Management has, under its jurisdiction, many of the activities which can be of great value in promoting the development of the northern part of our province, if proper policies are adopted. The availability of cheap energy to help in the extracting and processing of our natural resources, an abundance of clean, unpolluted water, and favourable transportation rates are all essential ingredients in the northern economy. It is, therefore, important that this department, and its Minister who has the responsibility for these areas, be aware of our problems, and be willing to co-operate with us to improve the opportunities for growth and expansion that come our way. As a northern member it is my privilege to be the lead off spokesman for our party on this department.

The Ontario northland transportation commission, which comprises the Ontario northland railway, Star transfer and Ontario northland communications, not only serves the residents of northeastern Ontario and northwestern Quebec, but also has a significant role to play in our existence, growth and development. This commission had a net operating profit in 1967 of $270,093, as compared with a deficit of $290,359 in 1966. According to the May 30, 1968 Toronto *Globe and Mail,* profits were shown by Ontario northland communications and subsidiary Star Transfer Limited, helping to ease a deficit in operations of the Ontario northland railway. Further, it is interesting to note that railway earnings are expected to increase as shipments continue from the new Ecstall mine of New York-based Texas Gulf Sulphur Company Inc., near Timmins, and as the Sherman mine at Timagami, owned by Dominion Foundries and Steel Limited of Hamilton, begins production. The amount of ore being shipped out by Texas Gulf is in such large quantities that the railway business is booming. It makes one wonder if this government is more interested in reaping railway profits than it is in seeing a smelter built in the Porcupine area to process these ores which certainly are more than adequate to warrant a zinc smelter.

With the ONTC now showing a profit, one would imagine that there would be satisfaction with the present freight rate structure. Recently in the Timmins daily press, G. W. Walkey, general manager of Kam-Kotia Mines Limited, expressed concern that if the ONR goes ahead with its proposed increase in freight rates for copper concentrates the mining company will have to curtail its development activities. He said:

> The effect it will have on this operation is that we will have to reconsider our decision to proceed with the development of the Jameland mines. The increase will also have serious effects on Kam-Kotia operations.
>
> I do not believe this increase is in the common interest of the whole area and it is going to have a detrimental effect on the whole area by reducing the number of jobs.

He said if the company stopped its Jameland development it would mean that there would be 150 fewer jobs in the area.

At its meeting on May 14, the Timmins council endorsed Mr. Walkey's position. Mayor Evans said:

> What is needed for the growth of the north is a well-advertised campaign by the ONR that freight rates will not prove a stumbling block to industry. This imbalance of opportunity must be corrected, but unfortunately when we are fighting for our existence in a low wage area, we have this additional handicap. Freight rate increases spell real hardship for all who live here.

It appears clear, Mr. Chairman, that whenever and wherever Texas Gulf builds their smelter, it will be one to process zinc and not copper. Therefore, the smaller copper producers are dependent on favourable freight rates to ship out their concentrates for processing. In order for these smaller mines to continue operation and make modest expansion where possible, it is important that freight rates for copper concentrates not be raised. Indeed, marginal mines could be forced to close by such extra costs as increased freight rates will entail.

The statement of the New Liskeard *Speaker* of January 30, 1964, quoted by the hon. member for York South on April 20, 1964, and recorded on page 2233 of *Hansard*, is being borne out once again to the detriment of the north. It reads as follows:

> Over the years it is becoming increasingly evident that there is a double interpretation of the term "development railway". Businessmen in the north interpret this to mean that the railway was built to give the north an even break with the south so that our manufacured articles could compete and that our necessities would cost no more than they do in other parts of the province, but for the commission, the development tag means the development of the railway is a successful and dividend paying business, built with high freight rates, paid by the north.

Since the ONR deficit is declining and even has the prospect of making a profit this year, I fail to see where an increase in freight rates is warranted or justified, especially as far as small and marginal mining operations are concerned. The northeastern part of Ontario must not be hindered in its development by the ONR but must be assisted. I therefore call upon this government to see that the decision to make this freight rate increase is reversed and to see that a new policy is formulated that is beneficial and of assistance to the citizens of our corner of the province.

In this regard, I hope that the ONR will give consideration to a reduction in incoming freight rates on gasoline and petroleum products. On page 2252 of the 1965 *Hansard*, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, in reply to a question stated:

> Negotiations are under way between the major oil companies and the railway for adjustment in petroleum products rates.

In answer to a question by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight) of March 28, 1968, as reported on page 1344 of *Hansard*, concerning the possibility of transporting gas and related products, in a way that would equalize the cost factor for northeastern Ontario residents with other parts of the province, the hon. Minister said:

> Mr. Chairman, there is very little movement of oil or gas products by rail today. As you know gas and oil move by pipeline and tank truck. We have very little to do with transporting any gasolines or oils on the Ontario northland railway.

Well, Mr. Chairman, in the month of April of this year, this ONR which according to the Minister has very little to do with transporting any gasoline or oils, only brought in 44 cars of gasoline to Timmins. It would appear that the Minister did not do a very good job in his negotiations in 1965 with the oil companies because now he tries to skirt around the problem by giving misleading information in reply to a justifiable question on the matter.

There is another aspect of the ONR that deserves comment. During the last couple of years, working conditions on the ONR deteriorated, discontent grew, and morale reached an all-time low. Grievances were ignored and senior management was unsympathetic to the workers' legitimate concerns; employees complained about unsafe track conditions in some places, and things got so bad that all the employees booked off sick last September in the middle of the election campaign. This action dramatized their discontent, and forced management to make certain concessions—probably at the prodding of the government—who did not want an embarrassing situation to exist in the middle of an election.

At any rate, working conditions have improved. Senior management now handles grievances in a reasonable length of time. Union suggestions get much more consideration than before. As far as the track condition is concerned, the CPR was commissioned to do a survey of such, and reported that generally the road and track bed was sound. Even so, one wonders why it is now necessary for three work trains to be out fixing the track and road bed this year—something that has not taken place for a few years.

Also, why was the speed limit on the Timmins-Porquis route 10-miles-per-hour be-

low the limit for other sections long after the spring break-up? In this situation, the union and the men are to be commended for their backbone in action. The government is to be condemned for allowing such anti-union management to disregard their employees to the degree that they did.

I want to turn to another matter. This is the application by Union Gas Company of Canada Limited in Chatham to import gas purchased from Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company of Kansas City, Missouri.

The hearings have been adjourned to next Monday, June 17, 1968. There is still time for the Ontario government to intervene on behalf of the citizens of this province, and the north in particular. They could make application for an extension of the deadline for submissions. My colleague, the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes), has intervened in his personal capacity in a letter to the hon. Jean Luc Pépin, federal Minister of Mines, Energy and Resources, dated April 12, 1968.

The application should be opposed on the grounds that filling a substantial portion of eastern Canada's gas needs with imported US gas has these disadvantages—incidentally, Union Gas proposes to step up current imports of 15.5 bcf annually to 60.5 bcf within a seven-year period.

First the price and supply will be subject to the jurisdiction of the United States regulatory agency, which will act in the best interests of the United States citizens.

Second, it will cost Canada an estimated $400 million in foreign exchange over the period of 20 years of the contract. Third, it will tie the Canadian gas market in with an American company and accentuate the trend to the continental economy over which Canadians have but little control.

Fourth, any additional pipeline construction necessitated by the contract will provide jobs and economic activity in the United States instead of in Canada, and particularly in Ontario. Trans-Canada Pipe Lines estimates that loss of this market will reduce its capital outlay by $60 million, of which $35 million would have been spent in northern Ontario.

Fifth, Trans-Canada Pipe Lines estimates the prices charged will constitute a cost to consumers of at least $30 million more over the 20 years than they would pay to Trans-Canada if it supplied Union Gas customers. These two estimates by Trans-Canada Pipe Lines should be checked out by the Ontario government which has the research facilities to do it.

Sixth, it will reduce the volume of gas which could be brought to eastern Canada through a second northern gas pipeline, thereby increasing the cost of the second line and delaying its construction.

The New Democratic Party had pointed out on several occasions that the second northern pipeline is absolutely essential to service all the northern communities which do not yet have natural gas due to lack of adequate supply. They include Rainy River, Fort Frances, Atikokan, Schreiber, Terrace Bay, Marathon, Heron Bay, Manitouwadge, White River, and Wawa. We propose that the pipeline be routed through Nipigon, Terrace Bay, Schreiber, Marathon, Wawa, Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury.

We note that Trans-Canada Pipe Lines states in its 1967 annual report that it built only 19 miles of looped line in northern Ontario and Manitoba in 1967 and has no plans for further looping in 1968. In view of the fact that its agreement with the government of Canada does not compel it to start looping the northern line until 1970, and delays until well after 1966 attainment of the target of moving 65 per cent of eastern gas needs through the northern gas line, we think that the Ontario government should consider construction of a publicly-owned second pipeline along the route proposed, and that it should do this immediately. Otherwise the development of secondary industry and processing plants for our national resources will be delayed indefinitely and northern stagnation will continue.

The dereliction of duty by the Ontario government in failing to put its research resources to work on the figures presented a year ago when the issue of building a second pipeline through the United States was argued is now coming to light.

The application by the US company, Northern Natural Gas Company, to halt the construction of pipelines through the US by Trans-Canada Pipe Lines alleges that the actual contract cost of laying the pipe exceeded the estimate submitted to the original hearing by 92 per cent, an increase of $34 million in costs. Trans-Canada's president, Mr. James Kerr, is quoted in the *Globe and Mail* of January 4, 1968, as saying in reply, "Increased costs are general in the economy." If the increased costs had been anticipated and taken into account in the calculation it is possible that the northern Ontario route

might have been shown to be no more expensive, especially when you allow for the $5.5 million in extra costs which Trans-Canada incurred during the delays resulting from the US hearings on its pipeline through the US. The company reports in its 1967 annual report that this amount was incurred when it had to purchase gas from other sources to meet at least the Canadian need until it got the US line in operation.

This government failed to protect the interests of Ontario residents by sitting on the sidelines during the original hearings on the southern versus the northern route one year ago. It is continuing to sell out the north by not intervening against the application of Union Gas Company; and it is nullifying the avowed policy of ending regional disparities by failing to see that adequate supplies of natural gas are made available for northern industry. It is also depriving the northern homeowners of the benefits of competition in heating fuels.

Another aspect of this department's activities that deserves attention is that of gas pipeline safety. I think this department should get the regulations they are considering declared before very much more delay. This problem of pipeline safety has drawn considerable attention, especially since President Lyndon B. Johnson in his consumer message to Congress on February 16, 1967, stated the following:

> The safe transmission and distribution of natural gas is essential to all of us. The natural gas industry is among the most safety-conscious in the nation, but natural gas is inherently dangerous when it is being transmitted. It travels through pipelines at enormous pressure, it is highly inflammable. When it burns it can reach temperatures as high as 2500 degrees Fahrenheit.
>
> In March, 1965, a tragic pipeline failure near Narchitoches, Louisiana, killed 17 persons; the recent blaze in Jamaica, New York, dramatically underscored how serious a gas pipeline failure can be.
>
> Pipelines age and as more and more of the system lies under areas of high population density, the hazards of pipeline failure and explosion increase. I recommend The Natural Gas Line Safety Act of 1967.

So concludes President Johnson.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, we in Ontario have not had natural gas explosions in which there have been serious losses of life, but we have had explosions of such a nature as to cause us real concern nonetheless.

In 1961 there were two explosions on Trans-Canada Pipe Line's 30-inch northern line; in May of that year a blast at North Bay injured nine persons and started several brush fires. Another break three miles north of Gravenhurst in July damaged a one-mile section of the line and about a dozen houses, injured several persons and started a brief fire.

More recently on November 20, 1967, there was an explosion on the main natural gas line near Huntsville. The *Globe and Mail* of November 21, 1967, described the event as follows:

> Flames shot more than 100 ft. into the air after an explosion ripped the Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Ltd. main natural gas line near here yesterday. One house was damaged and two barns were destroyed in the blaze. The gas fire burned for about an hour and a half after the explosion and "lit up the whole town with a huge, steady bluish-white ball of flame", an OPP constable said. The explosion rocked Huntsville at about 5:30 p.m., shook buildings and sent some residents fleeing in panic. The explosion left a crater about 100 ft. long, 20 ft. wide and 15 ft. deep. It was surrounded by a large burned-out patch of mud about 400 ft. across. About 1,200 ft. from the pipeline, fire destroyed two barns and the property of Ronald Langford. A large block of earth or rock hurled by the blast crashed through the roof and kitchen ceiling of Mr. Langford's home about a quarter of a mile from the pipeline. A large section of 30-inch pipe, about 30 ft. long, ploughed into the earth 500 ft. from the explosion centre. At least 15 homes near the pipeline were evacuated. As gas in the remaining section of the line burned off, the huge flame gradually subsided about one and a half hours after the explosion.

This explosion could have had very disastrous results with serious loss of life. As luck would have it, this did not take place. I am interested in finding out from the Minister the findings of his department's investigation as to the cause of that blast. The question arises that even though the number of explosions has been low, could, in fact, these explosions have been avoided with more stringent safety inspections by the transmission line company? What kind of regular safety measures are followed by this company? Do they have to walk the line at least once a year to inspect the operation or what inspection is required by this government?

We cannot afford to leave anything to chance in this kind of operation. Legislation must be introduced to force gas line companies to make periodic checks of their mains. But of even more crucial importance is the aspect of pipeline safety as it relates to distribution to the various consumers in the cities and towns of this province. In Metro this past winter a serious explosion occurred on January 8 when the home of Fred Dixon in Etobicoke blew up. Mr. Dixon, his wife and two children escaped unhurt though the house was demolished.

Then on January 31 the Rosedale home of William Nicks, president of the Bank of Nova Scotia, was partly blown up. The explosion came when James Whitton, a chauffeur, lit a cigarette in the service quarters as he went to open a window after smelling what he thought was sewer gas. Mr. Whitton received burns and cuts and was hospitalized as a result. It is reported in the Toronto *Daily Star* of February 2, 1968:

> The explosion did estimated damage of $95,000 to the Nicks home itself, another $10,000 damage to its contents and another $2,350 damage was done to houses around the residence, about $350 damage to a car parked nearby.

In the February 19 *Telegarm*, Oka Jones, president of Consumers Gas, said the cause of the explosion was a hairline break in a six-inch gas main. According to my information, a week or so after this explosion, gas company employees were up in the same area fixing another break in the old cast-iron pipe. It makes one wonder in just what shape the pipe system is on many of these old gas pipe lines. It is my understanding that on a lot of the older cast-iron pipelines there is a real danger of deterioration and corrosion due to the process of electrolysis. Robert Tibbs, business manager for gasworkers local 5-6, oil, chemical and atomic workers international union, is reported in the St. Louis *Post Dispatch* of November 15, 1967:

> Underground pipe systems serve as conductors for electric current running through the ground. Where these currents leave the pipe, ions of the metal are carried away in an electrolytic process, but over the years can eat away sections of pipe. There was no protection against this in the early 1950's. Now, before they are laid, the pipes receive a cathodic protective coating to avoid this difficulty.

One wonders just how real this problem of electrolysis is in our older cast-iron gas pipelines and how great a danger this poses to our community.

In his testimony to the House of Representatives committee hearing concerning natural gas pipeline safety on February 28, 1968, Robert Tibbs made these pertinent observations concerning gas pipeline safety. Speaking of the Laclede Gas Company of St. Louis he said:

> Laclede admitted they lose two billion cubic feet of gas each year. This loss is less than most comparable gas distribution companies. Laclede admitted that they have a considerable backlog of known leaks.

In his statement to the senate commerce committee a year earlier, Tibbs said:

> No gas industry spokesman will deny the existence of an enormous backlog of known leaks on every gas distribution system in the country.

He also stated that rumours circulating in Washington, and reportedly originating in New York, had it that cast-iron mains cannot stand the strains involved in street repair.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt if the situation is much different here in Ontario as far as gas loss is concerned. I think there is, no doubt, a great deal of gas loss through these leaks. In fact, I am led to believe that there may be a system that classifies gas leaks in practice here in Ontario. Bad ones are repaired immediately; others as soon as possible, while others are left and checked periodically to see if they are not increasing. When it is convenient they are eventually repaired.

The question, of course, that calls for real consideration is this one: What is being done to eliminate these leaks? Have we adequate safety legislation on our books to require the danger to be eliminated or greatly lessened? According to Tibbs, it is extremely possible that effective, meaningful, pipeline testing and corroborating leak reports with existing information of the pipelines' original installation dates and the pipeline material originally used, would reveal a pattern of leak development, so that sound preventive maintenance could be developed, not the massive replacement touted by the industry. As an aid to gasoline safety in the distribution of such to the consumer, I believe the following additional safety regulations should be adopted by this department.

One: All gas utility companies of Ontario shall report all existing leak surveys to The

Department of Energy and Resources Management, as well as submit a duplicate report of all future leak surveys within 30 days after completion of such surveys.

Second: All gas utility companies in Ontario shall submit their written report containing the number of their gas services and miles of steel main which are not properly coded and cathodically protected.

Third: All gas utility companies operating in Ontario shall submit their written report to the department of a monthly compilation of all gas leaks reported to them from any source. This report must include the result of the utilities' investigation relative to the cause of such leak and the corrective measures taken.

Fourth: All gas leaks reported to or located by a gas utility company operating in Ontario must be eliminated within 90 days of their receipt of the initial leak report. If in the event gas pipeline leakage results in gas collecting in any confined space—that is, manholes, sewers, catchbasins, basements, and so on—upon receiving a report that such condition exists, the gas utility must forthwith initiate immediate and continuous efforts to locate and eliminate such leak.

Fifth: All gas utility companies operating in Ontario must inspect all houses as well as businesses and industrial establishments once a year.

We cannot afford to take chances with a potentially dangerous product by which the lives of the general public and the gas company employees could be jeopardized. We must insist on even more stringent safety measures to make a safe industry that much more safe.

Mr. Chairman, there are other things that could be said about this department but my colleagues and myself shall deal with these as the individual estimates are considered.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I shall deal with the remarks from the hon. member for Essex South. I think perhaps one of his first questions was regarding the jurisdiction dispute between the federal and provincial government in James and Hudson Bays. I might say that I was not talking about offshore drilling in my remarks. I referred to exploration and drilling on land. Perhaps there will be offshore drilling and I would think there would be a practical solution worked out with the federal government—at least for exploration offshore.

Mr. Paterson: Is there a problem with the province of Quebec in this regard—the boundaries set?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot answer that. I know there has been a dispute but I doubt if there are any boundaries set by the Ontario government or any decision reached with the federal government.

In regard to oil tankers in the Great Lakes, I might say first that this comes under the jurisdiction of the federal government and the international joint commission. I understand that the discussions are continuing on these matters between the federal water pollution control agency and the federal water pollution control agency in Washington.

I would think that as long as we have the Great Lakes here and the key transportation that they offer for delivering many items, there will be oil moving by our Great Lakes. I doubt if we, in Ontario, will ever have any jurisdiction over that.

I do not know whether you referred to our drilling offshore in Lake Erie. I might say that in Ontario we have carried out full-scale tests of new chemicals for disbursing oil spills. This is in the drilling rigs in Lake Erie and all this equipment will be carried on board all drilling rigs from now on. I understand the chemicals are quite effective.

You also asked a question regarding American policy of drilling in the Great Lakes and I am advised that all the states have been considering drilling in their portion of Lake Erie. Michigan is opposed but only has a very small acreage. Ohio is deferring action at the moment. As far as we know, New York and Pennsylvania are proposing to go ahead with exploration drilling.

Now in regard to the dredging in the Great Lakes and again—I think you were referring to dredging where they were taking out gravel—that would come under the jurisdiction of Mines. I might say from the pollution standpoint, that OWRC is studying all dredging operations on the Great Lakes this season and any resulting pollution from dredging and disposal of dredging material will be reported.

You also mentioned education in conservation authorities. I might add that the $95,000 —in vote 605 refers to grants to conservation authorities and in vote 601 we have included $35,000 for conservation films and $4,500 for a junior conservation programme.

Thus, the total for all the information in education would be about $134,000. I think

perhaps you had a few questions and if I have missed answers that I know, I will be very glad to try and answer you as we go through the estimates vote by vote.

You spoke of erosion and I think you mean erosion within the Great Lakes. Of course, that comes under the jurisdiction of the federal government. As you know, although we do some erosion work through conservation authorities, the work has been very slight.

You also mentioned that the jurisdiction of water should come under the issuing of drainage permits and that should come under our department. At the present time, I would like to advise the House, that we have interdepartment committees working very closely together in all departments concerned with drainage and with the supply of water. Before any grant is paid, on a drainage scheme in the province of Ontario, it must be cleared with the departments that are concerned with keeping our water tables as they are.

The hon. member for Cochrane South spoke regarding the Ontario northland railway and communications system. Of course, he seems to be concerned because through efficient management, we were able to get out of the red last year and get into the black. In any business that I have been in or any business that anyone I know has been connected with, they think it is a great day when they can get out of the red and at least try to pay some of the money back that has been loaned to them over the many years that they have been operating.

We are concerned and we do not want it said—nor can it be said—that the Ontario northland railway freight rates are any higher or as high as any other railroad in the province of Ontario.

I will say this, and I have said it many times, that we will keep our rates lower considering the mileage, than either one of the other two railroads in the province—and this we have done. If you live in some other parts of Ontario—and we do not always talk about northern Ontario, we have an eastern Ontario and a southern Ontario and a western Ontario, and a southwestern Ontario—if you would compare freight rates and relocation rates to what you people enjoy in that area, then you could see where people down here, where it is not an Ontario-owned railroad, have something to complain about.

Now you are asking us and you referred to Kam-Kotia mines. Sometimes I fail to understand you people because I do not think that you are too friendly with the big mining companies, are you? I never understood this.

Mr. Ferrier: Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am answering the question! Here you are asking us to raise money from the residents in the province of Ontario to subsidize mining companies operating in northern Ontario.

Mr. Ferrier: Asking for money?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, you are doing that. We are not making money on our rail operation in northern Ontario. And if you would take the freight off the two iron mines, and Texas Gulf and Kam-Kotia out of our year's business, you would find that we would be in the hole. How many dollars was it last year? Some $600,000 to $1 million. Now are you asking us to lower their rate to subsidize them some more so they may pay more in taxes to Ottawa?

Now let me talk to you about rates on this particular one. Our normal rate, when we started with this company, was $4 a ton, and if we were to charge the rate that we should be charging today it would be $3.50 a ton; that is the regular rate. We were down as low as $2.55 a ton, and now we raised it to $2.81 a ton and they are complaining about high freight rates. Surely you fellows in the Opposition do not seek to raise money from the province of Ontario to subsidize mining companies—large mining companies with large profits—so that they might have a lower freight rate?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): We are raising money across the province.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: All right, if we lower our freight for this company what are you going to do with Texas Gulf, what are you going to do with all the rest of them?

Now you fellows are not consistent; you never were; you do not figure out things.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, we figure them out!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You did not figure that one out too well if you want us to subsidize mining companies in northern Ontario.

Now let us face—

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): But they had a quarter of a million for Honeywell!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: This year we will be drawing more freight from the mines than we have ever moved in the history of the Ontario northland railway. And we are hoping this year that we come up with more profit than has ever been made on the Ontario northland railway. Now I hope you people out there

will not complain this year when you see us making a profit and ask us to subsidize these large mining companies, who are doing fairly well in my estimation.

The hon. member also spoke about the problem we had last fall while the election was on. Of course to me it was unfortunate it happened then, I would say that it was settled because the union representing the employees ordered them back to work; but it took a while, as you know.

I do not know whether it was a politically sponsored walk-out or not? Nevertheless it happened.

The hon. member referred to—

Mr. MacDonald: This is innuendo; the kind deplored by the Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: He stated that this year we started to update the trackage on the Ontario northland railway.

I would just like to tell hon. members that during the past five years general upgrading on the roadbed has been our policy.

New rail has been laid. We have already laid 83.2 miles of new, 115-pound rail—that is the heaviest rail—to take care of our new ore trains. We have laid 8.4 miles of 90-pound rail, replacing the old 80-pound on our sidings and on our spur lines. We put ballast, rock ballast, on 86.1 miles of the Ontario northland railway, and gravel ballast on 28.5 miles.

The programme has been going on for the past five years, and we are doing about the same mileage this year. Yet the hon. member refers to this as the first time we have had three work trains out on the Ontario northland railway. Now my dear man—

Mr. Ferrier: How many did you have last year?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We had just as many and we upgraded just as many miles of track last year; and this has been going on for five years. Before making statements like that in the House, why do you not get the truth? It is not hard to get. The chairman is here or you can get it from North Bay. Anyone would have told you this programme has been going on.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): They do not give you a report in North Bay.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: All you have to do is look in the estimates and you will see what was going on.

Mr. Martel: They will not give you a report.

Mr. Pilkey: All he is doing is covering up his tracks.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am not covering up my tracks, this is the truth. If you think I am covering up my tracks come on up with me and I will show you. We are not ashamed of what we are doing up there.

Mr. Pilkey: I cannot afford it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You can afford it because we will give you a pass. I will take you up with me.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Take him in the private car.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Dealing with the problem of accidents on our gas lines—the Trans-Canada line and those on the gas lines within the province of Ontario: First let me say that we all, I think, realize that when we deal with gasoline and oils that we deal with very dangerous materials. I think they are materials we realize we must have in the province if we are going to have the energy we need for our expansion. So we must live with these things, but we must be as rigid as we can in enforcing the regulations.

As far as Ontario is concerned we have had a detailed pipeline code since 1959. There have been three failures on the Trans-Canada line in the past 11 years. That is on over 2,000 miles of pipeline, so that is not too bad.

But I might say that that line comes under federal regulations. All the other lines within the province come under our regulations, but not Trans-Canada where they are moving gas from one province to the other.

Now we think our record has been pretty good in the province of Ontario in the past three or four years. In fact, it never was very bad, but I think it is very good right now. I do not think we will ever reach the point where at some time we will not have leaks; and of course if we have a leak it can lead to an explosion.

All the gas distributing companies in the province have men working continually on these lines, inspecting them. Things can happen, especially where construction work is going on and something happens to disrupt the pipeline; or you might get a leak and if it is not reported it can cause an explosion; but I would say that although you are never

happy until you have this solved 100 per cent, I do not think we can hope to solve it 100 per cent as long as we are moving the dangerous materials that we do move, natural gas and our other gas and oil products.

I think we have done a fairly good job in this province.

Gentlemen, there were other things said, about the application of Union Gas that is being heard before the national energy board now, the application to import more gas from the United States. This matter is still before the national energy board, so I do not think I will discuss it at this time any more than to say that when they start sitting again we will have representation from the province of Ontario looking after our interests as far as the pipeline to northern Ontario is concerned. But we do want to make sure we have an ample supply of gas for the energy needed in this province. Of course it will be up to the national energy board to decide whether they can import this quantity of gas or not.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 601. The member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, the Minister made some remarks with regard to the Ontario northland railway, and I would just like to point out to him that I think that the member for Cochrane South was asking that the rates be not increased; and by not increasing the rates when the railway is showing a profit, I do not think he would be subsidizing any private industries.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I should point out to the committee, to the member for Nipissing and to the Minister, that actually nothing that I can see in this particular department estimate, covers the northland railway transportation. On the other hand in supplementary estimates we discussed the Ontario northland railway quite extensively.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the procedure is, that the ONR has been listed as a final item in the consideration of these estimates, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we had a supplementary estimate before the House and it was debated some time ago—March 28—and I think, at that time, it was understood that that was to be the debate in the House of the estimates for the Ontario northland railway. Now in my general remarks then, there had been something said by the critic and I was not worried about that, that was quite all right, I think had either critic at that time wanted to mention the railroad, I was not too concerned about it.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, for the last two years, it has been discussed under this estimate, under the first vote if you look back in the estimates of last year and the year before. And next year there will be no place to discuss it, if you follow that procedure, because there will be no supplementary estimates to cover the loss of the railroad for 1967, because there was no loss. Where are you going to put it next year if you do not put it in this vote this year?

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman is in the position that we are dealing with estimates and there is absolutely nothing in this estimate for the ONR. There are several pages of debate in *Hansard* starting at page 1339 covering all of these phases of the Ontario northland railway. Now I just simply put it to the committee, do we repeat this again? It is not in the estimates.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the Chairman may argue that it is not in the estimates, but we have had a procedure for years including, for example, the workmen's compensation board which comes under The Department of Labour—such agencies are considered as the final item in that estimates. We reached it late one night and it has been postponed to another occasion, but the procedure of having agencies which fall under a certain department considered as the final item in that estimates has been one that, I concede, has not been honoured fully all the time, but has grown up increasingly in recent years. I think that is the point that hon. members are making. I think it is possible that they may have something new to raise, not a rehash of what was debated in March.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think the members know that if they want to question the Ontario northland railway, that it can be brought before the committee on commissions, and this has happened every other year, prior to the estimates hitting the House.

Mr. R. S. Smith: We have asked for them this year but we have not got them yet.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I cannot help that. I do not control the committee. In fact, I am sure they will come before the committee when they get a date, and I might say that the chairman and I are here today.

These are the only people we have from the Ontario northland railway. I know very little about it. We have no officials here from head office.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if I may make a comment on the discussion at this time. The hon. member for York South is just a little off base in his parallel with the workmen's compenastion board, because I think a discussion of this type ended a few weeks ago with the Premier agreeing to put the workmen's compensation board on the order paper for a discussion of its report—as an alternative to discussing it in these estimates. Surely what we want to discuss, today, is not the detail of its operation, but policies having to do with the Minister's responsibility of reporting to the House for the Ontario northland railway. And it seems, that under the first vote, we could very well continue the procedure of discussing policy matters, if you would care to allow it as being in order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I want to make it quite clear that I do not want to restrict proper debate on this, but I pointed out, simply as a matter of information, that there has been seven pages of discussion and debate.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, if I might address myself to that. I recall participating in that debate, and we were restricted to debating on the supplementary estimates. I tried to raise the question of the number of accidents, and so forth, and I believe the reply, at that time, was to bring this up under the Minister's total estimates. And I would plead with you, to allow my associate to continue with a few new remarks in this regard.

Mr. Chairman: Is the Minister prepared to entertain further discussions on the Ontario northland railway aspect of the—I cannot say of the estimates because it simply is not in the estimates?

Mr. Nixon: Of his responsibility then, perhaps you could say.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: All right. If you want to question me on my responsibility, that is fine, but I cannot answer detailed questions on the ONR, with all the officials in North Bay.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman was simply doing his duty in pointing out that the commission members are in a different place.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Well, Mr. Chairman, I presume, then, we can discuss the remarks that the Minister made a few minutes ago, and he indicated, in those remarks, I think, that he would expect that the profits shown by the Ontario northland railway and the expected profits this year, which I understand there is hope will be in the neighbourhood of $1 million, more or less, should be brought back into the provincial government, to pay for the advances that have been made to the Ontario northland railway over the last number of years. Now, I maintain that the profits are being made from the natural resource of northern Ontario – the mining companies that are using the road to ship the pellets from Timagami and the concentrates from Texas Gulf—and I think that the profits from the Ontario northland railway should be put back into northern Ontario.

Under the Act that was passed in the 1950s, to set up the Ontario northland transportation commission, there is a section which permits the railroad to set up a development officer and to get into the area of promoting development for northern Ontario. Now, I think, if the Minister and this government are serious about calling this a development road in northern Ontario, that the first step should be taken and that a development officer should be hired to work with the northeastern Ontario development association, plus the other municipalities in the north; and to expand the economy, as well as to bring in new industry and perhaps to increase the activity and productivity of our natural resources.

Now, I would state that I am firmly opposed to this Minister indicating that the profits of the Ontario northland railway are going to go into the general revenue of this province. I would ask him to guarantee us that this is not the case.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, first, let me say that I was referring to the Ontario northland railway and where their profits were going to go, but I said that any business that I was connected with, I was always happy the day that we started making a profit so we could pay off some of our debts. Now, since the day of the first operation of the Ontario northland railway, a lot of things have happened in this government, but you get moneys other ways. We have, you say, a development officer. Why do we need a development officer of the Ontario northland railway?

Mr. R. S. Smith: You just go up there and look at it, and see.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I know all about it. I am up there quite often and I talk to him quite often. We have many people working on the ONR, but I do not think that is our role to play. I think our role is transportation and communications. We have a highway. Every department knows about northern Ontario. We have moneys going up there all the time. So, if they make a million dollars and it comes back to the Treasurer, and the Treasurer spends $5 million back in northern Ontario, I do not think it should be for the railroad to build northern Ontario. I think that is some other department of government. I think you people are all businessmen enough to know that you like to see something run economically and profitably—do you not? You can throw money away any place. You are not happy if our people up there throw 2 or 3 million dollars away and nobody gets any benefit. Would you like that? I do not think so.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is the development up in the north throwing money away? Is that what you are trying to say?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, no, but we have other departments that look after development. We give you, in the railroad's role in transportation-communication today, the things that will develop northern Ontario. Immediately a mine talks about opening up, they get in touch with the Ontario northland railway. They want to know the rates—can you get us cars, can you build us a spur? This has happened twice in the last three years, and they were ready when that mine was ready to go. Is that helping northern Ontario? We did not say no. They give them a good rate. They bought new cars, and put down new spurs. This is all ready when the mine starts production. Thus in that area, I think that the Ontario northland railway has helped development.

Then we have other departments of government that will develop the other areas.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, apparently the direction of the Ontario northland railway had just been changed by the Minister. No longer is it to be considered part of the development of northern Ontario.

I would like to ask the Minister if he means that these profits should go to pay off the current debts of the railroad? That is, the money that has been spent for the new cars in the last eight or ten months. I think these amounted to almost $2 million. Does he mean that the profit now should go to pay off those loans that have been made by the banks?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Here I read from the commission Act, clause 37, which I have never read before because we have never had to deal with profits.

> 37(1): The revenues received by the commission shall be applied to the payment of all costs, liabilities, obligations and expenditures properly incurred or made, and all surpluses shall be paid into the consolidated revenue fund at such time and in such amounts that the Lieutenant-Governor in council may direct.

And that is—

Mr. R. S. Smith: In other words, as the Lieutenant-Governor in council may direct?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We would not leave $5 million sitting up there drawing no interest if we could use it down here to save this.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But since the Act also allows you to form a development section within the company, then the moneys that would be spent on that would be taken into the profit and loss of the railroad. If the moneys that are to accrue as profit are spent in that way, they would not have to come back into the general revenues of the province. All you have to do is to read the rest of the Act, if you have not read it, and you will see that you can put the two together and in that way, you can put the moneys back into the Ontario northland railway.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not think that your leader, or the leaders of the other parties or any other member here, would want the ONR to get into development, as you suggest.

Mr. MacDonald: Speak for yourself—we do!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What type of development?

Mr. MacDonald: Development of the north—economic development.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I know, but what type of development? Do you want us to start building roads?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I know that I am not. But that was profitable too, and you have not got too much to blow about in anything you have ever done.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister will permit me to make a comment. He has indicated that he does not believe that anyone else in the House would support the

position taken by the member for Nipissing. I might tell you that we support him completely.

Surely the Minister, as an ardent free enterpriser, would realize the only reason that the government is in the business of railroading is to provide a service that free enterprise could not provide in the past, and should really not be able to provide now if the government were taking the proper approach insofar as the development of the north.

The argument—as far as the Minister gives it—that the government should not be subsidizing these large mining corporations is a good one on the face of it. But when we look at the rest of the facilities and resources in northeastern Ontario that have not been tapped, that is where the vision of the Minister—or lack of it—is important.

It is in that particular area, where this railroad and the direction of the railroad, which must come from the Lieutenant-Governor in council to this Minister, that the development part comes in. Surely, if you sit back and wait for someone to ask you to build a spur and not use the resources of a major railroad for the development of northeastern Ontario, you are not living up to the responsibility that is inherent in the fact that this is owned by the people of Ontario. They expect it to be administered for the development of that part of the province.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think that somebody else is getting mixed up here. I said develop railroad transportation or communications. That part I agree with, and if we can develop railroads—we have developed transport companies, we have developed bus lines, our communications system is good—now we have reached that point, are we to take the profit from that and reduce rates to wealthy mining companies? Is this what you would like?

Mr. Nixon: You are responsible for the rate structure. You can reduce that rate as you see fit, but should we reduce it to give a better rate to a mining company that is paying large taxes?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There is nothing wrong with that. We have a railroad there and when that day comes, we will be working at the lignite. But I think your member meant that we should develop some other things in northern Ontario. Maybe roads; I do not know what he was talking about.

Mr. Nixon: He was talking about community facilities.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You do not want this ONR to get into the mining, do you?

Mr. Nixon: You should have development officers, and you could do all sorts of things through your development branch for the communities.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We are, as far as transportation and communications are concerned. This we plan on. There has got to to some other department in government that will look after the other areas of development.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 601, the member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: I would like to make a couple of observations here. I would not like the hon. Minister to get the idea that I am promoting the large mining interest of this province. I must say that Mr. Walkey of this particular mine, threw me off his property during the election campaign. But I am concerned about the riding of Cochrane South and the economic development of that riding and the 150 jobs that may be done away with because of the policy of this railway, or jeopardized because these freight rates are to be raised, I am justifiably concerned. I might just say, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: May I ask a question? What company said that there would be reduction of 150 employees?

Mr. Ferrier: This was the Kam-Kotia mining company. They are in the process of developing another mine in conjunction with the one that they have now called the Jameland mine.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They are doing that now, are they not?

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, they are doing it now. If this development is curtailed and these jobs are not there, the area is going to continue to just drift and perhaps stagnate. Perhaps the railway would not be doing its job of subsidizing, but I imagine that if things were to continue in that area as the present trend suggests, the amount of money coming out of The Department of Social and Family Services to that part of the province would continue to increase. You would lose far more if you raised them than if you left them as they are.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I cannot quote the figures here, but I think that before you follow this too far, you would find out what the increase means in actual dollars to Kam-Kotia—the moneys that they had in

profits last year—and you can get that from the report. They are developing the mine next door, at the present time. I think that when you get all these figures, that the statements that your are quoting from the manager of Kam-Kotia will not stand up under daylight.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 601?

Mr. R. S. Smith: I have a couple of other questions for the Minister in regards to the ONR. Meetings of the commission are all held *in camera,* and, apparently, the minutes of the meetings are not available to the members of the Legislature. Is this correct?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer that because the question has never been posed to me before. I get the minutes all the time, and I have been with the commission.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The question has been put to you because I have had a request for a return on the order paper for two months.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, that could be so, but I am telling you now, that the question has never been posed; that all the members get minutes of commission meetings.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I am not saying all members.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Do you think that they are entitled?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Can we see them on request?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I will have to find this out.

Mr. Nixon: Can we see them on request?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I am not talking to the Chairman, right now. You were questioning me on my role. Now, let me say this. Anytime that I have been up with the commission—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We have met with many people, and we did not meet *in camera.* We have met with many people along the railroad, discussing different things. Now, I do not think that if we are discussing freight rates, we are going to let that out in the minutes until agreement is reached. And I would doubt that it would be expected.

Mr. R. S. Smith: For two months now, I have been waiting for an answer to my motion for return on the order paper. Now, you have had two months to find out. Either you are going to show us the minutes or not. You say that you have never heard of it before and, yet, it has been on the order paper for two months, you know. Where have you been? Did you not notice it?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The particular minutes, but not to furnish minutes to all the members of the House.

Mr. R. S. Smith: No, but I asked for a copy of the minutes of the meetings for the year 1967. Apparently, the Niagara parks commission has indicated that if members go down to Niagara Falls, they can go in and be shown all the minutes of the meetings. The chairman of that commission has indicated that. Now does this policy apply to all commissions within the government, or does it not?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I cannot answer for all the commissions in the government, but I would think that any time the member wants to look at any particular year's minutes of the Ontario northland railway and would go with the chairman or with the general manager at North Bay, he could see those minutes—unless it was minutes negotiating some rates that we did not want to release to the public at that particular time.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The policy is then, if I ask the chairman of the railroad to see the minutes, that I can see the minutes?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: In the North Bay office, providing it is not a minute that is dealing with negotiations that were going on at that particular time.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That is fair enough.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, I have two questions I would like to ask the Minister. One is, could we have an explanation, sir, of your association with the Canadian standards association, and the grants you make to them? And the second one is on the grant to the University of Toronto re Great Lakes institute.

I recall reading in the paper, some two weeks ago, where one of the large transport companies had donated a boat to the University of Toronto for research on the Great Lakes. Would part of this grant go towards the buying of that boat, or the upkeep of the expenses of that boat?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The first one I think was grants to the Canadian standards association, the $2,000. That is for work they are

performing on the energy side, or the energy end of it.

Mr. Worton: Is that approval of equipment that is used for gas, electricity, and so on?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Gas and propane standards, yes.

Mr. Worton: For the $2,000, Mr. Chairman, what liaison does the Minister have with them? Does he have some say in what the standards are or is he consulted as to the standards?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, we are consulted as to standards and our engineers work with them in working this out. And the member's other question was the grant to Great Lakes institute?

Mr. Worton: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: This is for general administration in their total operation and post-graduate studies in hydrology.

Mr. Worton: In other words, Mr. Chairman, I was reading this article where, I think it was, Direct Winters transport had given one of their vehicles for research.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Right.

Mr. Worton: And evidently it was quite a valuable asset; then it was disposed of for a very small amount of money. I am wondering if part of this grant went towards repayment of that or the losses that were incurred in that?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): I would like to go back to the ONR for a minute, Mr. Chairman, and the passenger service. Over the last year as so there have been some drastic cutbacks in passenger service—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think if we are talking of passenger service, that is not my policy, that is the policy of the commission and should be discussed with them.

Mr. Jackson: I believe it is the policy of the railroad—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is not set by the Minister, I have nothing to do with it.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Chairman, in connection with vote 601 there is a sizeable increase in the amount to be voted this year. I wonder if the Minister would be able to explain the reasons for this increase?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There are some other items in other votes in previous years that have been moved to this vote 601. This year, the amount of money in the 1968-69 estimates related to the item that required $14,000 in last year's estimates, is in fact only $15,500. The following items were either gathered from other votes and added to the main office under the new information and public relations section or were new items necessitated by the addition of a photographer to this staff. And the items that were added are: conservation authorities branch, publication and reports, $80,400; photography and art supplies, $3,100; movie production—that is a new movie on conservation — $35,000; darkroom equipment, $4,000; commercial art work, $5,000; exhibits and displays, $15,500; and junior conservationist programme, $4,500, to give you the total.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the Minister might prefer to discuss the matter of provincial-federal co-operation in the areas in which he is responsible under individual votes. On the other hand, it has been stated several times that the important responsibility of pollution is very much a shared one. We find in the first vote a grant to the Great Lakes institute and in other votes there are other funds available for pollution control and pollution investigation. Just a few days ago, the government of Canada opened a relatively large and expensive survey facility, I believe at Burlington, and I think it is essential that the funds we vote as well as the funds voted by the Parliament of Canada be co-ordinated in the best interest of all of us taxpayers. The Minister is aware of the fact that these funds are now assuming fairly large proportions although many people believe they are still by no means large enough.

I wonder if the Minister would comment on how these efforts at research and practical pollution abatement are co-ordinated between the two levels of government?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the vote of $130,000 to the University of Toronto re Great Lakes institute, although they do some research, was largely for the training for graduate students. But they are doing work on the Great Lakes in conjunction with the Ontario water re-

sources commission, and I think perhaps with the IJC as well.

Mr. Nixon: Now there is another vote further over, under 606, called Great Lakes water quality research. Is that an independent body entirely and who spends that fund?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That comes under Ontario water resources commission.

Mr. Nixon: Right. Then dealing with the Minister's responsibility to co-operate with the government of Canada—and I well understand that this has to be a two-way street, otherwise the thing will break down entirely —I understand further that there have been considerable negotiations with the government of Canada trying to involve them more fully in the work of the conservation authorities and also with the recreational aspects of this government, some of which are represented by the Department of Tourism and Information. Now, the Minister was somewhat critical of what the government of Canada had or had not done in this regard and believe me, I want to know the facts from this end, from the government's aspect about this matter, without dealing specifically with the problems of the Grand Valley conservation authority. How does the Minister approach the government of Canada or how does the government of Canada approach the government of Ontario in co-operation, particularly in these fairly important projects in conservation and recreation and anti-pollution measures so that neither one side nor the other can hold up important works?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say the officials of the conservation branch and the OWRC are constantly meeting with the officials of the federal government on different projects. I think our concern in conservation has been that the federal government did not want to pay grants on any recreational land. They would pay on flood plain lands but they wanted to stop there and then it was either the responsibility of the conservation authority of the provincial government or a cost sharing. Now, of course you know at the present time with an election on, there is no way that we can discuss these matters with Ottawa, although they were under discussion prior to the convention being called. Then right after that, of course, there was a federal election called.

Mr. Nixon: On this point, I can see the Minister's problem in discussing it at the highest level, with the Minister responsible for the pollution measures, but surely the discussions among the civil servants and the represented OWRC should be able to go on unhindered.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They are continuing at the present time but we want to discuss with, and at, the Ministers' level a programme that we can follow along for the next five to ten years in order to develop our conservation recreational land. We are going to try, and I hope, when government is formed, that we have some success along the line. We are going to work at it, at least.

Mr. Nixon: Well, I hope you have, and—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: And perhaps, maybe you would go down and help us someday.

Mr. Nixon: Well I trust the same government is going to be back in there again and I will do what I can.

But the Minister knows my views on this, that while I may be able to talk with some of the Liberals down there, the Minister is the man who must talk with the government. If he cannot find his way through that problem—and it is difficult the other way as well—then we really have a problem. Because to allow the solution to be put off by what is the worst kind bureaucracy—that at the highest level—is simply inadmissible. I do not know where the blame should lie. I presume that a little bit lies with both camps. The people are not going to stand for that, and if there is blame to be laid, let it go where it should.

Now, there are some very far reaching solutions that have to be arrived at in the near future, and one of them has to do with whether the government of Canada is going to accept any responsibility, at all, for these inland waterways that are waiting for development. We have heard this Minister, and many other people not associated with politics at all or directly with this government, complaining that the government of Canada is holding up the development on the Grand River and, specifically, in the upper Grand.

Now I do not want to get into too much of an argument, but I mean the upper Grand programme, not the one for recreation in the lower Grand, but surely, it would be possible for somebody to read the federal statute—whether it be officials in Ontario and/or officials in Ottawa—and say this is either possible or it is not. And, if it is not possible, then it is the responsibility of this government to co-operate with the municipalities

and the conservation authorities, to go ahead and do what we can afford ourselves. Perhaps we can negotiate a better federal statute. I would hope so. But, if the statute does not permit them to take part in this, then I wish we would stop trying to lay the blame elsewhere.

I am not, for a moment, saying that the federal statute is perfect. I think there are serious shortcomings in it and, until such time as the laws change, then, surely, we have got to accept our responsibilities with the municipalities and do what we can afford to do; and I think we can be doing much more.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I might say, Mr. Chairman, that, personally, I have no problem getting along with the Minister, but I think he knows that they have been planning to introduce a new federal water Act for the past two years.

Now, until we can get a look at the Act or until it is introduced, it is pretty difficult for us, as a provincial government, to tell a municipality what is going to be in it. And I think you would agree with me, that perhaps they had their problems in the last two years, many problems, and they just never got around to introducing this Act. So I hope that after June 25 when a new government is formed, that there will be an Act introduced, and then we know what programmes we can develop with our municipalities.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, that is so, Mr. Chairman, to some extent, no doubt. There have been predictions of a Canada Water Resources Act, but there has been legislation for some time. Federal funds have been made available for projects of national importance. How they decide that, I do not know, but surely there are criteria in the present statute that permit the people in authority to decide what is a project of national importance, in which federal funds can be used. Evidently, there has been a great delay in the work in the province of Ontario, with the approval from this Minister having been given but the ability to go ahead with the project hinging on a decision from Ottawa that is not available under present statutes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think many of the agreements that we have now, the federal government are letting terminate, in the hopes that when the new Act comes in, we will start a new agreement. Of course, we, in Ontario, are far ahead of some of the other provinces in pollution and in conservation. I might say we are the only province that has a conservation Act. So, they do deal directly with the government in—

Mr. Nixon: In spite of that, probably this province has more pollution than any other province.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, we have more industry.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, all right. Well now, there is one other point in this first vote, which I think has to do with policy, that I want to raise. It does have to do with the sharing of responsibility for public works, and I do not mean Public Works as represented by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), but projects which are going to improve recreational facilities. If the government of Canada has a fixed policy position, that they are not going to participate in recreational facilities, and that they believe that this is a provincial responsibility, then I think we have to move on this more effectively. I think of the area in the lower Grand. If you want to say this is parochial you can, but actually it is all in the constituency of the hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk. Here is a broad stretch of river which, with the involvement of $10 million of public funds from some source, can be made a useful recreational centre. This must be coupled with pollution abatement. That is another problem and a huge problem, but this is something that can be developed in the lower part of the province; the western part of the province, which the Minister was saying is not getting its share in comparison with some other parts of the province, and this is a project that can be taken on by some Minister.

I submit that it is the Minister of Energy and Resources Management that can give the lead in this. Maybe it is Tourism and Information, maybe it is Lands and Forests, but I think the more reasonable approach would be through this department. There is always the thought that, since commercial boats once used the lower Grand, perhaps we can inveigle the government of Canada into paying half, or three-quarters or 20 per cent, or some share. But as long as there is this thought that taxpayers' funds from some other source are going to be available, it will hold up the whole thing.

I hope, very sincerely, that some Minister —and I believe it can be this Minister and this department—can move forward in the near future, when political difficulties are set aside—and I sincerely trust and hope that they will be—and when policy decisions can

clear the way. If they cannot be cleared, then Ontario should move ahead. I do not believe we can put off our responsibility—which is apparent—in order to wait for someone else to come along.

Votes 601 and 602 agreed to.

On vote 603.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on the energy branch. The Minister was talking in his opening remarks about the availability of natural gas; and I can well remember his comments a year ago in which he said that there would be no shortage during the last winter; and I believe the results indicated that he was correct at that time.

There has been considerable argument about the looping of the northern pipeline, and the Minister realizes that this is in the plans now, as a result of decision taken by the national energy board, I understand. But does he feel that in the immediate future—let us say the next five years—before that looped northern line is going to be in service, we can be sure that the industry of northern Ontario is going to have the—I was going to use the word unlimited, I believe it should be —unlimited availability of natural gas energy? We have seen a tremendous surge in the economic growth of many parts of Canada as natural gas was made available, but, I wonder what kind of statistical assurances and predictions we can have, at this time, that our industry, and the growth of the industry is going to be provided with this source of energy and fuel.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member heard me say, in my opening remarks, that there was a study being conducted by our department in northern Ontario, at the present time. I do not think we could answer his question fully until that study is completed, and we expect that in approximately a year from now.

I think also a lot will hinge, or depend, on the decision on the Union's application to import gas from the United States, in comparison to building the other line in northern Ontario. I think that decision would have to be made first. And I believe, and of course it is a guess before the study is finished, that if we get that amount of gas, then it will leave more gas for northern Ontario, to be served by Trans-Canada Pipe Lines on the existing Trans-Canada pipelines.

Mr. Nixon: Well, I understand that if we have the Great Lakes loop, the south loop will relieve the northern line of providing the gas for southern Ontario, so that it can be used in the north to a greater extent.

During the next five years, or until the northern loop is in operation, will the amount of natural gas that we import—I do not mean what we just transport through the United States but what we import from the United States—increase significantly?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, of course, I would think that that depends on the decision that is now before the national energy board. I think they are importing, at the present time, all they are allowed to import, that is, during the peak months in the winter time. Whatever decision is made will govern whether they will import more, or whether the gas coming through or the loop will have to begin sooner.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Chairman, in his introductory remarks, the Minister made mention of liquefied natural gas, and if there is probably going to be some real use for this in the future. He mentioned some place, I believe east of Sudbury, where a storage basin, or such, was now located. I wonder if the Minister could inform us where this liquefied natural gas comes from, and what province or what part?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It comes from western Canada.

Mr. Ferrier: Does it come through the pipeline or by—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, it is coming through the pipeline at the present time, in liquid.

Mr. Ferrier: It comes through the pipeline as a liquid?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh, as a gas, then liquefies.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 603?

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): I suppose oil comes under this vote, does it?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Spence: In the Rodney area in Elgin county there is an oil field where they use water flooding. The oil company refused to buy only a certain amount of the oil. I understand there is something in this oil, the company says. Does your department do any research on this?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No.

Mr. Spence: And there are no other companies that will process this oil except Imperial Oil?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say we have met with the officials of Imperial Oil and the company that was producing this well in the fields. We have met with them—each on one occasion. I understand that Imperial Oil are taking a part of their production and that perhaps Shell Oil now has negotiated to take some of their production. I believe they could sell it all to another company, but at a reduced price to what they are getting from Imperial Oil. I do not know whether or not it has all been settled. I understand a large quantity of the production is being taken at the present time.

Mr. Spence: Very glad to hear that. Another question, I would like to ask in regard to plugging the gas wells. How many gas wells has the department plugged if the lessor goes broke or is unable to find gas or in case when gas has quit producing?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, on properties where the company has moved out, the property is sold, and then a well is discovered by the new owner, we will plug that. There is no charge to the owner. But we do try to collect from a company who for some reason has an unproductive well. We do try to get money for plugging that well for him before he moves out—or if it should be the present land owner that owned the well, we would try to hold them responsible for plugging.

Mr. Paterson: On this same topic, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister has the details close at hand regarding the number of abandoned wells that were plugged in the Niagara peninsula during the past year, 1967? Also, how many are plugged in the Essex-Kent area, and the Lambton area? There are three distinct regions, and I wonder if he can further indicate what the programme is for this current year and how many operators there are in the province that have equipment capable of doing this work? Further, now difficult is it to procure these operators?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, last year we plugged 9 wells in Essex, Haldimand 14, Norfolk 6, Welland 37, Lambton 1, for a total of 67. Total cost was $125,561.29, for an average cost per well of $1,875.

Mr. Paterson: Does the Minister have any comment on this year's programme? I know they were anticipating doing a number of abandoned wells in my particular riding, and I believe, on talking to the inspector in the area, they were unable to secure an operator with equipment to come down into that area and do these wells.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we are asking in the vote here for $100,000 which we feel will be ample for the next year. We are not trying to plug all the wells, we are trying to plug those that would be a threat or are polluting our streams or something. However, if we know a well is not giving any problem, we are not trying to force anyone to plug it at the present time. We feel $100,000 will take care of the wells that we need to plug this coming year.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Chairman, may I follow this up? Perhaps by this method of financing the plugging of these wells, are you not subsidizing the large gas companies for such purposes as storage sheds. I am speaking of the Sherkston area. I know many cases of persons who have been charged for plugging wells off and have paid a portion—yet the wells did not belong to them. They bought the property and they were charged for this. In fact, I had them come on my property. They said to plug this well off was going to cost me $900. I said no, I do not own the well and never did, and this is not my responsibility. The point I do raise is this: The reason that they were plugging the wells off in that area—I am quite sure—is that they were using this as a storage shed area for the large gas companies and perhaps in future years to export this gas to the United States. Now is this not so?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot answer that question. Do I understand that you paid for plugging these wells?

Mr. Haggerty: No. I was requested to pay.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: By whom?

Mr. Haggerty: By whom? By Mr. Laramie from Dunnville, the representative from your department, I think. He works through Mr. Brittain. I have a letter at home on file.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: These were not wells —you did not drill these wells yourself?

Mr. Haggerty: No, I did not drill these wells, but they requested me to pay for them.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: And was that recently? What year?

Mr. Haggerty: This was about three years ago.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, our policies have changed in the past three years as far as plugging wells is concerned.

Mr. Haggerty: Would you say last year?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Haggerty: I think I know of a case where a person did pay a portion.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, it changed last year. You were not the owner of the property at the time the well was drilled?

Mr. Haggerty: That is right, but I own the property.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: But did you own it at the time the well was drilled?

Mr. Haggerty: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Did you own it at the time the well was drilled?

Mr. Haggerty: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Did you get some royalties?

Mr. Haggerty: No, I did not. It was a dry well and was plugged twice, yet they came back and plugged it again.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think you have a particular case here. I would be very happy to discuss this with you if you would like to come to my office anytime; I wish you would bring the correspondence you had with our department, as I would like to—

Mr. Haggerty: I have a list of correspondence from your department on similar matters, but I rise again. I think there is a conference today and tomorrow at Niagara Falls on pollution. I notice in an article in the Buffalo *Evening News* where the people on the Niagara peninsula, on the American side, are concerned by the conservation department's dumping of toxic waste, chemicals, and other pollutants into porous rock strata such as the white and red medina, called deep-well injection. It has been discovered by Americans that in northern Michigan state—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could hold this until we get onto the OWRC vote. We are dealing with energy at the present time.

Mr. Haggerty: Are you not dealing with the plugging of wells, too?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You were talking about industrial waste, I thought.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, I have talked about the white and red medina.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, but I thought we had finished. I thought you were talking about the conference on pollution.

Mr. Haggerty: This is what they are using in the United States. They are using previous gas wells for injection of this pollutant. It has been discovered by the Americans, that in northern Michigan state, salt water has been forced to the surface because of brine injection across the border in Canada. In western New York, the underground disposal of whey at a cheese plant resulted in pollution of water wells. Has your department approved of this type of disposal method in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would think that the question of the hon. member for Welland South that I just answered, where we are forcing water in the ground to force the oil out—you mentioned whey as well, did you—

Mr. Haggerty: I think that they discovered this does create pollution, this method of injection of pollutants into the old gas wells and so on. All I am questioning here is if you approve of such a method in Ontario? Are there any gas wells at the present time used as dry wells for this method?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, I understand that we do approve of refineries injecting their wastes into the ground.

Mr. Paterson: On the same vote, I have two or three more questions—go ahead, I will wait.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): I have heard of the problem on the American side where they have dry wells and have put pollution into the ground. Now you are allowing it in Ontario also. Do your people think that this will eventually pollute the grounds around that area, including the water wells? Surely they must? In the Welland area you plugged 17 wells last year. In certain dry wells such as those of the member of Welland South, they can take their disposal, their sewage, and their oil from refineries, and dump this into these dry wells. Apparently you allow that to be done in certain areas. I am asking the question: Would that not eventually pollute those areas also where they have a lot of wells? Most of the folks in the country do have a water well. They

do not have the city water. I wonder if your people looked into this matter? Because it looks like it could eventually be a serious problem.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We do all them to do this in certain areas. Now, these holes must be 2,000 feet below the wells, or they are very deep holes. They could not take any hole and just plunk their waste in it. These must be approved, and only in certain areas.

Mr. Bukator: Just across the border from us—and I do not think that that border makes that much difference—apparently they have polluted some of the ground in that area. You are quite sure that this is not happening in Ontario? That is the point that I am trying to make.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It has happened in some parts of Ontario. For example, in the Port Huron area several wells started to flow mineral water to the surface in the summer of 1967. Sub-surface disposal in the Sarnia area, and the subsequent increase in reservoir pressures, were suspected as the direct or indirect cause of this problem. A complete study of sub-surface disposal is presently being undertaken, and all disposal operations are being monitored. Volumes of injected fluids, primarily at the Imperial Oil Limited refinery are being progessively reduced to remove the possibility of disposed chemical effluence returning to the surface through unplugged wells. All sub-surface disposal applications are reviewed jointly by the petroleum resources section at OWRC.

Mr. Bukator: You are keeping on top of this?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes!

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. Haggerty. Mr. Chairman, if I could go over this again? Perhaps you could pollute the water wells in the area too? After all, the water comes up through seams in the rock. Are you not going to create a larger problem here? Some areas do not have city water or treated water, and they have to depend upon wells. I know that in my area especially there are a number of sulphur wells.

Mr. Paterson: I would like to put a question to the Minister in relation to the submission of the Ontario petroleum institute and to the hon. Minister. In subsection 4, where the industry points out that there has been a period of continued decline in drilling for gas and oil in Ontario, they point out that there were 75 licensed drilling rigs in Ontario two years ago. At the same date one year ago, it was down to 22 active in drilling. They put in a request that the gas industry, or where they are drilling, be declared a designated area so that there would be the benefit of tax incentives. I wonder if any action was taken in this regard by the department or by the federal government? Or do you not recall this particular submission?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sorry I do not. What was the question?

Mr. Paterson: Has the Minister considered any tax incentives to keep the companies drilling for gas and oil in business? They seem to feel that they are in a period of serious decline.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No.

Mr. Paterson: Could the Minister indicate to me how many wells will be drilled in Lake Erie in 1968? Is there any advanced figure on what these companies anticipate doing?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am told that they expect about the same number as was drilled last year, and we would not have any accurate figure as to how many would be drilled. It would depend on the well, and if—

Mr. Paterson: Last winter I recall reading in the area press, that one well became damaged or un-capped out in Lake Erie. There was an account of the tug going to bring divers out to it through the ice pack, and so forth. It was a matter of four or five days both ways. I wonder if there was any evidence of serious pollution as a result of the escaping gas?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There would be no pollution from gas. Was that in Lake Erie or Lake St. Clair?

Mr. Paterson: To the best of my knowledge it was Lake Erie.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We know nothing about a well in Lake Erie, but in Lake St. Clair we do.

Mr. Paterson: I have the clipping. It was Lake Erie. One further question for the Minister in relation to the talks on amalgamation between the Union Gas and Consumers Gas. I believe that there are discussions under

way in this regard? I felt, as a consumer of Union Gas, that we had a very preferred area in southewestern Ontario in regard to rates, and uninterrupted service. I wonder if the Minister and his department are looking into this proposed amalgamation and if he, in fact, could guarantee the people in the Essex-Kent district the same rate as is now being charged by Union Gas, as compared to the higher rate of Consumers Gas?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we have heard rumours although we do not know if they are still negotiating a merger or not. If a merger did come about, then rates would be set by the Ontario energy board.

Mr. Paterson: Yes. I wanted to ask a question in relation to the provincial institutes of trades in regard to gas fitters. Does that come under this vote or under the next vote? I am wondering how many students are being graduated in this particular source? Is it being used for instruction of the personnel of the department?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It comes under this vote. What was the question?

Mr. Paterson: How many students are taking advantage of this course in the province, or how many are being graduated each year?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I might say that that does not come under our department. We licence the actual fitters under our department but that would have nothing to do with us. You are talking about students that are going to one of the provincial institutes?

Mr. Paterson: Yes. I would like—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That would have nothing to do with our department at all.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 603.

The member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: In leasing of the gas fields in Lake Erie, are they assessed by local municipalities for tax purposes? If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Simonett. Good question.

Mr. Haggerty: The reason I raise the question is when they are out trying to get the oil and gas and mineral storage agreement and leases, I understand that these storage sheds are not assessable. They are not assessed for tax purposes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sure I cannot answer that but I would doubt it very much. I would doubt that they are assessed.

Mr. Haggerty: Do you not agree that they should be assessed for tax purposes?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I might say it would be very hard to get your local assessor down there. You have to measure—to see what is going on. Maybe the cost would be more than the assessment would bring in taxes to the municipality. Of course, that would not be our policy—it would not come under this department whether they should be assessed or not.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Minister to say that gas fitters' licences were issued under this vote?

The reason I raise this is form 309, the gas fitters' licence. Many of the men working in the industry are concerned that the qualifications to get this licence are far too easy. Anybody can take the book that is given, I think it is a B166 code book, and they can read through this book and memorize a certain number of facts and write an examination. They get an idea of what the questions are going to be and they can pass this.

The gas companies are running schools for their salesmen and high school teachers are getting this licence and so on. Those who are working in the industry are very concerned that there should be some practical experience, some period of practical experience that goes along with the written examination. They should have a year or six months, or something like this, actually working in the gas industry so that they know more than just what they can memorize out of a book.

They also feel that after a certain time they should be periodically retested to get this licence. I wonder if the Minister's department has considered making this practical period obligatory in getting this form 309, and if they have considered that they should be retested from time to time.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say any experience that I have had personally was just opposite to that of the hon. member. I have had many people complain we have been too tough and we will not give the licences out very easily. But we do agree with you and we are working on it at the

present time, that is, they should be re-tested and beginners, perhaps, should serve some time before they get a licence.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 603. The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I have one further question of the Minister.

In reading back through the debates over the past three or four years I noticed comments concerning the application of oil distributors who wish to distribute their fuel from a central tank into a subdivision.

I wonder, have any or many of these applications been made to the department and what is the department's policy in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that there are about a dozen at the present time. This is a distribution system by pipe through a subdivision. We will entertain applications; of course, they have to be checked out.

Mr. Paterson: One further thought. I believe that fuel safety comes under this Minister's department?

I am wondering, does the department itself give any training to drivers of gasoline tank trucks, or is this up to the individual company itself?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No. That would be up to the company and The Department of Transport.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oxford.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister about the quality of gas that the gas companies put into the lines. What type of a deterrent or fine is assessed on a company if they do not put the right quality of gas through their line? I have a complaint at the moment relative to a sulphur that has entered the line and it has not been there before. I understand that there are purifiers but consumers in this particular area are very upset about the situation. I wondered what they can do—what does the inspector do after he finds that is happening?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is natural gas?

Mr. Innes: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand that there is nothing in our Act that would affect this matter but we are prepared to have the board investigate and report back to us on this matter.

Mr. Innes: Yes, I understand that. What happens is that they open up an old sulphur well; they will close it off for a while and then there will be an accumulation of gas come back into the well again. They say, "We will tap into it and use a little more again rather than bringing the pure gas from the Tilbury field." So what I want to know is if they do it once, is there any deterrent on the part of government that they will not open it up again? Apparently, there is not.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No. I think that in order to protect themselves they should at that time install filters.

Mr. Innes: They should do what?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Install filters. It would filter out the foreign matter.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 603. The member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Has your department been responsible for plugging the well, owned in 1967 by Foreign Explorations Limited, Toronto, Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand they have been ordered to plug some wells but we have not plugged any for them.

Mr. Haggerty: You mean they have been ordered and have not done it yet?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand we have made several orders and they have plugged some, but I do not know particularly what you are talking about right now. We would have to check that out. I could not—

Mr. Haggerty: Who is paying the cost for this?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The company.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 603; the member for Wellington South.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, in regard to fuel safety, in the past two weeks I have had representation made to me from some of the small garage owners which handle gasoline. They are suggesting that your department should print the forms that require a dipstick type of measure for the gasoline tanks. This may not be a large item to the Minister but it is an ever-increasing cost to the small operator. You know what difficulties they are having. They have brought it to

my attention that this is merely a checking system for your staff and they feel that these forms should be put out by you people for them to fill out and given to your inspectors when they come around.

The other thing they brought to my attention was this handling of gasoline for some of the summer cottages. As you know, you have to have a special type of can for them to obtain gasoline and yet many of the camping stores that furnish oil and gas for stoves put out a can which does not meet the standards that you ask for in your specifications. When they come to have them refilled they cannot do it according to law. They have mentioned they felt this law should be advertised more to take the responsibilty of policing it off the gasoline operator. Very often he will turn down a man who will go down the road and some other fellow who is not, maybe, as honest as the other individual will fill up the can. They feel this part of the Act should be spelled out more in the papers during the coming camping season so they are not put in the position of having to refuse people for not having the proper type of container. I think there is justification in their complaint that the people who sell the supplies put out a can with a fluid, and yet they cannot by law refill them. But they can be sold from any department store or any camping supply store.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: First, let me say, on the forms—we do not say what form they must use, they can use any form. I think most of them, if they would get in touch with the distributor, can get the forms supplied. I do not think there is any problem there. This happens to be one of the businesses I am in and we have had forms supplied by the gas company for 30 years.

On the disposable can, you can buy naphtha gas and some other gases in these cans, but they cannot be refilled again.

Mr. Worton: It does not say that on the cans.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think they are just plain, with the trade name of the product. Is that right?

Mr. Worton: It says it is highly dangerous but it does not say that it cannot be refilled.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is right, that can be thrown away. I do not know—and again this is a business I am very closely associated with—and we ran into trouble because we are in a tourist area as well—but I think it is the biggest boom that happened to our business. We are selling more cans now—we have lots of them there—from a half-gallon up to a five. And we say, "Sorry, we cannot fill your can but there is one right in there." It is better than the gasoline business.

Mr. Worton: I think perhaps the Minister is stretching the point a little bit. I do not think people are that generous when they come and buy a gallon of gas that they want to pay $3 or $4 for a can.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They do not have to.

Mr. Worton: Ah, but they do. I do not think it is properly clear as to what the can is. You put out specifications on a blue paper as to what can they can use, but they bring a can that they picked up at a store, take it, fill their stove up, and then take it to the gasoline operator and say, "Fill it up". It seems to me that if you can sell something out of a department store, we should at least be consistent and be able to use it again or make them sell it in a proper container to start with.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, Mr. Chairman, these people can get the same product they sell at the service stations. You can get the same product in a can and sell it to a service station.

Mr. Worton: At three times the price.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, but we will not allow you to refill it because it is a throw-away can.

Mr. Worton: Three times the price, too, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not think this should be debated here.

Mr. Worton: The Minister is a business man and he knows these little things are affecting the small operator today. He is getting fed up and he says: "What is the use of me keeping on in this business, I am getting tired of using forms to provide the government with more money."

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member would not ask us at this time to go back to using any can or bottle for gasoline? Would he like us to do that?

Mr. Worton: No, I do not, but I tell you there are still some who are getting away with it. I think you people should spell it out better. Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, for

getting carried away with that, I wish to withdraw.

Mr. Bukator: I know the point my colleague is driving at and maybe others have had the same experience that I have had. I did purchase a red one-gallon can from a hardware store and the spout has a top on it. You can lift it up and put it back into the can and reverse it to use it as a spout. Now, I felt I was doing the right thing. I bought the can, took it to the gasoline station where I do business and he said, "I'm sorry, that can does not meet the regulations, I can't fill it." So I have had the experience this gentleman is talking about. Now, I do not know how many others have had the same experience, but it struck me as rather odd. It was not that expensive, but I bought a gallon can for the purpose of filling it up with gas to put in my lawnmower. The attendant was living up to the letter of the law and he said, "That can does not meet the requirements, I can't fill it for you."

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It was not an approved can.

Mr. Bukator: Well, it was approved as far as I was concerned.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, but it was not stamped "approved".

Mr. Bukator: No, I do not know what was on it, it was a gallon can and I bought it in a hardware store. I went down to the gas station and they could not fill it. I do not know why they can sell that can if it does not meet the legal requirements.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: But is it not odd—I wanted to do what was right—I needed a can and it had a fancy spout that you could reverse and put into the can and then put another top on it. I drove down to the gas station and he said, "It doesn't meet the necessary requirements, I can't fill it for you." A few weeks later—yes, I found a gas company that sold some gas, another fellow at another gas station—finally they decided they had to relax the law a little bit, that this can would be all right. I am still using it, but it took a few months. I should not be talking about breaking laws, but I did not think I did when I bought a can that was on sale. I felt I was perfectly within my rights to do so and I still have the same can. It is a one-gallon tin can painted red with this spout that I spoke of. In the first instance, the gas attendant would not fill it for me because he said it did not meet the requirements. Now, is there some kind of special can? I would say—off the record through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister—if he has one of those gallon jobs, bring it along and I will buy it if it has a spring on it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I might say I agree with the members, it is a problem sometimes. I doubt if they would want to go back to using bottles or any old can. There is a regulation can today and you can buy half-gallon, gallon, two gallons, five gallons—and it is marked "regulation". Of course, I think perhaps two or three years ago, when they first came out with cans, some manufacturers or some distributors said it was painted red with "gasoline" on it but that would be an approved can—but they were not all approved.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, a couple of days ago lightning hit a natural gas installation near Galt and this resulted in an explosion and fire. Could the Minister advise if this was an unusual occurrence and not bound to happen again with possibly disastrous results?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would think it would be a very unusual occurrence but I am sure I could not say it would not happen again. It is one of those things that would not happen very often because most pipelines are grounded and that would usually dispose of the lightning.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister's department have any regulations which would cause the gas companies to provide protection for their installations from lightning?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I doubt that we would have regulations, but again, installations where a pipe goes into the ground seems to me that that would be a ground. I do not know what part of the line—was it the line it hit or what?

Mr. Makarchuk: I think it was a surface installation that was hit and this resulted in an explosion and fire.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Oh, it was not a pressure station that was hit?

Mr. Makarchuk: I am not sure.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There was a pressure station hit by lightning and it is under investigation at the present time.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, one of the things that has been missing from this particular vote so far has been the appeals by the farmers of Dawn township for justice in the provision of adequate payment for the gas storage that is used by some of the major gas companies. I would like to ask the Minister what progress has been made in satisfying these complaints. Normally, the group representing the farmers has been very regular in their attendance here just before the Minister's estimates—so we would be up to date on the latest development—but since they have not come down this year we can assume perhaps their situation has been improved somewhat. The Minister would be in a position to report on that, surely?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would say that good progress has been made. I think there are negotiations going on in some areas yet but things are much better than they were a year ago, I believe, on both sides. There has been co-operation with the companies and with the farmers and I think things are progressing now.

Mr. Nixon: They have been negotiating for 20 years and there has not been any progress.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, finally we got them together and things are going very well.

Mr. Nixon: I am glad to hear that.

Vote 603 agreed to.

On vote 604:

Mr. Ferrier: I would like to know something about the energy board hearings. Are these open to the public and if a company decides that they want to increase their rates for gas to the consumers, do they give the opportunity to all interested parties to present briefs and make their representations, or is the decision to allow them to increase or not increase just done by the board itself without hearing representations?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, all hearings, are open to the public. As far as rate-setting is concerned, their plants are estimated and that has to be approved prior to them setting any rate. Then we allow them a return on their money. But they cannot change their rates without a hearing and it is quite a long process to go through before there can be a change in the rate structure.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 604, the member—

Mr. Ferrier: Consumers Gas, I understand, sells cheaper in the Niagara peninsula than it does in Toronto. I wonder if the Minister could inform us why there is this difference in the price.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am advised it is an old company that was bought out by Consumers. Everything was paid for and it is local gas so their rates would be lower than on the new lines that are coming in from western Canada.

Mr. Makarchuk: Could you give some indication what returns you are allowing the companies on their money when they are setting the rates?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Seven and a half to 8 per cent.

Mr. Makarchuk: This is on total investment that the company has?

Vote 604 agreed to.

On vote 605:

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, on vote 605, I have two very brief questions, one is in relation to item 8, the farm pond subsidies. Basically, this work in the province is being done under the aegis of The Department of Agriculture and Food and the local agricultural representative, specifically in my own county when I do not have a conservative authority.

I wondered, in the county where there is both an agricultural representative, and a conservation authority, are the conservation authorities themselves advising people who are putting in farm ponds of the extra benefits that can be accrued through a farm pond other than just simply an irrigation pond, and so forth? Is that work continuing in these areas?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Do I understand your question—are you asking if the conservation authorities build farm ponds?

Mr. Paterson: No, I realize that this does not come under them.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Right.

Mr. Paterson: But when it did come under the conservation authorities themselves, the conservation officers would often advise the farmer on fish management in the pond and other assets. In my own area of Essex county, where we do not have a conservation authority, the agricultural representatives are strictly advising our farmers on an irrigation pond, as such, or a water-holding pond, and we do

not receive that benefit. I just wanted the assurance that possibly the conservation people are still going a little bit beyond a mere water-holding concept.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The answer is yes. I might say that this was one of the reasons, perhaps, that we put this programme under agriculture representatives so we could get full coverage all over Ontario. And then I understand it will come within the conservation area.

Mr. Paterson: Yes. A second question in relation to The Parks Assistance Act. I think this is a wonderful Act, based on my own experience in my own community. The moneys spent in the local park have really developed this as an asset to the community and area. I wonder how many municipalities applied last year for moneys under the terms of this Act.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I wonder—perhaps there are some more questions while we are looking that up. I think we have it here some place if we have not all lost our books.

Mr. Nixon: If you want to answer that question in a few minutes, there are one or two points I want to raise on the conservation authorities branch. When we were discussing the bill the Minister said that the department was considering, or the governmen was considering, a change in the grant structure with what is usually referred to as a sliding-scale grant that would give poor municipalities and poorer conservation authorities a chance to go ahead with some of the more important projects that they could not undertake under the grants the way they are presently fashioned.

I think the one thing that was put very strongly to the committee was that some of the major dams and facilities relating to conservation were to be found in the parts of the province where the municipalities could not afford their share of the development. While the plans were there and the conservation report—I should not say the plans but the recommendations were there and the conservation report—as far as the authorities could see in the future under the grants system that presently pertained and still applies, they could not undertake these works. Their recommendation was that the grants system ought to have a sliding scale that would allow the people of the province, the taxpayers of the province in general, to pay a larger share of these major works that were located away from the population centres.

The justification, of course, is that the benefits of conservation would be appreciated by the citizens in a much broader area than just the conservation authority itself. The Minister said that this was under some discussion. First, I would like to know if the vote under 605 contains funds that could be applied to a more generous application of provincial funds in certain projects, particularly in those areas that we do not have access to as large an assessment themselves. Maybe I will let the Minister just comment on that now.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, this programme, I might say, of finding grants up to 75 per cent will commence January of next year.

Mr. Nixon: In 1969? Well, that is—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: In 1969. So that it will go with their calendar year, the conservation authorities' calendar year. We have no money being voted on today as there will be only a part of the year which will be dealt with by Treasury board.

Mr. Nixon: So if there are any approvals under the new grant programme it will be dealt with probably in supplementary estimates?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I doubt if there would be much spent before another year anyway.

Mr. Nixon: Would this 75 per cent maximum grant, which is already available—as I understand it—for projects approved under the small watershed head, be expanded from that into other projects, depending on the location, rather than the type of project?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: This applies to administration and, of course, this would be based on the assessment in the municipalities and the moneys that they are spending for conservation.

Mr. Nixon: Right. I would like to refer a bit more to these grants. As I understand them, basically, the province of Ontario pays half of approved costs, and the municipalities gather half themselves. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Fifty-fifty, yes.

Mr. Nixon: Now there are exceptions having to do with small watersheds, and other exceptions that will becoming in within a year. But some projects, as many as possible, are participated in by the government of Canada. And if they were to approve federal participation, it would then

be 37.5 federal, 37.5 provincial, 25 municipal, which seems to be a nice programme indeed. In the Minister's experience, what type of programmes do get federal approval? We have had some federal approvals.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Flood control, small reservoir programme, and that is about it as far as the 37.5-37.5—

Mr. Nixon: They do take part in the small reservoirs that permits us to pick up 75 per cent of the cost? The programme on the upper Grand—and this time it is in the constituency of the Chairman, is it not—some of it anyway—and perhaps one other riding north of that again—so that I am not accused of talking about projects in Brant, because the Grand River conservation authority does not undertake, for obvious reasons pertaining to the river, a good number of programmes.

As I understand it there is a programme in the upper reaches of the Grand, which is a very expensive programme involving large dams. Are there two main dams required?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Five.

Mr. Nixon: But there are two that they are prepared to go ahead with in the near future. Is that not so?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, two.

Mr. Nixon: This is provincial approval but is that provincial approval at the 37.5 level, so that it cannot go unless the federal people come in, or is that the 50-50 approval that could permit the construction to commence?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is at 37.5 at the present time.

Mr. Nixon: In other words, there is not approval in the broadest sense—you are prepared to pay 37.5 per cent but you are not prepared to say you will pay 50 just now.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I doubt, Mr. Chairman, if the authority itself would want to pay 50. I think they would have to get two governments cost sharing their 25 before they would proceed.

Mr. Nixon: And the municipalities felt they could only pay 25 per cent, the approval is still pending?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Right, at the 20-52.

Mr. Nixon: What is holding it up? Is it the statute, or is it something else?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I cannot answer what is holding it up. If I knew perhaps we could do something about it, but I think there are some worries with the federal people. I believe there was some pollution and they wondered what area or what percentage of this was going to be used for pollution abatement. I think these are matters that are being straightened out at present.

Mr. Nixon: You know the chairman of the conservation authority has made two or three statements that have been widely reported. The Minister has referred to it previously in the House under circumstances on both sides that were not so conducive to getting at the facts. As I understand it, the federal statute simply will not permit funds to be used if the works that are to be approved are not economically viable.

It is their view that pollution control is not the responsibility of a conservation authority and is not achieved by simply having water to flush the pollution down the river. Pollution control is achieved by putting in sewage disposal facilities—and as I understand it—a federal statute does not provide funds to replace sewage disposal facilities.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What are you going to do with the effluent facilities?

Mr. Nixon: The effluent is not pollutant in the normal sense, although the Minister knows that there are other views on this. We are talking about the raw sewage and the need for dams so that there will be a sufficient flow of water to keep the river flushed out. This is apparently a responsibility that the federal government is not keen to accept. As a matter of fact, I understand that they do not believe it is permitted by the federal statute.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that the hon. member, and perhaps our department, think alike on this—and you sold me on the idea. We are trying to sell it to the effluent facilities plants. It is not a pollutant, but it still has to go through a river flush and be disposed. I think this is perhaps the problem we are having with the federal government at the present time, and of course, as I said before, we have not been able to meet with them in the last three months. Time is getting close, so we hope we can solve the problem.

Mr. Nixon: It seems to me that the people who are representing the experts in the department should be able to go to Ottawa or have the Ottawa people come here and sit down and say: " Look, does your statute permit this or not?" If they say no, then it is

obviously a provincial and municipal responsibility. If you are going to wait, and continue to wait—and if the Minister feels that this requires an election to solve this—I hope he is right.

But if you are going to continue to wait on some political development that may or may not occur, then I think that we are going to lose some of the advantage of the plan that we have. Meanwhile the people in these areas—and I assume that the people in the Grand Valley are not the only ones that are going to suffer—will see the effects of not having the developments they should have.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we will all admit that regardless of what government gets in—and I think, too, during this election campaign there has been a debate on pollution—and I say these things, and again I think you will have to agree with me, that at this level we will have to meet with the new Minister and try and iron out something—and I think perhaps we can—regardless of the government. There has been a lot said about pollution during the election campaign, and many people have been out and there is just nobody to talk to—you can understand that. Because last October, or September, when an election was on in Ontario, the Ministers were not around these buildings too much to hammer out a policy.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, that is right, but we have been financing conservation efforts and new dams for a long time on a 50-50 basis. This has gone on for many of those great years of stability in the early 60s when there are always people in Ottawa that you can go down and talk to. It has been so since 1963 up until the present when there has not always been political turmoil. Is it the Minister's thought that the federal government is going to involve itself to the extent of 37.5 per cent in most of the projects that would be approved by this branch of the department?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is a fair question to ask me to make a statement that would be in *Hansard* about a government that is not even elected—one that I have not talked to yet. I would hope you would wait until we at least meet to discuss our problem in the hopes that we could solve them.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kent.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to clearly understand these grants. I understand that the federal government contributes 37.5 per cent and the the provincial government contributes 37.5 per cent and also the municipalities 25 per cent. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The authorities—

Mr. Spence: Authorities. If I understand it correctly. How does ARDA get mixed up into these conservation authorities? We hear in certain parts of the province of Ontario that ARDA is spending too much on conservation authorities. I would like to know where ARDA works in this. Does it work in southern Ontario? In what parts of the province is ARDA used?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we have certain areas where even with the 75 per cent that the two governments share in the cost and the authority 25 per cent, they cannot proceed with the project. There are several areas in Ontario, and through dealing with ARDA if we can get the project as an ARDA development then this could vary in the different areas. At the present time it would be 45-45 and 10 for the authority and municipalities.

Mr. Spence: Under ARDA?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, if it is approved by both governments.

Mr. Chairman: I think that perhaps the hon. members will permit, it being 6 o'clock, the chair will resume at 8 o'clock.

The House adjourned at 6:00 of the clock p.m.

No. 115

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, June 11, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 11, 1968

Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett, continued 4285

Motion to adjourn, Mr. MacNaughton, agreed to 4322

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
(Continued)

On vote 605:

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I am not sure whether it is proper to bring what I want to talk about up here, under vote 605 or under vote 607.

An hon. member: Well, do not bring it up then!

Mr. Ferrier: I am going to bring it up anyway. It concerns one of the lakes just outside of Timmins called Gillies Lake. This area was made a good deal smaller by the Hollinger mine over the years, and now that the Hollinger mine is shutting down there is the real danger that this lake will flood because the water from this lake was pumped through the concentrating plant of Hollinger into Pearl Lake which is a little distance away. Now that the Hollinger is shut down, the problem of flooding arises.

The hon. Minister when in Timmins suggested that the conservation authority should look into this, and see if they could find a solution as to who was responsible for the pumping of this water, and no report has been made as yet. If the responsibility lies with the conservation authority, it will mean that this province and the municipality will be completely responsible for it and the company will have no obligation. I am wondering if a decision has been reached and if the Minister feels that it is justified that the public purse should pick up the tab of the pumping of this water from Gillies Lake to Pearl Lake in the future years?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Some time earlier this year, when I was in Timmins meeting with the municipal council and members of the conservation authority, this matter was brought to my attention. I asked him at that time to put something in writing—so that we might deal with it here—and I might say at this time that I have heard nothing from Timmins at all regarding this matter.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on vote 605, I wonder if the Minister can tell us something about the general policy of the expropriation as far as the conservation authorities are concerned? I note that my friend the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) is here and I know that he has more than a passing interest in the matter of expropriation, but I have cause to question at some length the actions of various authorities insofar as conservation proceedings are concerned.

It was of some little help, and I underline the word little, when The Expropriation Procedures Act was amended and when it was determined that, prior to a conservation authority having the right to expropriate, there had to be the opportunity for a public hearing before the county court judge or the dictrict court judge.

But it is more than passing strange—I am sorry that my friend from Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) is not here to object to my phrases—but it is more than passing strange to see some of the procedures that some of the conservation authorities are using so far as expropriation is concerned.

A particular authority that I am very concerned about is the Junction Creek authority in Sudbury who were interested in certain lands to build a dam in the vicinity of Sudbury, just north of the city limits there. Some considerable months before, they had taken the land, they published a notice in the Sudbury paper stating, or giving warning, apparently under the authority of The Conservation Authorities Act—that is the way that the advertising was headed—to all persons who may be interested, and they listed 12 or 15 parcels of land described in the land titles office in the area: "Do not deal with these pieces of land because the conservation authority is about to expropriate them."

I would like to get the Minister's view on this unusual kind of action by a body that gets its authority from this Legislature. This action, to my mind, constitutes certainly a

slander on title and lays ground for a substantial claim for damages because, well over a year in advance of any effective bylaw being passed, they had published a notice in the local paper saying to anyone who might be interested, to the general public, do not deal with this land because we are thinking of expropriating. This advertisement appeared over their signature and under the apparent authority of The Expropriation Procedures Act.

Now I would like to hear from the Minister what his view is of this kind of action and perhaps the Attorney General could assist him in expressing his view because I know full well that when this matter finally comes to a hearing, insofar as values are concerned, there is going to be a substantial claim for damages against, at least, the authority and probably against the government for damages. Because they hurt the title, they hurt the ownership of these people to their property, well in advance of the time they had any legal right to do so.

One would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that of all bodies that deal with public lands or have a right to expropriate, that the conservation authority, under the watchful eye of this very careful Minister, would observe the letter of the law most meticulously. So I would like to hear the Minister's view in connection with these matters.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, first let me say that I do not administer The Expropriation Procedures Act. It comes under The Department of the Attorney General.

Now I would think that the same would apply to all conservation authorities. When a project is anticipated, of course, you must have a survey. This must follow and as soon as the surveyors go in on certain properties, whether it be highway, conservation authority or what it is, then I think you smear the type of land. I do not think the hon. member disagrees with me. Now I understand the case you are talking about right now. This perhaps has happened. No doubt it has.

Mr. Singer: Oh, it did.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Fine, but this is all right. How else would you do it? There is no other way to do it. This case is going or has gone before the judge for his ruling. Now I do not know whether a decision has been made or not and my advisors here cannot tell me but, nevertheless, it has followed the procedure as set down by The Expropriation Procedures Act.

Now I think you would agree with me that regardless of what project you want to move ahead in the province of Ontario or in the world, before you can move, you must have some engineering, you must do certain things that would, in my opinion, put a smear on the title.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed in the response of this Minister. I would really think that he should take advice, either from his own legal advisors or from the Attorney General. In part he has been quite correct. The matter is finally going to be determined by His Honour Judge Cooper, who is the district judge of the district of Sudbury.

I am advised he is about to make an order and the order, at this point and by agreement, is not going to be contested. But if my friend the Minister would take advice either from his own legal advisor or more hopefully, from the Attorney General, he would, I am sure, be assured very quickly that unless and until the appropriate judge made his order, no one had a right to publish an advertisement in the newspaper that indicated that the title to that land was clouded in any way.

In other words, what was done, and I say it without any qualms whatsoever, was a thoroughly illegal and improper act, at least a year in advance of the time that that authority had any legal position to act in this manner.

I am not suggesting that they should not have done surveys in advance. I am not suggesting that they should not have engineering reports in advance. But I am suggesting that when they had the cheek to publish in the newspaper, at the expense of the authority, which gets it money from public sources, the illegal notice advising the owners of that particular piece of property—and there were a dozen pieces of property mentioned in that particular advertisement—that they no longer had a right to deal with it because the property might be expropriated in the future, that the act was improper and illegal. No Minister of the Crown has any right to stand up here and say anything other than it was absolutely wrong.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, we come to the point with some of these Ministers, that when there has been a mistake made by an emanation of this government, that at least one Minister is going to have the courage to get up and say, "I am sorry. Somebody made a mistake." Well, now here it is, there was

a mistake made. The advertisement is available. The advertisement is illegal, improper, has no basis in fact or in law. All I can get out of the Minister is, "Surely nobody is going to complain about it." Well, I am complaining about it and it is going to be complained about in court, and it is going to be complained about when the amount of the compensation for the land is determined, because, rest assured, Mr. Chairman, because of those illegal actions, somebody is going to have to compensate those citizens who are improperly and unlawfully treated.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, may I say this. It was through no action of the Minister or anybody in my department, that an ad appeared in the paper. In fact, this is the first I knew about an ad appearing, and I deal with people in Sudbury day to day; sometimes I see two or three delegations a week. I have never heard this before.

Now, if there are people up there who are disgruntled, and perhaps they are—I am not denying that fact—at least I would have liked to have heard about it, prior to it coming to the House. Evidently, this has been going on for some time.

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: All right, surely there is somebody in Sudbury who had access to people in my department, or to myself, and I have been in Sudbury three times within the last six months. I have never heard of it before. But I want to remind you of this, that conservation authorities are bodies—autonomous bodies—unto themselves; we do not tell them what to do, so surely you are not going to blame that on my department, or me, as Minister, when it happened outside our control and we had nothing to do with it, nor knew anything about it.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is the usual poor excuse that comes forward from Cabinet Ministers whenever they are caught out in error. How much is it—50 or 75 per cent? Seventy-five per cent of the provincial money that goes to this authority, 75 per cent of the money that is collected on behalf of the people of Ontario, goes to carry out these illegal actions. The matter has been enough of a local issue. It has been talked about in the papers sufficiently well, but the Minister sits in a very unfortunate position when he stands up and says, "Nobody bothered to tell me." That is a bunch of nonsense. I am sugesting, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I might say that—

Mr. Singer: All right, will you just wait until I finish and then you can talk. I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that it is the responsibility of this Minister to inquire about what goes on in these conservation authorities; to ascertain whether they are acting legally or illegally; whether they constitute themselves as little dictatorships or not; and when they act obviously in an illegal way. I am not going to do a clipping service for the Minister and send him clippings out of the Sudbury papers, that is not my business, that is his business to be on top of his department. And I think it is high time that the responsible Minister concerned himself about those bodies that get substantial sums of money from his department.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, it is difficult, of course, to express any opinions which the hon. member for Downsview seems to want without having the facts exactly before one. He says, and I do not doubt, that some notice of intention to expropriate was published; he says it says certain things in rather general language.

Mr. Singer: I will give my friend a copy of it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, it would be nice to have it and I have premised my remarks with the fact that I have not got the terms in which the notice was published. Now The Expropriation Procedures Act does provide, as my friend knows, requires, in fact, under section 5, subsection 1, the publication of a notice of expropriation—that is one of the procedures in The Expropriation Procedures Act—and, of course, the purpose of that. The notice is set out, the form is set forth in the schedules to that Act, form 1. That is the first thing, the intention, the purpose, the reasoning behind it. That is to let people know that their land is likely to be expropriated, that some expropriating authority wants it.

Now I would think that the public would be glad; apparently there is a reason for this, not only would the owner of the land have notice that his land is going to be taken and that if he has uses for it, or purposes in mind, that they are going to be modified or frustrated, or set aside by the taking of that land by an expropriating authority.

And I certainly would think that the public, any member of the public thinking of purchasing that land or acquiring it for his purposes, would be glad to know that there is

not much use of buying that particular acreage because if he starts to develop it, that programme is going to be destroyed, taken away from him by expropriation.

So, first of all, I would say that Mr. McRuer, in his report, which I have before me, speaks and recommends a further, more ample notice, with a greater length of time. Then he proposes a further, more ample inquiry than we have in our amendment of last year. I agree with his recommendation, and in our consideration of the legislation, which we have in tow now, I think those recommendations will receive most thorough consideration, and I hope we will be able to accomplish them. But, for the hon. member simply to say that this notice was outside the notice in the Act—

Mr. Singer: Absolutely.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, perhaps it was—

Mr. Singer: By the admission of the authority's solicitor.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps it was. That does not necessarily in my view make it—I was going to say make it illegal. I do not know whether there is a prohibition really against a body saying, "We are proposing to expropriate these lands and we think it might be wise not to make plans to deal with it". I doubt if that is an illegal act. It may be beyond what an expropriating authority should do; perhaps they are wise just to stick with the very strict lettering and wording of the form in the Act.

I am not going to pass an opinion on what the hon. member says is going to be a case before the courts, but I would think that the court, if that action comes before it, will say, "Well, was this done?" First of all, they probably will weigh the intention to avoid people getting into deals which will disappoint them, when the land they buy today is taken away tomorrow, and perhaps the court will weigh whether any damage was suffered by anybody.

I would think that the owner, when he comes to have that land evaluated, assessed, negotiated if necessary, and arbitrated if necessary, will find that the value of the land will not be varied insofar as he is concerned by the fact that it is stated that it is going to be expropriated. The value is either the value at the time the notice is published, or it is the value of the land at the time it is taken, and if the land moves up in value for various reasons or due circumstances, I do not think that value will be diminished by publication of the notice. To my mind it is altogether possible that that owner, when he gets before the final adjudication, it may be the expropriating authority itself, will be satisfied by its decision as to value.

First of all, he may be satisfied by the expropriating authority that such-and-such a value is a reasonable, fair and proper value. If it goes to negotiation and arbitration, I would think that these factors would be taken into account. I cannot at the moment see that the publication of a notice in wider terms than are required by the Act is first of all a wrongful thing. Perhaps it was an unwise thing.

I cannot see, second, that that will necessarily affect the judgment of the expropriating authority in reaching a value, or will affect the court's judgment in determining the final value, whether that owner held it or whether it had been sold three or four times. I think whatever body will adjudicate finally upon this matter will be able to reach an evaluation which will be related to the value of that land either today, tomorrow or when it is finally taken.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am surprised really at the Attorney General, who should be the defender of the rights of the people of Ontario, rather than the partisan politician that he appears to be tonight. I am surprised, I am shocked—and I am also surprised and shocked at his views on the law about real estate. He will remember, and I am convinced in my own mind he was absolutely wrong about the indefeasibility provisions in The Ontario Housing Corporation Act, where we alleged—and in not much confidence, Mr. Chairman, I now can say there are several lawyer members of the Conservative Party who agreed with us in private but did not get up in the House and say it—that we were absolutely correct in saying that once a cloud was put on the title, it was a cloud on the title no matter how much explanation the Attorney General put to it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not disagree with that.

Mr. Singer: Now the same principle applies here. It did when that bill went through the House.

Hon. Wishart: I have never said that a cloud on the title was not a cloud on the title.

Mr. Singer: Well, all right. That was the way the bill was pummelled through the

House and there is no other word for it. Now, the same thing is being done here. Here the Attorney General says it might have been unwise to publish, before an expropriation bylaw was passed or before there was authority to pass a bylaw, a notice in the paper that said—and I say, Mr. Chairman, in keeping with my reputation as a member of this House and as a solicitor, the notice says: "Do not deal with this land because we are going to take it". This is a cloud on the title and it destroys an individual's right to deal with his own land.

And it was done well over a year in advance of the legal authority so to do. And to try and explain how a government body, chaired by a government appointee, a Mr. Caswell, whose politics in Sudbury are well known, can act in this manner so detrimental to the rights of individual citizens who do no know how to fight him until they have to come to Toronto and hire Toronto solicitors because they feel the cards are stacked against them. Mr. Chairman, to try and explain this away and say it is reasonable and it is logical just passes all understanding that I have.

The next battle will be fought at a different level, Mr. Chairman, but I am surprised that the chief law officer of the Crown would say that under the circumstances I have related and subject to checking he wants to see the notice. I will get a copy of the notice for him. I have it—this is a defensible matter. I would think, Mr. Chairman, that emanations of the Crown—and the conservation authorities are emanations of the Crown—should lean over backwards in being fair to individuals who own property and whose property might be taken away from them.

In this case, I suggest it was not only unfair, it was onerous. It was a wielding of superior authority by a government appointed body, apparently in the name of statutory authority. But it was not, and I would think that there should be substantial embarrassment on the government benches when this kind of a fact is brought before this House.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think I might be permitted surely to take from the remarks of the hon. member for Downsview at least those words which he tried to put in my mouth. He gets up and says, "The Attorney General stands up and says it is reasonable and logical". I never used such language in my remaks a few moments ago. I did not say it was reasonable. I did not say it was logical. I did not say it was defensible. I did not say it was not unfair. I did not say it was not onerous. All I said was that it would not necessarily affect the value of the land when it comes to be adjudicated upon.

I think perhaps the court will say, or the arbitration board or the expropriating authorities will say, "You went beyond the provisions of the Act". How serious that may be, I leave to that body to weigh. But I say that they can well determine the value of that land at the date of publication of notice; the value of it today; or the value it might have tomorrow or the day it is taken. I did not say this was a logical thing to do. I did not say it was even defensible. I did not say it was not unfair. It may be onerous but I did not use those words at all.

All I am saying is that there is a purpose and a reason behind the provisions in The Expropriation Procedures Act which generally requires notice of intention to expropriate to be published at the time a plan is filed. The purpose behind that is to warn the public of this purpose; to warn the owner that anything he may do would be frustrated by the taking of that land.

This point I wish firmly to make. I did not say that this was not a cloud on the title. It does, in a sense, constitute a cloud if the language is as my hon. friend said, "do not deal with this land." Those are the words he uses. Then I presume the notice was perhaps couched in a little more legal terms than that, or in definite civil terms. But if it said that it would be a cloud on title and I do not say it was not. All I say is that in weighing the effect of this expropriating authority placing that type of cloud on title, they went beyond what they should have done. But I say the owner can be compensated adequately for that error and I trust that will be done.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept what the Attorney General says at face value; if I put words in his mouth it was done unintentionally. But I think there should be concern in the mind of the Attorney General when it is brought to his attention, or the attention of this Minister, that a conservation authority has acted very improperly; to bring to heel the people who were responsible for this. Granted there may well be a remedy and that remedy will be asserted at the proper time and the proper place but it is unfortunate—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): There may be.

Mr. Singer: It may be asserted, and whether the courts will agree or not it is unfortunate that the individuals who are

affected have to be put into the position of asserting, perhaps to the highest courts of this land, this kind of a claim because they are put in this unfortunate position by the improper actions of an emanation of this government.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I think the general case that the hon. member for Downsview is making is a valid one. I have the impression, as a layman —and I do not want to get into the legal technicalities—that he has perhaps weakened his case by driving it too far in this specific instance.

I suspect that it was not an illegal act. It is just another of these improper acts and whether or not that kind of a notice, being published in the paper, which might well depress the value of the land, is technically a cloud on the title, as a layman I would not say. But the thing that worries me, to come back to the initial thrust of his argument, is that this was the Minister's responsibility.

Here we have a real problem because we set up conservation authorities and they are supposed to be autonomous. The law should be clear enough to guide their acts so that they do not get into trouble as they do. This is what disturbs me about the conservation authorities in the expropriation of land. I think the Minister acknowledges that this is a continuing problem and he has got a revised Expropriation Procedures Act in the mill, which we may not see until the next session.

The thing that disturbs me is the conservation authorities which, I would hope, would be as sensitive to the public interest and to the public reactions as almost any body, because the implementation of their objectives requires public support. And yet, I must say with regard to conservation authorities bodies, for which I have the greatest of admiration and support for their objectives, that there are few bodies that have been more insensitive to the public feelings. So much so, that the government last year came in with something that theoretically I do not agree with, but I voted for it. Namely, the proposition that conservation authorities should have to justify when they want to expropriate by going before a county court judge.

Quite frankly, from what I have seen of county court judges, sometimes their judgment on whether land is needed is not necessarily the right judgment. I do not think they are the appropriate people to come to what is in effect a political decision. But conservation authorities in the instance of the upper Thames conservation authority, the Old Humber Valley conservation authority, have been so incredibly insensitive and have been willing to bulldoze forward in terms of achieving their objectives, to ride roughshod over the rights of individuals, and even the convenience of individuals, that something had to be done.

The government acted a year or so ago. Conceivably after a little time, when the situation settles down, we can revert to what would theoretically be a sounder approach.

But my hope at the moment would be that we will get an Expropriation Procedures Act that would have all of the built-in protections to the little person who is going to have his land expropriated. So that you would not have to be appealing to the Minister, in effect, to encroach upon the autonomy of the conservation authority; that the law and the rules and the procedures would be so clear to the conservation authority that we would get closer to the end of our trouble. So this is only one of an endless series of unfortunate cases which we have had with conservation authorities. My hope would be that it will be cleared up when the Attorney General brings in his new Act.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Welland.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on vote 605. I am pleased to note that while the total estimated expenditures this year for the department have been reduced by some $33 million from last year's budget figures, the funds in this vote have been increased by about $270,000.

All members are aware that the Niagara peninsula is steeped in history and that this fact coupled with the attraction of Niagara Falls makes the area one of Canada's greatest tourist attractions. I suppose that something like 15 million visitors come to this area each year and more and more of them are using the facilities which have been provided by the Niagara peninsula conservation authority.

This authority now controls over 950 square miles, while the land owned by the authority totals roughly 2,000 acres. The population within the authority's area of responsibility numbers about 350,000.

In my own riding, we are fortunate in having the St. Johns conservation area in

Thorold township, consisting of a total of 78 acres. About $20,000 have been spent by the authority since the original purchase of land in 1933. The property, which is virtually unspoiled, embraces practically the whole watershed and contains the source springs of the St. Johns, a tributary of the Twelve Mile Creek. A dam has been built which has created a three-acre pond and this pond is stocked with rainbow trout by The Department of Lands and Forests.

This area, which has been completely fenced, is also a botanist's paradise. This is only one example, Mr. Chairman, of the excellent work which is being carried out by the Niagara peninsula conservation authority.

In fact, apart from the 3,000 acres of superb parkland developed by the Niagara parks commission, the only parks of a regional nature in the counties of Lincoln and Welland are the conservation areas provided by this authority. The municipalities, with one or two exceptions, have, unfortunately, provided little or no recreational space either for the residents or tourists.

In Wainfleet township, the Long Beach conservation area maintains 2,200 feet of excellent sandy beach with camp sites, parking lots, 600 picnic tables, a scout camp area, demonstration woodlot and so on. In the last seven years the number of people using these facilities has increased from 48,000 in 1960 to 99,000 in 1967.

Apart from the Long Beach area, however, public access to the shores of Lake Erie is very, very limited indeed. I know the government is fully aware of this situation and I am hopeful that greater public access will be made available in the future. Ball's Falls is another very picturesque park and picnic area on Twenty Mile Creek above Jordan in Louth township.

During 1967 many thousands more visited this area in addition to about 5,000 area school children who were conducted through the pioneer cabins, grist mill, the lime kiln, nature trails and other features of this beautiful and historic site.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the members of the Niagara peninsula conservation authority and the local authorities for the splendid work they have accomplished to date and to assure them of my continued support.

At the same time, it is quite clear that while great progress has been made to date we are still very short of parkland in the area. This is especially the case when one considers the large numbers of tourists who visit the area each year and the tourist potential of the future years.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, we in the Niagara peninsula are delighted with this government's plans for the preservation and development of the Niagara escarpment and especially with the more recent recommendations for the construction of the 47-mile scenic drive to link Queenston and Hamilton.

I sincerely hope that the government will move as quickly as possible to implement the recommendations of the Mayo commission for the Niagara region. I know that the government will receive the most enthusiastic support from all residents of the area and from the members of the Niagara peninsula conservation authority.

Thank you very much.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to accuse the hon. member for Welland of filibustering, and it is always great to hear his contributions to these debates.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Ask him why he resigned from the Niagara parks commission.

Mr. Nixon: And I thought that perhaps in the course of his remarks, he was going to tell us why he resigned from the Niagara parks commission. But we may have to wait for a further estimate to get that information, until his speech writer gets down to brass tacks on that particular problem. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we could recall to the Minister's mind a comment that was made by the Attorney General, and the member for York South and the member for Downsview about the amendments to the expropriation procedures statute two years ago, which allowed citizens the recourse of the courts to challenge the right of a conservation authority to undertake expropriation procedures.

There was some considerable debate about that two years ago, as I recall, and we on this side had some doubts as to whether a political decision entered into by the responsible Minister should be appealed to the courts. However, the statute was carried, as the Minister is aware, and we have since had the first reference to the courts. I believe that it was Judge McCombs in Hamilton who ruled that even though the Minister has given his approval, and had been reviewed by

the Ontario municipal board, which had given its approval, that the conservation authority in Hamilton had not in fact justified their need for certain lands associated with the project that they wished to undertake.

This, of course, is the first instance were the procedures that were written into the bill two years ago have come before the courts for refusal, and in fact the Minister's decision was overruled. I believe that it is a serious responsibility that the Minister has in reviewing the projects that are put before him by the conservation authorities to look into the matter very carefully and if, in his view, the conservation authority has not properly put the programme before the ratepayers and land holders concerned, that it should be his responsibility so to do.

In this particular case, involving the Hamilton conservation authority, the Minister, I suppose, decided that everything was in order and gave his approval, following the review of the Ontario municipal board. But his honour Judge McCombs did not uphold the Minister's decision.

The Minister says that there were other instances of this. I would like to hear them and to know what procedures the conservation branch of the department is undertaking so that these judicial reversals of the programmes and plans of the conservation authorities are not going to be too numerous. Surely the responsibility for the political decision is the Minister's and it is surprising that more than one of them had been reversed.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, first let me say that the first case which came before the judge was in Kingston, before Judge Campbell, in the Napanee conservation authority. They were upheld in that case.

Mr. Nixon: This was the first case of reversal.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That was the first case, yes. Now again, when a project is conceived by the conservation authority, this is what they would like to do in a particular area, of course. At this time there has been no land purchase, or expropriation—and we go into many areas where we do not have to expropriate. It is very easy to go in and purchase the land.

Then you go into other areas, such as happened in the area that you just spoke about. There were farms there and the farmers were concerned and they were able to prove to the judge that their case and cause was stronger than the conservation authority's.

Now I am not the judge of that. I think that this—

Mr. Nixon: In fact you are the judge. You make the political decision. You automatically give your approval.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Only that we go ahead with the project, providing that everything else is in order. That is the limitation that I have.

Then we must put through the expropriation procedures. If they turn out in favour of the conservation authority, then we proceed. If they do not, then we have to take another look at it and see if we can comply with the wishes of the people in the area and still come up with a project.

I do not make any decision on purchasing any particular land. I make a decision on an overall project that would be good, and I do not know, sitting in my office, if all these people want to sell. I would not have the slightest way of knowing, because nobody has contacted any of the landowners at this time.

Mr. Nixon: Well, the conservation authority felt that they had a case that justified the use of The Expropriation Procedures Act. The Minister gave his approval to the project, which involved the use of The Expropriation Procedures Act, which includes a reference to the judge.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No I do not.

Mr. Nixon: It includes a reference to the judge. Now, Judge McCombs found that the conservation authority had not established a case for the need of the land and yet previously the Minister had given his approval to the conservation authority's need for the land. How do you justify this decision?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I said that we gave approval of the overall project, provided that they could purchase the land. For all I knew they could go out and deal with all these landowners without even going to expropriation.

They did not have to come to me for permission to expropriate. They had to go to the judge first and then, if that is approved, then they come back to us for advanced purposes.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but inherent in decisions made by the conservation authorities is the right given them by their own statute to expropriate land. I feel that the Minister's

decision in this regard is the important political decision. In other words, the representatives of the people, in their exercising their responsible decision, have decided that the programme can proceed.

Now, of course, the Minister has been reversed by Judge McCombs. Is there the option on the part of the Minister or the conservation authority to appeal the judge's decision and, if so, are they considering such an appeal?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It will be the conservation authority's option if they want to appeal his decision. I do not know whether I am to consider it or not.

Mr. Nixon: You have got to be fairly close to it. You provide the funds. You are not sitting in your office all alone. You have some very competent assistants who are advising you at the table now, and they are backed up by a platoon of competent assistants, many of whom, surely, travel out to talk to the conservation authorities from time to time.

I think this Minister's responsibility is very evident—not to dictate decisions, but to give the sort of advice which will lead to successful programmes and the implementation of these programmes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I hope this would be a decision that is made by the autonomous body if they want to appeal a decision. I would hope that nobody in my department is going to go out there and persuade them to appeal or not to appeal.

I do not know whether this is going to happen or not, but I hope it does not. As far as I am concerned, I have not discussed this with anyone in the Hamilton region conservation authority. I read it in the paper. I know it happened; nobody has mentioned to me, outside of hearing of it here or—

Mr. Nixon: It ought to be of passing interest to the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I never. But I am not interested in taking somebody's land, if it is needed worse for some other purpose and this was so ruled by a judge.

Mr. Singer: Oh, Mr. Chairman, we get into the very thing that we complained about when this statute was brought before the House. The government is placed in the anomalous position of having made a political decision and then having it overruled by the courts. The Minister has to be interested in whether or not the courts agree with them.

It is in the wrong place to begin with. We urged upon government at that time that you do not slough off this responsibility on the judges, who are not aware of this from day to day; who have not the independent facilities to investigate; who have not the staffs available to use to go out and see. We said that the ultimate decision should be the Minister's decision—a political decision on which he will rise or fall.

Now the Minister wants the best of both worlds. The conservation authority in their wisdom, or lack of it, says, "We want such and such a plan in the Hamilton area." The Minister's people look at it and say, "That is fine, we put our stamp of approval on it." And somewhere there is a document that has the Minister's signature on it, saying okay.

The Minister cannot surely take shelter under an umbrella by saying, "I am not sure whether we should expropriate the land or negotiate for it." The Minister has said this is a good scheme. The judge has slapped the Minister in the face when he says, no, it is not. Somewhere along the line, Mr. Chairman, surely we must have a government that will stop sloughing its political responsibility on to the courts. That is exactly what this government is doing, and that is exactly what this Minister is doing.

If the judge disagrees with the Minister, either the judge is wrong or he is making a political decision, and the Minister has no right to put him into that position. We are not talking about values. We are talking about wisdom. The Minister's seal of approval is on the wisdom of that decision. The judge says, "The Minister has got holes in his head; I reverse his decision," and the government is placed in the unfortunate position of being overuled by a judicial decision.

The government is in the unfortunate and anomalous position that they were bound to get into when they placed the final authority in the courts rather than in the politicians. The Minister makes decisions from day to day on which he rises or falls in a political sense. He hopes he makes decisions that are politically sound and that the people who he makes them in favour of or against are not going to be antagonized against him and reflect their displeasure at a future election.

But what happens here? We have a conservation authority that makes a decision,

the Minister puts his stamp of approval on it and then he says, "Well, gee whiz, it is not my fault. The judge says it was a bad decision. We cannot help what judges do, we do not want to interfere with the courts."

I say, Mr. Chairman, this is a complete avoidance of political responsibility, and this government continues to play this merry little game that is now beginning to catch up with them. Either they should have the political courage to go ahead, or they should abandon their present position in trying to say: We are a responsible government in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I recognize the Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Downsview seems to have a penchant for what I would call mis-stating, if I may use that term.

Mr. Singer: You may use any term you want and I will not be offended.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I can demonstrate it as well. The decision of the Minister was not reversed by the judge. That is what the hon. member said.

Mr. Singer: The decision, as regards its wisdom, certainly was.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The Minister sees a scheme proposed by a conservation authority, in this case the Hamilton conservation authority. A good scheme, let us say, for a reservoir, a dam, or a recreation area; I do not know what it was. The Minister looks at it and passes a decision that the project designed and proposed by this conservation authority is a good proposition, a good programme, and he says, "I approve—you may go forward with that insofar as my department is concerned; it is approved."

All the judge has to do is to decide if the total area proposed is required or if the conservation authority is in a sense too expansive, perhaps too greedy in taking a certain area. He passes only on the question of necessity of the property to be taken. He is not denying the scheme, he is not overruling the Minister. He is not saying this is not a good conservation programme. He says instead of requiring, let us say, 400 acres for the flooding you only need to go to a certain line and that will be adequate, and he passes on the necessary—

Mr. Nixon: The judge threw out the whole scheme.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps he did, then the whole thing was unnecessary.

Mr. Singer: Well, there is the whole point.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But the judge, I do not think, did throw it all entirely out. I think he only modified the scheme. I do not really accept that he ruled it out entirely as I understand the fact. The judge said: You do not need all this particular land you are looking for in this scheme.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to just say a word further. I cannot debate legislation which is not before the House, but I think I would like to say that I would not argue strongly against the view that the question of the necessity or the desirability of any conservation programme or anything of that nature where an expropriation authority is involved should be decided by the Minister. I would not argue strongly against the view that that is a political decision.

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear! He did before.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is not to say that I am forecasting a view which I will put forward in legislation. I note that Mr. McRuer takes that view, and I think there is merit in the view that he has put forward. So, in these estimates, while we have to debate a situation we find in our statute today, I might say that we do not need to argue too strongly against the view that these decisions on hospitals by the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), perhaps; education perhaps by the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis)—

Mr. Singer: That is what we said when you brought in your bill two years ago.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And I recall saying this, and I was not able to agree with you at that time.

Mr. Singer: Well, maybe we make progress very slowly.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You did not change my views.

Mr. Singer: Somebody did.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No.

Mr. Singer: Mr. McRuer did.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No. You do not get the point.

Mr. Singer: Well I guess not, I am dull.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I say I will not argue too strongly against your views tonight.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if the judge threw out the whole project, as far as I am concerned this is proof that when we bring in the new Expropriation Procedures Act we should review that section which takes it to the county court judge. Because, quite frankly, the judge has no blessed business to be meddling in the basic decision as to whether there should be a conservation authority or a dam.

I think the main problem which I want to illustrate—and I thought in the earlier part of the Attorney General's remarks that he had clarified the comments that I wanted to make—can be seen in the Gordon Pittock dam that was built in Oxford county.

Mr. Singer: Gordon who?

Mr. MacDonald: Gordon Pittock.

Mr. Singer: Oh, yes, I remember that one.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There is a case, if I may interject where too much land was being taken.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let me make my speech.

Mr Singer: That cost you one seat—he is not here any more.

Mr. MacDonald: What I was trying to say is that the Attorney General was almost making my speech for me. My recollection is that the authority changed the boundaries considerably, at least once, if not twice. In other words they just had poor engineering. Whatever the reason, they put on a plan of expropriation and later, having caused all of the uncertainty among the property owners, they then changed it. But, Mr. Chairman, that is only part of the story.

I know of one instance of a farmer whose whole farm was going to be bought, and he went out and bought an alternative farm. Then the authority came back and said, "But we only need half your farm, the half without the buildings, and you can try to survive on the other half." There is another case which still goes on, namely, where they were going to expropriate a whole farm and then decided that they would only take part of it, but each spring the water comes up and floods the land.

The responsibility has been left to that farmer to sue the authority every year to get damages. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is an inexcusable imposition on an individual, that he should have part of his farm expropriated and be left with the responsibility to sue the authority for any damage that might come from flooding each spring on the remainder of his land. It is this kind of situation in which there was poor engineering, or not a clear definition of what land is required.

In my view—since the Minister is contemplating revisions to the bill—this is not a decision which should be made by a county court judge, even the decision as to the amount of land. In the first instance it should be made by the conservation authority, and it should be reviewed thoroughly by the Minister's staff. In other words, it is a political decision, by political bodies, the emanation of the Crown here, the conservation authority, and the Minister's staff. They decide, and they decide with some definitiveness with regard to what land is required, so that you do not make mistakes, so you do not create the kind of inconvenience and unnecessary hardship on the part of the people who are involved.

I would hope that the Minister would so amend his Act that we can get back to a sounder basis. Although I must add that I still am persuaded that reference to county court was necessary, for the time being to cope with the rash of actions by conservation authorities—insensitive actions by conservation authorities, to get protection somewhere. And if we could not get protection in The Conservation Act, we had to get it in the court. I regretted it then, I regret it now.

Mr. Nixon: But you voted for it.

Mr. MacDonald: I know I voted for it; I said that—because it became necessary because of the action of conservation authorities. But I repeat, if the leader of the Opposition is correct that this whole thing was thrown out, then it certainly underlines my regret and I hope that the Minister can come in with a better Act.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that the whole project was not thrown out; there was a large acreage of land bought in a part of this area and perhaps with some revision, there still could be a project proceed there although not on as large a scale as was anticipated when it went before the judge.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I assume that the conservation authority was able to purchase some of the land without resort to expropriation proceedings. And I am glad that the Opposition is united in this regard so that when the changes in The Expropriation Procedures Act come before us sometime in 1968, we will be able to perhaps come up with a better bill than we have. But, my point is this, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has a very strong responsibility, a political responsibility which, for a short time, at least, has been transferred to the courts, but in reading briefly from the clipping that refers to this matter, it says:

> Judge McCombs criticized the authority for failing to inform concerned residents of the detailed plans for the project.

Now, surely that is the Minister's responsibility to see that the authority under his jurisdiction, that gets the funds from the vote that we are asked to approve tonight, or a similar one a year ago, sees that all of these procedures are lived up to the letter. And that the citizens of Ontario who are paying these bills, and who are subject to The Expropriation Procedures Act have all of the rights that are coming to them as far as information pertaining to the decisions taken by the expropriating authority is concerned The judge then said that the authority had not proven the lands were necessary to the project. I cannot see how the Minister could approve a project or a scheme if the authority could not prove that the lands were needed.

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nixon: Now, surely if he is allowing himself to be put in a position of simply rubber-stamping the decisions that are taken by the authority when he is meeting at least 50 per cent of the costs, and 75 per cent of a good number of these projects, then he is shirking his responsibilities. I think it is a serious matter, particularly when he is calling upon us to vote an additional $2.5 million for his operation in the coming year.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think we have gone over this enough times now and I think I have explained my role in it. I said it before, and I say it now that I approve an overall project, certainly I would approve it—

Mr. Nixon: Do you do more than look at it?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I look at a map, and note this would be an ideal project if we could get a dam here. I do not know who owns the property behind it. But then, I am never—

Mr. Nixon: You have more responsibility than that.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: To be an ideal project, this was the place to put it—right there. As far as the cost of building the project—the overall scheme—we would have had a larger lake; we would have had more recreational area. But I went up and looked at it six months ago, after expropriation proceedings had started, and I could see that we were disrupting a couple of farmers. But I did not—

Mr. Nixon: Even though you have given your prior approval?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Just on a project. I never gave, nor do I give, approval to expropriate. This is done by the conservation authority themselves and it is moved ahead from there.

Mr. Nixon: The Act that you administer gives expropriation authority.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, it does not—that is under The Department of the Attorney General.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, you cannot have the chicken coming before the egg.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, which came first, the chicken or the egg?

Mr. Singer: The Minister has a function to perform, and if the Minister looks at plans and he says, "This is fine—if this is a good project, that is going to go ahead". And the Minister can smirk all he wants; the best thing this Minister does is smirk.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I get that from looking at you!

Mr. Singer: The Minister looks at a plan and says "This is a good project, and the lake should be as big as it is represented on these plans." Then the plan should go ahead. The Minister must know; it must have intruded even to his mind, that if he approves of a certain set of plans, that you need as much land as is shown on that plan to let that project get ahead. What the Minister has, in fact, said to us tonight, Mr. Chairman, is that the judge was wrong.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I did not.

Mr. Singer: Now, this places the government in an impossible position; by their own statute it goes to a judge. If the judge reverses the Minister, the Minister stands up and says, "I really had nothing to do with it, because it could have been all right, and we had half the land or two-thirds of the land." It is about time that the Minister began to understand what his function is and I, as a Minister, would resent very much having a political decision, for which I am responsible, being reversed by the courts when I have made it politically, as is my responsibility.

And, if this Minister, unfortunately, has not enough sense to understand the responsibility given to him by the statutes, and he says that the judge can reverse them, and he says there is no insult, there is no interference with his authority, then, Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that this Minister does not understand what his job is.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): I was kind of hoping now that I would have made my bit to say before supper. I was going to develop a good case here but mine now is a very small project compared to what has happened since 8 o'clock. And yet I would like to defend my good friend from Welland who got the biggest hand in this House that I have heard anybody get for a week, regarding some of the projects that the conservation authority of the Niagara peninsula have actually brought into existence.

I know not whether the conservation authority first meets with your people or not, before they buy. But in some cases they have purchased properties and have developed some pretty nice parks. The conservation authority of the Niagara peninsula, headed up by Francis Goldring, the man that I have the greatest respect for—except his politics—other than that, he is a fine man and is doing a good job in that area for many municipalities. The problem that exists in the Niagara peninsula, and that goes along Lake Erie, along the Niagara River to Lake Ontario and almost to Hamilton, so it takes in quite a large area, is that some of the municipalities make their *per capita* contribution and in so doing do not get a little project some place closer to home.

We have heard of many projects by the member for Welland, Mr. Chairman, and quite good, too, but down in the southern part of the county, I have argued for the Black Creek project since I have been here —1959.

Since that time, some of the property was purchased along the Black Creek area so I now find I must have been right or they would not have bought that 100 acres at Stevensville. They are considering a dam in that area to dam up the section of land that used to be dammed up when they originally had a grist mill there, so apparently it has been a natural spot for that type of construction.

Now, I would like to ask of this Minister, since fresh water will not be brought from Lake Erie to that area but it will come as nature provides and then spill over after the lake is filled, are there many of this type of dam in the province that are doing a good job for that area? And I am talking about only where you have the run-off water into a pond or a lake. Do you have some of these in existence in the province and are they doing the job they were meant to do?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, I understand we have several and they are doing a good job.

Mr. Bukator: I am glad the Minister said they are doing a good job because recently you purchased some land, in Lincoln county, where my friend from St. Catharines (Mr. R. M. Johnston) comes from, and the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch). The Niagara peninsula conservation authority, in the quarterly comments for 1968 said:

> Clearing at the Virgil reservoir in Niagara township is now complete. Our men have been working at it most of the winter, the authority is now starting to store water in the reservoir for summer use, for spraying and irrigation.

What I am trying to ask the Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, is if the reservoir and dam are going to do as good a job as others are doing? We are also considering one, at least you have provided the money to buy 100 acres, in Bertie township, and there has been some criticism of that project. I know not whether the Minister received any complaints from Fort Erie, but the deputy reeve of that town has taken a strong stand against the project in Bertie township.

I live closer to that project than people of Fort Erie do, actually. Stevensville is halfway between two points, or not quite. What I am trying to say is that if the influence of one man, the deputy reeve or the reeve of Fort Erie, one Clare Berger, can stop a project of a type that I am talking about—that we have tried to bring into existence since 1959—then I believe the Minister, with his experts, should take a good look at this and not stop the project. I do not think the tail should wag the dog.

I know that the Minister does not want to walk ahead of an authority. He feels that the decision should be made by the conservation authority of that area. And yet I believe that if someone from the department takes a look and believes, as I do, that this dam ought to be built—the land has been purchased—I am sure the money will be there. The Minister's experts should be on the job. I want to put that on the record because I know when one does object to anything, even in this House, whether it be founded on fact or not, the very fact that he objects for some unknown reason, means that he gets the press and sometimes his picture along with his comments. It has a tendency to get some of the people of the area to believe that he could be right.

I do not believe this project, Mr. Chairman, should be stopped. It is a step in the right direction and I would like, again, to say to the Minister and his people that he should take a good look and get that dam started immediately.

Having cleared that one point, I want to speak now of Black Creek at Stevensville, or just beyond to the south of Stevensville, in Bertie township. The 100 acres was purchased, the man moved out of his house, and the dam ought to be built immediately, in my opinion, so that they can get the benefit of it in another season. It has been long coming —since 1959.

The new canal is being built, the Welland ship canal, from Port Colborne to Welland. I have mentioned this before, but I think this is a good place to think of a project to extend this type of thinking into the future. When the canal was moved to the east it cut off a large supply of Lyons Creek at that point, so that water will spill into the canal. I have asked the St. Lawrence seaway authority to take a good look at that, and if they are going to cut the water off at the canal, they ought to provide sufficient water to Lyons Creek, to the village of Chippawa, and into the hydro canal to compensate, or to replace, what they have taken from them.

I know the department must have a direct liaison with Ottawa, and, if they do, I think they should take a good look at this, because I understand—from the legal minds that I have talked to—that there are riparian rights and water cannot be cut off. There are several farms along the way. All that is required is a type of spillway, such as you have at St. Catharines, to spill the water over the dam into the creek and provide fresh water into an area that is stagnant many months of the year. That is my second project.

The third one, and the Minister was there, involves the golf course of 144 acres just above the falls. I know that the conservation authorities may not purchase, but I would like to keep this on the record. This nine-hole golf course, with the lovely piece of land that could be maintained as a park, should be bought by someone, and, if need be, turned over to the parks commission. They need the land for parking, they need it for more parks in that area.

The fourth one you have heard so often that I suppose you have memorized it yourselves. I speak of Erie beach, just above Fort Erie. We have had the department people there, many of the Ministers, too. They felt it was too much money to pay—about $200,000—for 3,300 feet of lakeshore on Lake Erie that used to be an old amusement park. The paths, the sidewalks and the big trees are there yet. This could be made into a fine park. I say to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that I am not thinking of the present generation. We who have a few more years on our shoulders than we care to admit may not get the benefit of this, but our children ought to and their children after them.

These lands could be bought now and bought cheaply. I give this to you for what it is worth. I hope I have better luck with the Erie beach and the old Oaks golf club near the falls than I have in past years. These lands are available to you, and they ought to be purchased while you are considering more parks for the province of Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister want to comment on that? I have one other comment I would like to make.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that we have not heard anything adverse against the Bertie township project. Perhaps, if there is some opposition to it, people might be working with the conservation authority and the opposition is within the area at this point. I think, perhaps, we could check that. We have heard from no one opposing it, rejecting it, or any part of it.

Now, as far as the new Welland canal is concerned, I think there is a tentative plan being shown to government officials at the present time. No decision can be made yet because it is still under development. But I would think as soon as it reaches a point in development, a decision will be made, and there will be some Minister in this government responsible for getting this property

for a park and looking after one of the problems that is of considerable importance to the hon. member.

I doubt if the other two projects would come under the conservation authority. But, nevertheless, the member has put them on *Hansard*. They will be looked at when we talk about parks in that area, and we hear quite a bit about parks in that area. We are concerned about it, not only for the conservation authority, but I happen to sit on the parks integration board and I hear a great deal about parks in your area. In fact, I have been with you at two or three of these places. I am sympathetic and, again, they will come up for consideration, no doubt, at some time and we will know of your views.

Mr. Bukator: Just to complete the project involving the 144 acres that you visited with many of the members of the parks commission and some of the members of the parks integration board.

This property, I realize, may not be purchased by your people. But, I thought that with the knowledge of it you have, the parks commission at that time would have purchased the property. I am sorry Mr. Allan is not here, the chairman of the commission, because I think he feels possibly as I do. I would like his comments. If it can be bought, I know the man who owns the property has maintained it for this purpose.

Many of the cars that jam up the Horseshoe Falls area could park in that area just as they do across the river at Goat Island. They have parking areas and they have people carriers, I guess they call them, such as you have at the Toronto exhibition. You could take the congestion away from Horseshoe Falls and have a large parking area. Regardless of who have ears to hear, I hope they can hear of what I speak, because it ought to be purchased.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, there is one matter of some concern. By coincidence it refers to the Hamilton conservation authority once again—that the Minister must be aware of and perhaps his good offices can be used to improve the situation as it is presently developing.

The Minister's colleague, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme), has a plan to build a large controlled access highway through lands that have been earmarked for conservation purposes west of Hamilton—actually west of Dundas—in the large valley running up from the end of the lake.

These lands are ideally suited to conservation purposes. They are not developed at the present time. They are nothing other than pasture lands and I believe many acres are owned by other than farming interests; they are designed for conservation purposes.

The Hamilton conservation authority is one of the larger, wealthier ones. I believe, in the near future, it would have within its capacity the ability to take over these lands for one of the finest parks in the province, that would serve, in the very near proximity, the large numbers of people living in the Hamilton district. It is considered opinion by those people in the area particularly concerned with conservation matters—I refer particularly to the chairman of the authority, whom the Minister may know, that—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: A Liberal candidate!

Mr. Nixon: Yes, that is right. I expect he will be successful and he will be able to carry the cause of conservation to Ottawa. So the Minister will have at least one friend down there.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It could happen.

Mr. Nixon: I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the encroachment of highways into that particular area would be a serious matter indeed.

I hope that the Minister is in close enough touch with the needs of conservation to take up the cause with the Minister of Highways and, perhaps, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), who happens to be the representative for the area, so that we can see that the lands for conservation are not going to be lost—that their values are not going to be decreased, that they are not going to be divided by a controlled access highway, which I understand, can be relocated a few miles away from it. So that the area is not going to be decreased in value for conservation purposes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, first let me assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that we, on this side of the House, work very closely together and that this matter has been under consideration for some months.

Mr. Nixon: Unfortunately neither of those Ministers are here.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We meet quite often and this has been under discussion.

I understand that there has been a plan submitted to the people in the Hamilton area. I believe there have been some ideas brought forward—that if they moved it in particular areas, we might get to a point where we could keep everyone fairly happy. I think as soon as Highways can come up with another plan—if this is happening and we can get general accord in the area—then we will look at it from the conservation end of it.

But I might say, the chairman of the Hamilton conservation authority at this time is a very busy man. He does not want to come in here and talk to me about this particular problem because he has got a very heavy job on his hands right now.

Mr. Nixon: But you are aware of his views. In a recent speech the chairman of the Grand River conservation authority made the statement that there should be a long-term management study of the water resources in the Grand River valley, in order to have some meaningful control over this thing. He suggested that this be started as soon as possible.

Would the Minister advise us as to whether any plans are under way to get this study going, and if so, when?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes. I understand that there is a study now by H. G. Acres and Company, although they have not reported as yet. There will be a complete study of the area—and Associates, I should say.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Chairman, would the Minister inform the member of what is the municipality share of assessment, of cost, on a *per capita* base, of Metro Toronto conservation authorities, the Upper Thames conservation authority and the Grand River conservation authority.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: To answer this question we would have to get the information, because we do not have it with us.

They are on a sliding scale and each one is different. Of course, as you know, each project would be different as it affects certain municipalities where you are in multiple municipalities. But I would be very happy to get it for the member, if he would like me to.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Chairman, just one brief question. Simcoe county forest; does this come under this vote?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Which?

Mr. Shulman: Simcoe county forest. Is that a part of your—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, that is The Department of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister. In all the municipalities of one conservation authority, the assessment is agreed by the members of the authority and it is the same in each municipality in that area. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, not necessarily.

Mr. Good: Not necessarily.

I would like to make reference to the fact that it would appear that in areas where there is a large population, there is ample money to do a tremendous job in conservation and especially water control. I think this is very relevant in that the need is not related to the money available. In areas where there are large populations, we notice by your book here, that although the area, for instance, of Metropolitan Toronto, has less than four per cent of the total area under conservation authorities, they were able to apply and receive more than half of the money spent by the government on conservation. Whereas other areas relate pretty well equal to the amount of area that they have.

I feel that municipalities should have a better way of raising their money, because, in effect, every programme has to be instigated by the authority. The authority cannot do anything, regardless of the provincial-federal help, unless the municipalities within the authority region can raise the money to start the project.

There must be a better way than that used now, where the authority has to beg and plead and wine and dine the councillors and the trustees of the municipality, in order to get grants for the authority. I notice the select committee on conservation in 1967 recommended that a sliding scale of grants be developed, based on the financial ability of each conservation authority to carry out an effective programme.

Has the Minister any comments to make on this, so that areas where there are larger areas to be dealt with will have sufficient funds made available to them, to deal with them and not the present method where areas of large population and maybe a small rivershed or a small watershed seem to have more money available to them?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the hon. member was here

this afternoon or not, but this matter was thoroughly discussed then.

The ARDA project, the sliding scale that we are introducing January 1 and, of course, as you know now on reservoirs there is a 75-25 split. This has happened in the past two years. It used to be a 50-50 split on large reservoirs, but we moved that two years ago, I believe—three years ago.

We are going to introduce a sliding scale beginning January 1 next year. Of course, we have those authorities where the assessment is very low and which have very little population that might be put forward. If we can get it approved through ARDA, then this could be on a sliding scale up to 90 per cent —90 and 10. That would be 45 per cent provincial, 45 per cent federal and 10 per cent to the authority.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister indicated, just now and previously, that the federal government is involved in the financing at least of some of the projects that are carried out by the conservation authorities.

Is that money in addition to what we are voting here tonight? Or will there be a credit to the consolidated revenue fund to balance a part of the sum that we are voting here tonight?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There will be a credit to the consolidated fund.

Mr. Nixon: Could the Minister tell me approximately what that credit would be? I might say, Mr. Chairman, that if the Minister wants to send this information to me at some other time—but I really believe—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think that it would be approximately $4 million, providing that the projects move ahead as quickly as we anticipated.

Mr. Nixon: Right, I was just going to say that that is not an unduly large amount, but it is important since in this year we are going to be renegotiating, under the chairmanship of the Premier (Mr. Robarts), and with the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) certainly in attendance and taking part in the discussion. We are going to be renegotiating our fiscal agreements with the government of Canada and that it is really quite helpful if, in the various departments, we are able to find from the Minister, as we have from this Minister and others, just what share large or small, the government of Canada has in the responsibilities at the provincial level.

There is a great deal of feeling that we are due for a large scale reapportionment of each responsibilities, and it is useful for us on this side to know where we are at the present.

Vote 605 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if, instead of dealing with vote 606, we could move to vote 608, which is capital expenditures under The Conservation Authorities Act, while I have my people here in front of me?

On vote 608:

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell me if there is any money in that vote for Mountjoy township? There is the problem of flooding along the banks of the Mattagami River, and there has been talk of moving some of the low lying homes to another part of the township. Is any plan underway to do this, or any money in this vote for this purpose?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that there is a project on the east side between Timmins and Tisdale township but there is no project on the Mountjoy, which is the west side of the river. Is that right?

Vote 608 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Vote 611 next, if you please, Mr. Chairman.

On vote 611:

Mr. Nixon: I would like the Minister to explain how this differs from vote 608? Would these votes not come under the conservation authorities branch?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, this is the water management programme which is a small reservoir programme. Some would be within conservation authorities, some are outside of conservation authorities.

Mr. Nixon: Then some of these funds would be spent in those areas which do not have conservation authorities, and would the federal share be channeled through ARDA in this case?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, I am advised that ARDA shares half of the cost of the overall project.

Mr. Nixon: There will be a credit then of $1.5 million in this vote from the federal sources?

Vote 611 agreed to.

On vote 606:

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, it was just last week that we had a general debate on pollution, but there were some things that were mentioned that I would like to expand on in regard to the water pollution. It is just over two years now since the Minister made the announcement in the Legislature that by 1970 industrial water pollution would be under control in the province, and he has now less than two years in which to effect that goal. It is becoming more apparent all the time that he is not going to make it. By his own admission today there are still 300 industries in the province that have not effected any type of pollution control, and there are many hundreds of others who as yet have only installed primary treatments and the secondary treatments are still forthcoming.

Some companies are within the pulp and paper industry, who were the first to receive the government's notice of intention to allow them to continue polluting only for a certain length of time. And in early 1965, I think, the OWRC gave notice to this group of industries that by the end of that year they would have to have provided plans for primary and secondary treatment for the OWRC for approval.

The industry itself requires some assistance in order that they may go ahead with the programmes, but on the other hand the OWRC and the government must stand behind the regulation of the Act. I feel that of late they have been rather slow in pressing charges on the many industries in the province who are still polluting and who have not, in fact, provided any intention that they will install the proper facilities.

Under the timetable provided by the OWRC to the pulp and paper industry, two and a half years have passed since the plans for the facilities should have been at least submitted to the OWRC. About ten days ago in the Legislature the member for Sudbury asked the Minister a question in regard to the Ontario Minnesota Paper of Kenora. I presume that in early 1965 they received the same indication of the OWRC to act under the provisions of the OWRC Act if they did not provide the plans for the primary and secondary treatment. Apparently they did not provide these plans to the OWRC and on January 11 there was a charge laid against this company. Only then did they decide to do something about it. And what they did was to come to the Minister and explain to him that they had now received a consultant's report, even though the company had obviously flouted the law, and had operated illegally, polluting the Winnipeg River for a period of two years since receiving the notice of OWRC intention.

The Minister had the charges withheld. It then took three months for them to provide to the OWRC, on April 15, the programme that they proposed to institute in the next two years. Their plans were two and one half years late, and they were still given a three-month grace period before they finally did provide plans. There are numerous things that arise from this. The first is that if the government does not intend to have the law enforced with unco-operative industries, what respect will industry have for the law, and for that matter what respect will anybody in the province have for the OWRC?

Secondly, what special status does this company have with the Minister that they can exert such influence that a charge that has been laid can be withheld. This company depends on the natural resources of our province and it should be one of the first to be made to live up to the laws as set out by the OWRC. There is a third qualification to this incident and that is, what effect has this had on the staff of the OWRC? They go ahead and give the company every opportunity to provide these plans and were after them continually in the two-year period, and they decide that a charge should be laid. Where does this leave your civil servants, if the Minister turns around and withholds the charge?

Besides this question of enforcement of the regulations under the OWRC, the government must make other provisions for industry, such as the removal of the sales tax at the provincial level and with the co-operation of the federal level; remove the sales tax there so that pollution-control installations may be more easily acquired by them.

Loans to smaller industry on the basis of a reasonable interest rate should be provided for approved installations. Facilities and staff within the OWRC should be expanded to provide more technical and research advice to industry in the complex treatment of industrial waste. Co-operation with the federal government and the other provinces through the conference of resource Ministers to provide uniform regulations to control industrial pollution across Canada should be made so that industry cannot look to certain areas where regulations are lax and use that as an incentive to be drawn into that area.

I also have some comments to make, Mr. Chairman, on municipal pollution control.

Over the past 10 or 11 years since the OWRC came into being, the many municipalities in the province spent millions of dollars to provide sewage-disposal units and plants, usually with the technical advice of the OWRC but usually at the expense of the municipality, whether by debenture issue or on a user basis or under a contract to buy the services from the OWRC. The planning in many municipalities was shortsighted, or technically wrong, and now these same facilities that have been put into service within this past 11 years are not operating properly, or are far overtaxed because of the poor prognosis in growth in certain areas.

Most of the older municipalities face large expenditures in the area of separation of storm and sanitary sewers, since in many of them the storm and sanitary sewers both run into the same treatment plant. Newer areas still require trunk sewers and treatment plants to correct planning mistakes made over the past 20 years. The housing shortage will not be alleviated to any great extent without extensive new provisions of water and sewage treatment facilities.

To correct these problems, and build for the future, the Ontario water resources commission, with funds provided by this government, must give more incentive to municipalities in the form of grants, to go ahead with the required works. The province has not provided any incentive as far as grants are concerned but the federal government has provided grants to municipalities right across our whole province.

I think this goes back to some of the remarks that were made earlier here tonight where the province has indicated, or the Minister seems to have, the idea that things that are not done, we can just push it over to the federal government. And we hear this about every second day in this Legislature. Some 150 municipalities in Ontario have taken advantage of this federal grant to provide trunk sewers and treatment facilities, whereas this government has not accepted its responsibilities in this matter.

I think that in the past six years there have been over 400 loans made to municipalities within our province for a total amount of $156 or $158 million and 25 per cent of that loan has been forgiveable if the project was completed within a certain time limit. Most of the municipalities have had no problems completing within the time limit set by the government.

The second great problem that the municipalities have in providing facilities is the amount of time it takes for a municipality to gain approval from the OWRC and secondly from the Ontario municipal board. Many civic officials across the province have become more than incensed when dealing with the OWRC. The need for establishment of a facility may exist for up to three or four years before actual construction begins because of these administrative problems. The administrative procedures must be brought into this century and technical manpower facilities must be expanded to deal with the problems in an efficient and expeditious manner.

I do not believe there is a member sitting in the Legislature who has not experienced this kind of problem with some municipality in his area. There are many of us who have had to go to the OWRC to try to get their co-operation with the municipality that is providing a facility. If we look through almost any newspaper in the province we see clippings from municipal people who are communicating their frustrations with the OWRC. I had one picked out here that I was going to quote from and the headline said "The Waterloo South Member Critical of OWRC", but since he is not in the chair I will—

Mr. Singer: He is close by.

Mr. Nixon: He needs all the help he can get.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I was sure the Chairman would recognize the remarks so I will quote the last line:

> This has not been done and I cannot defend the OWRC for their lack of communication.

And previous to that it goes on about the problems they had in Hespeler. I think, then, that a new method of dealing with municipal applications through the OWRC must be set up and an increase in the amount of technical staff that is available should be provided so that these projects can go ahead within a reasonable time. I would like to also mention—

Mr. Nixon: Here comes the Chairman, maybe he would like to hear it after all.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Oh, I will send it to him after.

An hon. member: Read it again!

Mr. R. S. Smith: No, I will just send it down to him so it will remind him of what we were discussing. I would like to make some remarks, Mr. Chairman, in regard to

the water supply in the province. Over the past number of years we, in the Opposition, have been urging this government to move forward in the formation of a complete and comprehensive plan for a grid system of water supply that would be set up, similar to Ontario Hydro, to provide water at the wholesale level for distribution by municipalities.

I can remember Mr. Oliver, the former member for Grey South, who proposed this plan to the Minister some three or four years ago, and since that time every year we have brought this to his attention. The ground water levels in the province are diminishing and in many parts of Ontario there is absolutely no hope that it will supply our future needs as it has done in the past, especially in the southwestern area of the province.

We now see the government making surveys across practically all of southwestern Ontario and I think the Minister indicated this afternoon that there are now 13 surveys in the course of study. No proper and necessary overall survey has been taken of the whole area, however, to formulate a comprehensive plan which will service the whole province in an efficient manner. Piecemeal planning will cost more in the long run and provide exorbitant cost to the consumer, with greater discrepancies from one municipality to the other.

The London pipeline took nine years to complete from the time the need was foreseen until it actually became operational. The pipeline to service Talbotville, and presumably St. Thomas, indicates the problems of needed provisions of service to industry. The citizens of St. Thomas, because of the division of cost made by the OWRC were being asked to subsidize industry and certainly they responded in a negative way and the hassle has been going on for over two years. Unless there has been some decision within the last few weeks, I believe that the OWRC and the city of St. Thomas are still at odds and no method has been found by which the OWRC can bring the city to accepting the water from the pipeline.

A new approach must be taken, with regional government as the basis, or at least specific regions being established, for the supply of both water and treatment facilities. Financing must be done by the province and the sale of services to municipalities must be based on an equitable charge across the region, if not a whole section of the province. Present facilities of municipalities should not be completely scrapped but system of credits should be worked out by which provisions can be made to a municipality for the services it can use as well as the service provided by the pipeline. The cost of oversizing of pipelines for future use should be absorbed by the province until that pipeline is used to that full capacity, and then it should be recouped when the volume of the use of the pipeline grows.

The period of payment for the installation should be extended so that the present users are not overcharged because of short term amortization of the debt. Water is a material resource of our province, belonging to all our people, and all are entitled to it at an equitable cost, just as electrical power from Hydro generators is provided. Some consideration should be given to those areas of the province who can supply water in abundance, just as Hydro pays a user charge now in the form of water rentals.

But the direction for such planning can only come from one place, and that is the government through the OWRC. After the experience which the government has had with both the London and St. Thomas pipelines, it should finally realize the need for comprehensive planning on a regional basis, and should finally accept its responsibility to take over as the wholesaler of water in the province over the next two decades.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, first the hon. member referred to a statement I made some time ago, and I would advise him that I have two years to go to 1970. So please do not condemn me yet, because two years is a long time with all the programmes we have underway right now.

He spoke about designing plants, and that some of our plants that we or the OWRC had designed 10, 12 or 14 years ago, were now outdated or too small to take care of the population in some of these areas.

I might say that, I think, is one of the biggest problems that OWRC deal with when they deal with a municipality on a sewage plant or water works to take care of a city, and to build enough oversize that we can at least take care of them for the next ten years. This is a pretty difficult thing to do to sell to a municipality something they do not need today, because it costs money.

And I think perhaps that what holds up many of our projects is the difference of opinion between the engineers of OWRC as to what a certain town or city should have 20 years from today, and what they feel they would like to pay for it at the present time.

Of course, OWRC like to build some oversizing in all their projects, and I think we would all agree that this is a good idea. In fact, if we would think big enough we would perhaps build more oversizing.

In our water pipelines today, where there is oversizing built in, such as the St. Thomas pipeline, as you mentioned, the government does carry it until such time as this oversize is needed in the area.

But we have had a problem—our OWRC has a problem with St. Thomas. I think we have water—lots of water—to give St. Thomas at a price I would think was reasonable. But, for some reason, negotiations have been stalling, moving around from pillar to post, but might say—

Mr. Bullbrook: Could you elaborate on the reasons, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I will not at this time, because we are still negotiating. I do not know myself.

Mr. Singer: I think the mayor of St. Thomas has some views.

Mr. Nixon: A very reasonable man.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, the mayor of St. Thomas may be. If he would only come in and sit down and discuss things on a reasonable basis. I think we could have settled this maybe 18 months ago, and it would not even be a problem.

Mr. Singer: Most reasonable fellow.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I do not know him. Maybe I got in late on the negotiations, but I have had a lot of trouble right there recently—on that one.

But, nevertheless, we have water there and we can solve their problems. It is there. We do not have to worry about them going short of water, although at the present time there are some developers in the area who would like to move ahead with some projects, and there will have to be more water.

Mr. Nixon: That is the blackmail you are employing to make them agree!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, I would not say it is blackmail.

Mr. Nixon: No, I suppose it could be called something else.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You, as the leader of the Opposition, or anyone in Opposition, agree that if we are going to clean up pollution, we have got to have some rigid lines.

Mr. Nixon: You either do it your way, or you cannot build any house.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No. No, that is not it at all. Now, take in my own area, there are many developers' projects that have been held up for three years, just because there are no works in at all. I do not blame OWRC for this, or the municipal board. Now, that is not right.

Mr. Bullbrook: There are no what, please?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There is no water—there are no sewage works in at the present time, and not enough water to take care of the new developments which they would like to build just outside the city of Kingston in some of the smaller townships. I happen to represent that area, and I do not blame the municipal board or the OWRC for holding these projects up until such time as they can be assured that they will not have pollution and they will not have water shortage.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Where are they going to go?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I think we have a proposition now—or this government has—whereby we will build the works in a municipality with 25,000 or less people.

Mr. Nixon: What will the cost be?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We will look at a region. This has happened. Kingston township have put in sewage and water within the last five years, or maybe six years. Nevertheless, they put it in when they had nothing, a few years ago. Pittsburgh township, which is on the other side of Kingston, at the present is looking at a project that we hope will remove that restriction. Then I could go across the province of Ontario.

Mr. R. S. Smith: What took so long?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What took so long? It was because the municipalities wanted no part of this—many of them up until just a few years ago.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Even since two or three years ago?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Not necessarily, if the municipality is serious. And I understand that there is a new routine for keeping municipalities informed of the status of projects. This has just been initiated and is working well. Water sewage applications take about four weeks for OWRC approval. Now, I do not think this is unreasonable. We have got

to go to the OMB after that. That is when the municipalities come in, in good faith. We want to go ahead, and we are ready to go now in about four weeks for approval of a project.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister permit a question on what he is referring to at this time?

I think he is well aware of the fact that what frightens the municipalities off is the high cost that they must impose on their taxpayers. They are in a position where they cannot accept anything other than the third alternative that the OWRC presents, and that is that the OWRC builds the facility, and the users pay for it through their tax bills over, I believe, a 40-year period.

Now, as I understand it, this normally adds something like $200 to a tax bill for sewage, and sometimes as much as $200 to the tax bill for water. If the taxes are already, on a normal dwelling, something like $175 to $200 —you can see that the municipality is very loath to enter into an agreement. That is why I say that the Minister, and his colleagues, in a sense, blackmail these municipalities because they say either add these costs to your own tax responsibilities or we will simply cut off all expansion and you will simply sit there without any approvals for subdivision or even severance.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, Mr. Chairman, again I do not think you would call that blackmail.

Mr. Nixon: Well, it is Hobson's choice.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I know, but if they do not put in these remedial works, what happens to a municipality?

Mr. Nixon: Well, is there not some more equitable way to finance?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, we are financing it and we give up to 40 years. You tell me if there is a more equitable way to finance. I would like to know about it, because the OWRC would like to know about it.

An hon. member: Original cost at 40 years.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Pardon.

Mr. Haggerty: They are paying about three times as much.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, all right, we give you up to 40 years.

Mr. Nixon: Well, I think that there are other proposals, Mr. Chairman. One of them is associated with the cost of amortizing it over that period of time. I do not think that we can neglect the possibility in the near future of paying at least a part of this financing, and it may very well be the interest costs.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Do I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, to answer the question?

Mr. Chairman: You cannot answer it the second time.

An hon. member: They did!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: As I said, before I was interrupted, it would take four weeks for an approval providing everybody was willing to sit down and negotiate.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): How long does it take after that?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: On a project it would take two and a half years from that time to design and construct.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Two and a half years?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Two and a half to three years to design and construct.

Mr. R. S. Smith: This is where the problem is.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not know whether you were ever in the construction business or not, whether you ever designed anything, but you do not do it yesterday when you decide today.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Half the time is wasted between OWRC and the consultants.

An hon. member: And the OMB.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: If you think it is wasted, I think that you lack experience in building. I have had some experience, and you do not take it off the shelf in June and have it in operation in October.

Now, again, I am not sure whether or not I answered all the questions the hon. member for Nipissing posed, but I think I covered most of them. I would say this, that if anyone from the Opposition knows of a better way to finance these projects, we would be very willing to listen to them. We have to clean up pollution. If we are going to allow these developers to build, and all these things to happen, then we might just as well forget about pollution, because this is what would happen.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would comment on my remarks in regards to the charges that were laid against the Ontario Minnesota Paper Company which were withheld?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I answered one of his colleagues on that matter in a question before the Orders today. The answer is in *Hansard*. I have not changed my mind.

Mr. R. S. Smith: All you said was that you did it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I did not. I spelled out quite clearly why I acted in the manner in which I did. This is in a *Hansard* of just a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Was this done in consultation with the OWRC officials, or did you do it yourself?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I consult with all the people that work with me and work for me before I do anything in my department.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell me how many people are now employed in the Ontario water resources commission, other than the operators of the plants?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Seven hundred and fifty-five.

Mr. Pilkey: Another question then.

How many agreements have been worked out with the municipalities in terms of these sewage and water projects? Could you give us a breakdown on the agreements worked out on the sewage and those that have been worked out with water projects?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think I covered the number in my introductory remarks tonight.

Mr. Pilkey: I missed it then.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: This afternoon I should say, not tonight. Now, you wanted a breakdown of the different projects?

Mr. Pilkey: The number of projects. The number of agreements that have been entered into.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think, a year ago, I was able to report that some 125 provincially financed water and sewage projects had been initiated.

As of December 31, 1967, this figure had increased to 184, at an estimated value of $120 million.

Then I could go on with the total overall projects of OWRC where we spent, since its inception, $1¼ billion.

Mr. Pilkey: Is the Minister, through the Ontario water resources commission, insisting that the industrial waste treatment is equivalent to the treatment given to municipal waste? Are we getting on top of that industrial waste? Why I ask the question, it appears to me that we have obvious problems with municipal waste and sewage and we need secondary treatment in that area. But it appears to me that the real problem with pollution comes from industrial waste and the question I would like answered, to the Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, is: Is the industrial waste given the same type of treatment as municipal waste and are we insisting on that?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes. We demand the same standards in treatment of industrial waste. I might say that industrial waste is more difficult to treat because you are dealing with different types of wastes and there are, I would think, researches going on continually to cope with some of the waste, especially from dairies, some of our pulp and paper mills and some of our other industries.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, yesterday a specific problem was handed to me by a municipality in my county and I wish to take this up with the department specifically. For the purposes of clarification on some background, I would like to know from the Minister, what industries specifically were notified that they must put in industrial pollution control measures?

I wish to relate this to a small community whose effluent is treated by a pond with the effluent flowing through the normal sewage system of that municipality. In that municipality is located an industry which contributes substantially to the total amount of effluent in that community. Would such an industry be required, under your orders, to put in their own sewage treatment plant?

The reason I ask this is, if the municipality should not proceed to enlarge this, they cannot grow and yet they have no guarantee

that this industry will remain in the community. Thus, they might be saddled with a tremendous expenditure if they did proceed and the industry moved out.

I just wondered if such an industry would be required to provide facilities of its own?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well that, Mr. Chairman, would be a very difficult question to answer until I knew some more of what the industry was and the area that it was in. Are you talking about a canning industry?

Mr. Paterson: Specifically, yes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I think you and I had better get together and discuss canning industries more, because I have problems down in my area too.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I thought the Minister might be able to explain to us, the lack of action that the water resources commission has undertaken in the Metropolitan Toronto area in relation to supplying sewage facilities and water resources in order to alleviate the housing shortage. I suppose nowhere else in Ontario, is the housing shortage more aggravated than in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

Land costs here are the highest anywhere in North America and the availability of serviced land is probably at the lowest. The substantial reason, Mr. Chairman. It is that the vacant pieces of land in this vicinity just do not have available to them, either water service or sewage service.

The first one, of course, that comes to mind is one that we have talked about in this Legislature for all the years that I have been here, and that was talked about before I came here, and that is the acreage at Malvern.

Now Malvern still stands vacant today, still growing crops of weeds. There is a large acreage within Metropolitan Toronto available for housing. It is government owned in a partnership between the federal government and the provincial government and the only reason it has stood vacant for these 14 or more years is because the municipality, the former township, now the borough of Scarborough, has not had the financial resources to develop it.

One would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that this government, if it was anxious to encourage housing and anxious to make available facilities for people to live at reasonable cost, that, through its arm the Ontario water resources commission, it would have made available services to the Malvern community so that there could be housing built in this area.

There are other areas as well, in Chinguacousy township, which is just beyond the borders of Metropolitan Toronto. The Minister does not know where it is, but there are some of his colleagues—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: But I do know where it is.

Mr. Singer: You do know, well that is good. All right, then let me tell you about—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You do not know everything, you know.

Mr. Singer: Well, that is fine. I will tell you where it is. I will show you on the map or I can take you there. The 10,000 acres, Mr. Chairman, that were assembled there by the successor to Don Mills Development Company Limited were assembled after they completed their very successful development in the Don Mills area and moved on. They were experienced developers.

They were good developers and they moved on to develop in similar style, a similar kind of development which added so much to the Metropolitan Toronto area. But they gave up in disgust and the company that controlled that 10,000 acres has sold its interest and moved on somewhere else and a new company has it. That land, that 10,000 acres, is assembled for housing, it stands idle, and, apparently, it is going to stand idle for the foreseeable future—again because of the inability of anyone to supply water and sewage services to it.

North of Metropolitan Toronto, Mr. Chairman, in the townships of Markham and Vaughan, there is prime land immediately north of Steeles Avenue, prime land just screaming for development, but the municipalities of Vaughan and Markham just are unable to do any developing or to bring services to it because of the financial problem. How high can municipal taxes go?

One would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that a government that prides itself on being in the forefront of everything that is good in the world, would have extended itself to this point—and I am sure my friend, the Minister of Social and Welfare Services, would agree with me about developing Metropolitan Toronto. He and I are two of the very few voices in this legislative chamber who talk

about the glories of Metropolitan Toronto in wanting to be a big and better place.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): And we try to persuade the member's colleagues.

Mr. Singer: Well, all right, we try to persuade. I am hoping that I can bring with me the persuasive power of my friend the Minister of Social and Welfare Services to have some influence on his colleague in this department so that we can get services to these empty acreages and so that Markham and Vaughan can be developed, at least in their southern portions; so that Chinguacousy can be developed where the land assembly scheme has gone on; and so that Malvern would not have had to wait for 14 years.

I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, from the Minister, as to what plans, if any, the Ontario water resources commission has to make services available to these substantial acreages of vacant land to help alleviate the horrendous housing shortage that exists in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

An hon. member: In Ontario!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, first I might say that in the Malvern area, Ontario housing corporation, I understand, were going to develop that area, and at the present time are working out an agreement with Metro Toronto to put in the services. I do not know where the member has been recently because in Chinguacousy township in Peel county, that area out there, a regional agreement was signed some months ago. It is at OMB now for their approval and it will solve all the problems out there. Now, you see, we are moving all the time to help.

Mr. Singer: When can you start building?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: When can you start building? They are building now. You know, if the member would call me once in a while, I would keep him up to date as to what we do.

Mr. Singer: I wish you would tell the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We do not like to brag on this side of the House, it comes out sooner or later. We tell them every four years and that is why we are here and you are over there.

Mr. Singer: You are there by the greatest mistake the people have ever made.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am here anyway and you will never be here. As far as Vaughan and Markham are concerned, if the hon. member would just be quiet for maybe another couple of months perhaps OWRC would make the announcement, or if not I will get in touch with him, so he will not need to worry about that.

Mr. Singer: Why should these things be kept secret?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Nothing is secret, we do not like to brag on this side of the House.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is a pity that with the present shortage of housing we cannot get some concrete statement from the Minister as to why the services are not going to be made available so that land can be developed to alleviate this housing shortage. It is a disgrace!

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make several comments in connection with my impressions of the operation of the Ontario water resources commission.

First I might say that my initial liaison with the commission took place as a result of my practice as a solicitor in October, 1964, at which time a client of mine was dealing with the municipality of the village of Point Edward. They had entered into an agreement with the Ontario water resources commission providing, as I recall, the legislation that the commission became the statutory agent of the municipality in connection with the provision of certain services within the boundaries of the municipality.

Certain officials sitting here tonight with the Minister, Mr. Chairman, have heard this story before, but I shorten this by saying that the bylaw was enacted permitting the extension of certain services to my client's land in October, 1964, if I correctly recall the year, and the services were installed in May, 1966, approximately 18 months afterwards. The point I make is this, that I do say and I say it as respectfully as I can, that there is undue delay at times, notwithstanding the rationalization put forward by the hon. Minister.

One recognizes that in the approach to significant development in areas such as the Sarnia area there has to be engineering feasibility studies and matters of significance and of great consequence and deliberations and negotiations. And, Mr. Chairman, in August, 1966, the Ontario water resources commission in its wisdom put forward to the city of

Sarnia and adjacent municipalities a plan for the provision of water in that area and it did not meet with the approval of the city of Sarnia. The city of Sarnia took the position that it could provide to itself—not only to itself but certain of its neighbours—water more cheaply and more efficiently than could the Ontario water resources commission.

And when I was elected to this office, Mr. Chairman, I felt this that I had a responsibility not only in connection with the area of Sarnia but I felt honestly, sir, that I had super-imposed upon that an obligation to the people of the province of Ontario. And if it was the responsibility of the Ontario water resources commission, as I had read in the maiden speech put forward some five years ago in this House by my predecessor in this office, to provide potable water to the people of Ontario as inexpensively and expeditiously as possible, then I felt that my obligation was to go to the people of the Sarnia area and say you must give up your parochial attitude. You are fortunate geographically; you happen to be on a large body of water and you can provide of necessity water more cheaply, perhaps, than can the Ontario water resources commission to other municipalities contemplated within the scheme of the Ontario water resources commission.

This is the attitude I took, and notwithstanding many meetings that we had, the city of Sarnia felt itself that they could go ahead and make provision to the majority of the area contemplated by the Ontario water resources commission and maintain that degree of the autonomy that they wished. And this is most important, Mr. Chairman, this question of autonomy, because it pervades the entire thesis of government, and that is we keep taking away from the municipalities the right to make decisions at their level within their own constituency and boundary.

This is what they are so afraid of. My client back in October, 1964, was purely a small matter. The reason I brought up the question is that the Ontario water resources commission became the statutory agent of the village of Point Edward and no longer could my client or his solicitor or engineers involved deal with the village of Point Edward, but they must have dealt with the Ontario water resources commission.

I recognize this commission, although it is not in its infancy, is to some degree a relatively new emanation of the Crown and is building purposefully and relatively efficiently, as I see it. But the problem that I do see is this, that we do fail to recognize at times the natural desire for people at the municipal level to retain this degree of autonomy.

Without dwelling too much on this particular problem, I feel there has been extreme delay. It has been a two-way street, in fairness to the OWRC.

The city of Sarnia undertook certain studies. The latest information I have is that, as of April, 1968, the city presented an additional study by their engineers as requested, pursuant to a meeting that we had. But I suggest to you that this is the important kernel of what I am saying. You have a section of the Act that gives your commission power to designate an area. When they designate an area they have the power to take over rather the necessary capital assets of the municipality to provide and integrate with their scheme. I say to you that this decision is a most difficult one to make, but the only thing of consequential issue that I take with the commission is this: They are much too reticent in making a decision. In my opinion, from the dealings that I have had, the OWRC in connection with the city of Sarnia should say one of two things.

They should either say, "Yes, city of Sarnia, we will go along with the final proposal that you made in April, 1968"; or they should say, "No, we feel that it is in the best interest of not only the city of Sarnia, but recognizing our overall obligation, we feel that it is in the best interest of the municipalities that the OWRC scheme be implemented and carried forward. So if we have to, we are going to designate the area."

But I suggest this to you—let us get on with it and designate the area if you have to. I do not want to see you use those powers.

Our city and our very area is grinding to a complete halt because they have no direction, and this is one of the key things. You have the township of Sarnia where you will not get the approval of one plan. The community planning branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs will not approve a plan there now unless services are provided and these cannot be provided until some decision is made in this connection. So I exhort you, Mr. Minister, through the Chairman, that some decision be made in this connection.

I would like to speak for a moment on another thing that has caused me concern. It has come to my attention recently, and it was touched upon by my colleague from Nipissing and this is the question, in southwestern Ontario, of ground water levels.

It seems to me, and I happen to be dealing with an individual problem, Mr. Chairman, at the present time, that investigation of this problem within my layman knowledge of the situation, shows that there are problems in connection with the adequacy of ground water levels in our area, and I am somewhat afraid, Mr. Chairman, that an attitude of concern is not being taken on the part of some of the OWRC officials of the area in this connection.

I do not direct a question to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, but I suggest that we record right here and now that I am concerned in this connection, and perhaps some degree of inspection on your part with respect to this problem.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the last question first. I might say that ground water has been of great concern to this government and all the departments, including the OWRC, that deal with water. I think that if you will look back to three or four years ago, when our ground water and water levels were at their lowest, that is when we introduced the new programmes and increased grants to conservation authorities for reservoirs and water holdings.

We increased grants to farm ponds and started to build a pipeline into London. Since that time there has been a pipeline in St. Thomas in the Ford plant area, so you can see that this government has been concerned over a number of years. I think that we are moving towards the solution in some parts of western Ontario although there are other parts that have to be dealt with as yet.

I was very happy to hear you say, sir, that perhaps, with the powers that OWRC have in their Act, we should hurry these things along. I do not deal with the day-to-day operation of OWRC, and they are very kind gentlemen; they like to deviate and not use the powers that they have in that Act, or at least this is how I found them. In fact, in one other area last fall, I think that I was getting in about the same mood that you are in now, to say that if you cannot reach agreement, well let us use the powers and get this thing finished, but something seemed to happen right at that particular time. I would be very interested to read your speech again in *Hansard*, and I am sure that the representatives both of the commission and OWRC will like copies of that as well.

Mr. Bullbrook: If I might make just one comment, Mr. Chairman. I certainly did not intend to convey, and nothing could be further from my intention, that I look to the commission to exercise these powers. I agree with them that this is the last thing that should be done and the last thing that we want. But we just cannot go on *ad infinitum*, there has to be a decision some time.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I know that the commission is in the process of contract with Willoughby township, or at least they are working out some problem with them regarding water and sewers. Douglas Town, which would be at the very southern portion or southeast Willoughby township, has a registered plan, and I am guessing, of about 600 lots, and not too long ago they would not allow them to build any more.

This is the health unit of Welland county, because of the type of land that is there. It is a heavy clay. So they cannot build any more septic tanks. The water that they get is from Black Creek that I spoke of, and it looks a great deal like coffee most of the year, and they do drink that water most of the year.

I am wondering if your experts are looking at the possibility of extending the water line from the city of Niagara Falls, which presently feeds the village of Chippawa to its new boundary which is butted up against Willoughby township, and also from Niagara Falls to Queenston Heights and from that point, by gravity feed, to a pipeline to Niagara-on-the-Lake.

They are providing water about 18 miles from the city of Niagara Falls, and the pump house or water works plant is in the city of Chippawa, with exceptionally good intake. They have no problems with too much algae, and they have a good deep body of water through which to get their supply. I am wondering if your people have looked at the possibility of extending the water line from the village of Chippawa to Black Creek to Douglas Town, which is about eight miles?

When I was the reeve of the village of Chippawa, we brought a 12-inch pipe across the Welland River to the new boundary of the village, and going to the south, which we thought was large enough at that time to supply water to Willoughby township. We were hoping that we, through the pipeline of the village from Niagara Falls to Douglas Town—in other words what I am saying is that I do not see any reason for the water resources commission to build a second water plant. I think that the city of Niagara Falls could supply the water through its plant

because I think that the pipelines are large enough as they are to continue along the river to Douglas Town.

I think that if they were to take a good look at it, officially the Mayo report indicated that the day will come when Willoughby township, the village of Chippawa, and Niagara Falls will be one. I can see, and you do not need too much imagination to see that this will happen, and I would not think that two water works plants in one city would be necessary. Now, as I said, we have annexed a large portion of Willoughby when I was the reeve in 1955, and in 1957, we had on registered plans to put in a larger water pipe than was necessary for the village as we felt that the day would come when we would supply water up to river to Willoughby to its southern boundaries. I think that the pipes are big enough now.

It was planning for the future and I see no reason, and I would like the Minister's experts to look at the possibility of extending the water line from Chippawa and the Niagara Falls system. I am glad you are all listening to me, especially here. I was hoping that you would let Niagara Falls provide the water through the Chippawa line without building a second plant. The sewage disposal plant at Black Creek is necessary, but not another water plant, I think.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, if I might read a report that I have here on Willoughby township. Consultants have been retained to prepare and design reports for the commission on the entire sewage requirements of the Douglas Town area of the township, and to prepare and design a report on the Ontario water works requirements of the Douglas Town and Schneider parts of the township.

Proposals for the supply of water were presented to the area municipality on a basis of the preliminary report which has been prepared by the consultants for the commission and some delay occurred as a result of the time consumed by the municipality of Fort Erie in dealing with the proposal.

Mr. Bukator: Of Fort Erie.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, the whole area. Receipt of the above mentioned design report is anticipated during September 1968, and subsequent to satisfactory views of the report, a proposal will be prepared for consideration of the township. Now I understand from officials of the OWRC that when this report is received, they will look at the proposition that you have just suggested, perhaps to see if we could work it in before the whole—

Mr. Bukator: I meant to add a little more to what you already know. We thought that a six-inch water pipe at Chippawa would be large enough for the subdivision but we developed a water area and put in a bigger pipe taking it up to that boundary, believing the day would come that we would supply the water to Willoughby. And the pipes are there—two 12-inch pipes across the new bridge by the way. All that it would require possibly would be a bigger pump in the Niagara Falls pumphouse to connect onto our pipe and extend on up into Willoughby.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Chairman, I understand that in 1967, there were eight firms charged with polluting the water and convicted. I wonder if the Minister could give us the names of those firms, the kind of business they are in and inform us if the situations they were convicted for have been cleaned up?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, following are the prosecutions and other litigations in the year 1967 and to date, which have been completed or have been commended and not completed.

Canadian Canneries Limited, St. Catharines, went to trial on January 24, 1967; pleaded not guilty but they were convicted and fined $100.

Canadian Canneries Limited, St. David's, January 25, 1967; pleaded not guilty, convicted, $100 and part costs.

Culverhouse Canning, Culverhouse; pleaded not guilty, convicted, $500 fine.

H. Corby Distillers, county of Hastings, three counts; pleaded guilty on one count, two counts withdrawn, fine $250 and $18 costs.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The farmer on Manitoulin got $500.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Essex County Canners, George Clayton Dresser, joint charge; Essex, pleaded guilty, convicted, $100 and costs jointly.

UEL Butter and Cheese Company of Adolphustown Limited, R. R. Napanee; pleaded guilty, convicted, $200 and costs.

Rothsay Concentrates, county of Wellington; pleaded guilty, convicted, $50 and costs.

Industrial Tankers, Oakville; pleaded not guilty, convicted and fined $300, but the case is appealed.

Essex County Canners, Essex county, three counts; pleaded guilty, convicted, $1,000 and costs.

The Canadian National Railways–

Mr. Nixon: Get the little man.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Canadian National Railways – that is the little man; pleaded guilty, convicted, $1,000 and costs.

Canadian National Railways, July 4; pleaded guilty, convicted, $500 and $91 costs.

S. J. Moore, known as Ontario Well Digging Company, Newmarket; pleaded not guilty, convicted, fined $50 and $9 costs.

East Side Plating and East Side Stamping, Windsor Bumper Company, Windsor; pleaded guilty, convicted, $250 and costs.

R. Dick, Bolton; pleaded guilty, convicted, $10 and $5 costs.

Ontario Minnesota Paper; information laid and the charge was withdrawn.

Tank Truck Transportation, Vaughan township; pleaded not guilty, convicted, $100 and costs.

F. Margena; pleaded not guilty, convicted, $20 and costs.

Parr Brothers, Oldcastle; pleaded not guilty, convicted, $25 and costs.

There are four cases to be heard yet.

Mr. Ferrier: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, but I wonder if you could give us any assurance that the charge that they were convicted under has been cleared up or will this likely persevere. Have you any idea–any comments to make about that?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would imagine they are cleaned up or if not, there will be charges laid again. I think you will notice there was one company there charged twice and convicted both times. I think they are cleaned up by now.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask through you, to the Minister that we have in southwestern Ontario, and I know other parts of the province of Ontario, municipalities such as villages which have made application for sewage systems. Ontario water resources commission made a survey and report. The costs are outrageous. The average householder in that village is unable to afford the costs, which I understand would be at the rate of nearly $200 a year.

Now this village cannot afford building this sewage system. What course is going to be followed by the Ontario water resources commission in cases where municipalities find themselves in these conditions? I know this village. We do know, Mr. Chairman, you are not responsible. You cannot be blamed for the high cost of this sewage and water.

I know there are other towns that have to have water and sewage but to have taxes of $200 a home for 30 years if Ontario water resources commission builds the system, is out of reach. What course is going to be followed in cases where a village or a town is in this condition?

Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us how the cost has increased each year?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that costs have increased, there is no doubt about that. Construction costs, labour, interest, everything builds up now. Now to answer your question what can these people do–that is a very difficult question to answer.

In many areas, I do not know what they are using now, maybe a septic tank and their own water pump, or pumping from a well. Maybe some of them are and some of them are not. But I think if the average householder would figure where he has his own installation, septic tank or pumping his own water, that $200 a year will not scare him. He has had to buy his own equipment. He has had to maintain it and he is a little bit concerned all the time, a septic tank can block up or a pump can stop and it is a little difficult when this happens.

I do not know whether you live under these conditions or not but I do and to me, and the home I live in, if I could get sewage and water for $300 a year I would think it was a bargain in comparison to operating my own unit.

Now in some places the charge would run, depending on the size of the town, from $200 to $400 in those areas where it is very difficult to get the sewers and water in. It could be more expensive.

But to me, if you own a home, and I have talked to many home owners, they tell me if only they can get sewage and water–perhaps they have spent $15,000 to $20,000 in the home and it is no good to them until they do get these services because you cannot live on a polluted yard and you cannot live without water. So most of the people I have talked to, and many of them in the area I represent, if they can get sewage and water

anywhere in the vicinity up to $350 or $400, they are quite satisfied to pay that in order to get that service.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I might say to the Minister that there are many of our citizens in these towns and villages on set incomes and I would expect, in some of these villages, maybe a quarter are on pensions. Their income is limited and the village, they just say, and the experts say, cannot afford the sewage system at $200 on the average outlet.

Sit down?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Town.

Mr. Spence: Oh town; no, not town, I said village.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Welland South has the floor.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, what steps if any have been taken by the Ontario water resources to control pollution of the Great Lakes by the large vessels and foreign ships that use the St. Lawrence waterways and the Great Lakes system. Are there any inspections being made on these vessels at the present time for garbage control and sanitary effluent control such as holding tanks?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we are starting to repeat ourselves again. I think I have answered this question twice in the last ten days, but the Great Lakes is under the IGC and federal jurisdiction. It does not come under the OWRC or the province of Ontario.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I would like to read this letter on the record. It says:

> Dear Mr. Haggerty: I, and a few other citizens of Port Colborne, are very much concerned about our pollution in the Welland ship canal and in Lake Erie. On two occasions last summer I and others noticed a ship called the *Portodac* dump sewage and waste from its sides. On another occasion, I witnessed this same ship dump a large amount of oil into the weir. At the time we were fishing and it was completely ruined because of this. We reported it to the St. Lawrence seaway and were told that we would have to have a large amount of evidence and witnesses to see this.
>
> I, as a citizen, would like to see something done as soon as possible. Another area also which is very much polluted is Port Maitland. It is a great fishing area for Canadians and Americans alike. Why should we ruin our tourism because of this pollution? It must be done now, before it becomes too late. Let us clean up this area — Lake Erie, the Welland Canal, the Welland River and the Grand River. We could pay whatever it will cost through our taxes. Let us put our money to better use, please.
>
> Gary Michael

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that where an individual has actually seen a ship polluting, of course, if they would like to get in touch with the OWRC, or the department, collect, we will immediately go out and inspect. If this is the case, we can lay charges whether it be in the Great Lakes or the Welland Canal, both of which are under the federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps he would get the same run-around as he received from the St. Lawrence seaway. It would be the same thing — you must have more evidence and more witnesses. We know this is going on day after day.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We have no authority to patrol though.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested when the Minister outlined, in reply to the hon. member for Cochrane South, a list of those firms that had been prosecuted and convicted and the results of those various prosecutions. I wonder if the Minister could tell us how many times applications have been made by the Ontario water resources commission to the Supreme Court of Ontario for injunctions to restrain pollution from continuing? I am sure the Minister will remember when a private citizen did this, against the KVP Company, and successfully obtained an injunction from the Supreme Court of Ontario that it seemed wise to the government of the day to bring in a statute reversing the decision of the Supreme Court of Ontario.

But it would seem to me, sir, that if you have continuing offences, the $50 fines, the $100 fines, and even the $1,000 fines are little more than licence fees. If you wanted to stop the pollution effectively, from the sources that you have mentioned, it will be a matter of no great legal difficulty to bring before the Supreme Court of Ontario a lawsuit in which the water resources commission, or the proper enforcement authority, asks for an injunction

restraining the continuance of that offence. That is the way you will stop them if you are really serious about it.

Can the Minister tell us how many lawsuits have been initiated wherein the water resources commission or any other arm of government has asked the Supreme Court of Ontario for injunctions to restrain pollution?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand one. Now the hon. member speaks about $50 and $100 fines. I think, being of a legal mind, he would understand that OWRC have nothing at all to do about assessing the penalty. The courts do that, and if that is the way they see it, I do not think there is anything we can do.

Mr. Singer: No, I quite agree. I am in accord with the Minister. The Minister does not fix the fines, nor does the OWRC, but I am saying the Minister has at his command a weapon which apparently has only been used, or is about to be used, for the first time. The effective way to stop this pollution is to bring an action before the Supreme Court of Ontario. I would suspect, if you have enough evidence to get a conviction in magistrate's court, that you will probably have enough evidence to get the grant of an injunction in the Supreme Court. Then the pollution must stop, or else the offender is in contempt of court, and can then be appropriately punished. That is the way you will stop them. You will not stop them with these minor fines, whether you assess the amount of the fine, or whether the magistrate does. You will stop them if you get injunctions, and I am disappointed that the injunction procedure apparently has only been used once.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 606; the member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, mention was made by the hon. Minister on two occasions that Essex County Canners were fined in varying amounts. I vividly recall the involvement I had concerning this company on behalf of the residents of that area and township in dealing with OWRC. At one point I believe I requested either verbally or in writing that possibly the OWRC should consider padlocking these premises and prohibiting this particular company from continuing in operation. I just wish I had been a little more forceful in this particular instance, when the occurrences occurred late last fall.

I just wonder specifically, in regards to this one operator who is possibly operating under that name or a new corporation name. Will that firm be allowed to again operate this year, possibly putting the growers of tomato products in that area in jeopardy again? Or have these pollution problems been taken care of specifically at that plant? I would appreciate some comment in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that Essex Canners have been sold to another company. Is that right?

Mr. Paterson: Well, specifically, after all the problems down there, and after successfully doing some financial juggling and getting the banks cleared, they had a proposal in bankruptcy that cost the growers in my area and other suppliers $200,000. If we had just prevented this company from going into operation in the fall, when we initiated the action back in May, possibly we would have saved the people this money. I realize that this is not the fault of the OWRC, but I do not want to see this happen again this year. I do not want to see this plant continue in operation, continue polluting one of the major streams in the county, putting these people in jeopardy again.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I take it from the hon. member that he would like to see OWRC investigate prior to this plant operating this year, and that if they are going to operate and have not taken care of the pollution problem, that they be closed regardless of what happens to growers in the area. Do I take that as right now? For my own information. I imagine, if they are going to operate, they no doubt have somebody growing their crops for them at the present time.

Mr. Paterson: Possibly so. But arrangements can be made to dispose of this crop elsewhere, if this plant has no intention of living up to the request of the OWRC to correct this pollution problem. In fact, this fine of $1,000 is simply a licence to steal.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, Mr. Chairman, I doubt if we could give him an answer on that tonight. I think we will have to look into it, to see if they are thinking of operating again this year, and perhaps I could discuss it with the hon. member at that time.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: On the January 24, 1968, information service bulletins, there was mention made that the commission ask for closer controls by oil pipeline firms, and mention that a letter was sent out to the province's

four oil pipeline companies to develop procedures which would prevent the loss of free oil from storage depots, pumping stations, and other facilities. I wonder, in this connection, Mr. Chairman, if this is just a friendly reminder that the OWRC sent out to these four pipeline firms, or is this quite a danger as far as pollution is concerned? Is there quite a few problems concerned here and is there going to be a pollution development, or is this a reminder saying not to get too careless?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I do not know of the particular case that you are talking to, but I imagine that it is the oil pipeline where they are transmitting or reloading, or something of this nature, and people can get careless. Is this the problem? I understand that they had a break in the line in one of these cases, and it spilled into a water course. I can recall the south side of Kingston last year, where the OWRC made them clean, I do not know how much oil off the ice, but evidently they had a spill there. This is something that goes on continually and the OWRC are continually doing surveillance work especially around where these things might happen.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I believe that when the estimates of any department come before this House, this seems to be an open season on the officials rather than the Minister—and sometimes the Minister and the officials. But I have before me a report. There was a meeting in Niagara Falls, New York, on January 16, 1968. I wanted to say that Dr. Vance, Mr. Sharp, and Mr. Haverly among others, were there. I thought that Mr. Haverly handled himself exceptionally well at that time. His brief, of which I have two copies, was very detailed and I think a very factual and honest report. We did tell our story as it is in Canada.

We told it to the international joint commission. Now, our American friends also submitted briefs and reports, and that is why these particular facts were recorded about one week ago in *Hansard*. I am not going to go over them again, but I would like to draw to your attention that the biggest offenders are not the Canadian people, but because of the many industries along the border, they seem to have not done too much to clean up the pollution. And yet, we were told by most of the officials there that within a few years most of it would be cleaned up. The point that I would like to make and I would like someone who knows exactly what can be done to answer: How do we go about it? The international joint commission has also done a good job. I stood before them in 1948 when they were getting these facts. Now, they are all tabulated and the offenders are recorded and we know exactly how much they are polluting the water. These are all facts in reports that the international joint commission and the OWRC also received. They are all on the record.

Now, what I would like to find out from the Minister is how do we go about, in a peaceful way—we are not looking for an argument with anyone—towards getting our American friends to live up to their commitments and clean up the situation that we know exists now? Is there anything? Have you done anything? Are you acquainted with the problems? Are you working the problems out? I would be happy to know what they are. Have you any comments on that issue?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank the hon. member for Niagara Falls for his kind remarks of the officials of OWRC. I might say that it is very seldom that any civil servant or official working for the government gets a kind word once in a while and they do appreciate it. I might say that the only way that we in Ontario could deal with this, the United States, is through the IJC. It is the body with federal representatives from both the United States and Canada that must be the go-between the provinces and the States or Canada and the United States.

Mr. Bukator: Well, just to clean up the situation, we have representation on the commission from the Canadian side appointed by the federal government, and you also have representation on the American side by the federal government.

You also have the American corps of engineers who are usually the ones that do the work on the American side. In the OWRC are the people who do the job here. Now, apparently the IJC keep their thumb on the pulse of this problem, but I am wondering if they have the authority to order them to complete the job? Is that in their terms of reference?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand the IJC can order or bring pressure to bear, and I think that the hon. member recalls three years ago when we had great headlines that they were going to spend

$1 billion in the United States to clean up pollution. I think that it was quite prevalent. If you will look back through *Hansard*, I think that your colleagues at that time were telling us about all the money that the United States was going to spend to clean up, and that we had better get hurrying over here because we were not going to get caught up.

But evidently this did not happen. I understand that pressures can be brought to bear by IJC and perhaps by our federal government, dealing with their federal government, and I think that everybody is concerned about this matter, whether it be on the American side or on the Canadian side.

Mr. Bukator: I am trying here to find fault with the provincial government, and I have a perfect right to do that at this point. New York state provides 85 per cent of the cost of the sewage disposal plant from the federal and state government. It costs any city along the border just 15 per cent to build a disposal plant. We have to bear the brunt of it here, as you know, at the municipal level, so that they not only have the money, they have a larger grant; they do a bigger job of polluting, and they ought to be persuaded by someone to clean that up immediately.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Niagara Falls makes an excellent point when he says what the other jurisdiction that share some of the responsibility for the Great Lakes pollution in Lake Ontario, is doing. I was quite interested in his remarks about the 85 per cent assistance.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand that they all sit around and wait, it does not come very fast.

Mr. Nixon: They are not doing the job. The Minister was somewhat critical of my use of the term "blackmail" in the pressures that he, through the OWRC exerts on municipalities that are not moving fast enough towards providing proper sewage and water facilities. The Minister certainly is aware of the fact that if in the judgment of the OWRC, these facilities are inadequate, then the Minister's colleague in The Department of Municipal Affairs instructs the community planning branch that they will no longer approve any plans for subdivisions in that area.

I would like to ask the Minister two questions in that regard. What is the mechanics through which the decision is made, transferred and accepted by The Department of Municipal Affairs that, in effect, applies this pressure; and secondly, while this is probably a changing figure, can the Minister tell me approximately how many municipalities are on the list which originates with OWRC, and which are not permitted to receive approval for subdivision plans?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would think that when a plan is submitted to the Ontario municipal board, I know that at that time, before they would approve it, they would have to have approval from OWRC, The Department of Health, The Department of Education, The Department of Highways and, of course, any one of these can turn down an application.

Mr. Nixon: Could the Minister find out from his advisors how many municipalities are on the list that OWRC will not approve because of the inadequate water and sewage facilities?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry we cannot give you that tonight, but we can get it for you. It fluctuates as these projects come in, and we have not got it with us. I think that perhaps this was made up some months ago and it has fluctuated a great deal.

Mr. Nixon: Well, I would like that information if the Minister would be able to provide it, or I could ask it on the order paper, because the point was raised by my hon. friend from Kent that quite often the bill amounts to something approaching $300 to $400 a year for both sewage and water facilities. And while the Minister may know a great number of people who are prepared to pay that on top of $180 taxes for the whole property and other services, and this is the level of taxation in many of these municipalities, I am sure he is sympathetic with the feelings of the elected municipal officials who are not prepared to double or triple taxes for 40 years in order to provide a facility that, perhaps, in their view, should be supported to a greater extent by the central government.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is my view, too. You said central government. I agree with that and was thinking about federal government.

Mr. Nixon: Well, you have been passing the buck all night.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Brantford.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, the OWRC did a biological survey of the Grand River and its tributaries, and in it, it listed some of the firms that are polluting or contributing to the pollution of the Grand, and it mentioned that Uniroyal – 1966 – in Elmira, Biltmore Hats, Park Chemicals, Matthews-Wells Limited, Standard Brands Limited, and Guelph are some of the firms contributing or dumping industrial sewage into the Grand. Could the Minister indicate just what measures are being taken, or are going to be taken to eliminate some of this pollution?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say through you to the member that we deal with all industries on the same basis we would the municipality. Not any particular one, but all of them.

I think, regarding most of our industries, I would say all of them perhaps—and municipalities are also known—that we know the problems that they have across Ontario at the present time.

Mr. Makarchuk: Could the Minister indicate, when, in one year, two years time, this could be eliminated?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think it was two years ago that I made a statement when the estimates were up. The OWRC hope that they would either have projects completed or everything in a stage of completion by 1970. Now I do not know whether they are going to make that or not but we are heading towards it.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 606; the member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I have a question in regard to the Ottawa River pollution.

Last fall, prior to the middle of October, the Prime Minister made an announcement that in conjunction with the province of Quebec there would be a survey done of the whole Ottawa River. Could you tell me what the cost is going to be of that survey, and what proportion is being paid by the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: This is the study, I think that perhaps we have made—we have done a lot of our work, or the OWRC have, on the Ontario side, and the Quebec government completed some of their studies, or started, at least. We pay for our portion and I understand that Quebec government will pay for their portion and I understand that the annual cost to Ontario will be approximately $157,000 and to Quebec, $80,000.

Mr. R. S. Smith: For how long?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Three years.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Did the federal government not make an offer to the provinces to pay for a study to be made in the Ottawa River, as a pilot project for—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, I think—and this is a little vague—after the two provinces had agreed to make these studies, I understand that was a verbal offer made by the federal government of up to—what was it, $1 million? —$2 million to complete this study, it was felt by the two provinces they continue with their own study, because much of this work is being done.

Mr. R. S. Smith: This offer was made through the Canadian conference of resources Ministers meeting last spring, and the—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It was never made in writing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Who is the representative now to the Canadian conference of resources Ministers? The governmental Minister who is on that conference?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The hon. Minister behind you.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Previous to that it was the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Why can it never be the resource Minister?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I would think that the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunnelle) is the resource Minister; and Mr. Spooner, I might say, was the Minister of Lands and Forests when he was appointed to that commission.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Primarily though, that conference is dealing now with the pollution problems across the country.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: With all problems.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But this has not been their primary responsibility in the last year or two. Would it not be better to have the Minister responsible for that one? No, you do not think it would be? Perhaps, if you had been the representative you would have realized the federal government had made this offer—and I cannot understand why the province does not take it—for the Ottawa River.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I might say, Mr. Chairman, as far as I know there has been no offer on record made to the OWRC or to the Ontario government.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 606; the member for Windsor West.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, while the storm is still with us and the House has yet to adjourn, I want to raise a problem affecting residents of South Windsor, in the riding which I represent.

Recently they complained to the city administration of lack of adequate maintenance of the open ditch known as the Grand Marais drain—or "Grand Mare's" drain, in the jargon everyone in Windsor uses these days—that the maintenance had not been adequate since the city of Windsor took over this part of the former township of Sandwich West.

I want to ask the Minister if the Ontario water resources commission has yet obtained from its solicitors—as I believe its general manager told me he would—an opinion as to the commission's jurisdiction over the municipalities in the maintenance of these open drainage ditches.

Grand Marais drain is a major run-off ditch and carries off a lot of both residential and industrial sewage into the Detroit River. The residents in that area, in light of the recent heavy rainfall we have had, and again today, are concerned about the health hazards and about the very likely threat of the flooding of their basements. The only answer they have had so far from the city administration is go out and buy a sump pump.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Might I ask, is this area within the city of Windsor?

Mr. Peacock: It is within the city.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: And they told their residents to go out and buy a sump pump?

Is there any raw sewage in this drain?

Mr. Peacock: Yes, I believe there is, Mr. Chairman. I want to know if the commission has jurisdiction over the maintenance.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Has this part recently been annexed by the—

Mr. Peacock: Yes, that is right. It was annexed in January 1, 1966, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand that people from OWRC have been down talking to the city engineer there and trying to do what they can, but I think they are waiting for some advice from the solicitor before they move in on this particular project.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I understand the city does have plans for the construction of proper facilities. But, in the meantime, I am concerned to know if there are enforcible standards that the commission can put before municipalities like Windsor. I hope there are very few of them where such primitive sewage facilities still exist.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, one question. I am wondering if the water resources commission is making any studies regarding the treatment of phenol in industrial waste. This phenol goes right through newly-constructed sewage treatment plants, I understand, without any breakdown or treatment. This, of course, creates pollution in the streams and the result is dead fish miles below such treatment plants. I understand some European countries have had success with the treatment of phenol as it is contained in industrial waste. What progress is being made here?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand that phenols are removed by secondary treatment, and this is being done in the province.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am not going to argue that point, but I wonder if the hon. member would do this—I think it is quite a technical point, you are bringing up now—I wonder if you would speak to somebody in OWRC about this particular matter?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 606. The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): I do not wish to take up the members' time, but just to say I have written to the Minister about drainage problems in Sandwich West along the Malden road, and in what used to be called Roseland as Sandwich South, the drain between Scofield and Ducharme—an open drain.

These are very offensive to the people. I was along the Malden road on Sunday and the stench is unbearable. I just wish to report that we have problems there, and I hope that you will give us some help on that.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I understand there is a letter in the mail from the member now? Good. As soon as we get it, we will take immediate action.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I have in my hand the report of the international joint commission, United States and Canada, on the pollution of Rainy River and Lake-of-the-Woods for February, 1965.

In this report there are some 11 recommendations and I would like to just ask the Minister concerning recommendation No. 4: "That industrial wastes should be utilized, controlled or treated to comply as soon as possible with the Rainy River quality objectives."

It goes on further, but recommendation No. 5 is: "That action should be taken to minimize slime growth in the river by controlling or reducing the discharge of nutrients."

Can the Minister advise me what has been done by the company, the O. & M. Company, both in International Falls and Fort Frances to control the discharge of industrial waste into Rainy River?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am advised that O. & M. at Fort Frances have a good programme; that project will be cleaned up. On the other side of the river, we cannot advise as to what will happen there.

Mr. Nixon: What about nutrients elsewhere?

Mr. T. P. Reid: I would like to raise another question at this time.

I asked the Minister earlier in the session about legislation concerning pleasure craft and the discharge of human excretion into the lakes. I am not so much concerned about the Great Lakes at this point, but the lakes in northwestern Ontario, especially Rainy Lake and Lake-of-the-Woods. Is there any legislation now to prevent pleasure crafts from discharging their human excretion into these lakes?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We introduced legislation but as you know—I think the member was in the House—that we had to lay those over until January of this year. The reason for that is that we have very few places in the province of Ontario which have pumping stations to pump out these holding tanks. Now, just as soon as we can, we intend to meet the manufacturers and people who are interested in boating and see if we can come up with a programme where we have dumping stations that will take care of all our inland lakes before next spring.

Mr. T. P. Reid: In the meantime, do you have any kind of advertising programme to suggest to people who own these kinds of pleasure craft that they should not discharge this kind of human waste into the lakes?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, there was a pamphlet issued by OWRC, and I think it had pretty good coverage across Ontario and many of the states of the United States. At the boat show, they were there.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal tonight and this afternoon concerning pollution of the Great Lakes, but I am concerned specifically tonight with pollution of the lakes of northern and northwestern Ontario. Now, two weekends ago, I had occasion to go on a fly-in trip to northern Ontario and I was appalled at the garbage that was left to pollute the natural lakes that are supposedly hardly touched by human beings in northwestern Ontario.

I was also appalled at the attitude of the people, both Canadian and Americans, to the pollution problem. Now, we have seen what has happened in the last few years because we have neglected this problem or we did not realize it was a problem, and now it has become a great problem the pollution of our lakes and streams.

In northwestern Ontario, this has become a great problem, not only of garbage pollution but also of human excrement, people urinating and defecating into lakes or beside lakes so that it drains into lakes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: How about the animals?

Mr. T. P. Reid: The Minister can shake his head all he likes, but I was up there two weeks ago and I have seen people do this. And this might seem to be a big joke; it was probably a great joke a few years ago when these industrial companies were polluting the water and streams in southern Ontario. But I say to the Minister that this is going to be, in the not too distant future, a large problem in the natural, untouched lakes of northern and northwestern Ontario.

I would like to know what co-operation, what advertising, what policies exist under OWRC to prevent, to impress upon people who are using these facilities in northern Ontario that they should not throw their garbage in the lakes, that they should not pollute the lakes with human excrement and so on and so forth. What, first of all, is the policy of this government, and second, what co-operation exists between OWRC, The

Department of Health, The Department of Tourism, and The Department of Lands and Forests in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, Mr. Chairman, I might say that this problem the hon. member speaks about is a very real problem. How we educate our own people to keep their garbage and many things away from the lakes is a difficult question to answer. I know I have a cottage on a lake and one of my neighbours who has a cottage across the lake four miles away thinks the place for his garbage to go is in the middle of the lake. If it is out of sight it does not bother anyone. Now, how do you tell people? And these people know better.

Mr. Nixon: Get the OWRC after him!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, last year the OWRC did have a programme. I think you saw the billboards, and there were pamphlets out, "Keep Ontario lakes clean".

Mr. Nixon: There is a little calendar.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: And the calendar. A lot of people surely could see this. But I do not know whether it helped when they went out on a fishing trip or not. I think their beer bottles or empty bottles went into the lake or near the lake; their garbage was left over the same way, because they seem to forget for some reason just because the lake is five miles away from the nearest building that it can not be polluted. And this happens. I think it is a matter of education.

Now, as far as enforcement of the law is concerned, I think that would come under Lands and Forests. But I think all departments of this government are quite concerned about this and anything that we can do or anything that the public can do to stop this, the better it will be for all of us.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Chairman, one further question. I asked a question earlier in this session of the Premier concerning the possible pollution of Shebandewan Lake, where the International Nickel Company is going to be processing, or setting up a plant to dig nickel ore out of the ground. I would like to know at this time what regulations the OWRC will impose upon International Nickel to insure that the Lake Shebandewan, in which I have had occasion to fish and camp upon, will not be polluted by their operations?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Is this a new development?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well, within the last few months.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: In any new development, all plans have to be approved by OWRC before they can proceed.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well, I would like to pass on, and this is certainly just hearsay, Mr. Chairman, the fact that it has been said to me by an American engineer, while looking at this operation at Shebandewan said that certainly this would never be allowed in the United States. Now, I say to the Minister that this is pure hearsay. I certainly want confirmation that this very beautiful lake in northwestern Ontario, just outside or within, I believe, the purview of the member for the Lakehead, will not be polluted. Can the Minister give me just some general idea what conditions are imposed upon these mining companies that these lakes will not be polluted?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think we can assure the hon. member that if this is a new installation, he need not worry about pollution from this mining company. Before they start, or any time during the building, they will have to bring it up to OWRC standards and I am sure there are no new installations I have heard of in the province of Ontario that have not done this in the last few years. That is, new plants or new mines that are starting in operation.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Just one last question. It may be a little vague at this point, but how do our regulations in this regard compare with the American regulations? Are ours more stringent; do we require more restrictions than our American counterpart?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think they are both good, but I understand from some of my officials that, perhaps, ours are better.

Mr. Nixon: Would the Minister say ours are the best in the world?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will deal with certain matters on the order paper and then continue the estimates of The Department of Energy and Resources Management, and if time permits proceed with the estimates of The Department of Trade and Development.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:20 o'clock, p.m.

No. 116

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Art Gallery of Ontario, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 4325

Royal Ontario museum, bill respecting, Mr. Davis, first reading 4325

Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welch, first reading 4325

Tabling report, committee on the aims and objectives of education in the schools of Ontario, Mr. Davis 4326

Closing of the Ontario Hospital farm at Portsmouth, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. MacDonald 4328

G. M. Smith Transport Company, questions to Mr. Haskett, Mr. Sargent 4329

New York plan of legal aid, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Sargent 4330

Right of a patient to die superseding right of a physician to further life, question to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Sargent 4330

Possible conflict of interest involving Inco and the town of Copper Cliff, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Martel 4330

Police force used to investigate fatalities at Inco, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Martel 4330

Review of spot zoning regulations as a result of an OMB decision, question to Mr. McKeough, Mr. Breithaupt 4331

Statement by Dr. Glenn Sawyer, question to Mr. Davis, Mr. Shulman 4331

Third readings 4332

Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 4332

Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, second reading 4333

Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, second reading 4333

Fire Departments Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 4333

Police Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 4333

Raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, bill to authorize, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading 4344

Employment Standards Act, bill to amend, reported 4345

Wages Act, bill to amend, reported 4351

Industrial Safety Act, 1964, bill to amend, reported 4351

Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported 4351

Pension Benefits Act, 1965, bill intituled, reported 4351

Income Tax Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported 4352

Financial Administration Act, bill to amend, reported 4353

Department of Revenue, bill to establish, reported 4353

Public Service Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported 4353

Ontario Labour-Management Arbitration Commission Act, 1968, bill intituled, reported 4354

Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett, continued 4354

Recess, 6 o'clock 4362

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2:00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today, again, we have visitors to the House. We welcome students from the G. C. Huston public school, Southampton, in the east gallery. In the west gallery, we have students from Winona Drive senior public school, and also with us we have ladies from the Sharon women's institute in Sharon. Later today the Thessalon senior public school students will be joining us here. We welcome them all here.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ART GALLERY ACT OF ONTARIO, 1966

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Art Gallery Act of Ontario, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, just a very brief explanation. There are two or three very minor amendments. The main amendment is to increase the number of appointees to the board of trustees by two, and these appointees shall be from the city of Toronto.

ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting The Royal Ontario museum.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, just a very brief explanation: I think that among the very significant developments now taking place in our province one is the increasing interest on the part of our people in our cultural and educational organizations. If we are to respond adequately to this interest and meet the needs of our citizens in this regard, it is obvious that we shall require institutions which are alive and vital, and which are governed and directed by people who are conscious of their objectives, and fully devoted to their development.

The Royal Ontario Museum Act, 1968 establishes one of our foremost cultural enterprises as an institution under its own board of trustees. This bill is the result of long and careful discussions involving representatives of the University of Toronto, the museum, and the government.

With this new status, I am confident that the ROM will not only continue the important role that it has fulfilled for many years in this province, but will build upon that strong foundation to attain even greater and newer achievements. The museum has, without question, both benefited and matured in the last two decades and more through its affiliation with the University of Toronto.

It is clear, however, that consistent with the steps taken for similar organizations, the ROM deserves and requires the opportunity for an independent course of action. The Act now presented will provide that opportunity.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Did anybody suggest knocking the "Royal" off?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

THE CORPORATIONS ACT

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of this bill is to make applicable to Ontario incorporated companies the same provisions that Bill 50—An Act to amend The Securities Act, 1966—makes applicable to companies incorporated elsewhere. And in addition, this bill confers on the Ontario securities commission, with respect to insiders of Ontario public companies, the same powers of exemption that the commission now has under The Securities Act, 1966 with respect to insiders of non-Ontario public companies.

The bill also removes the present ceiling of 6 per cent per annum that a co-operative corporation can pay by way of interest on loans made to it by its shareholders or its members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, it is my great pleasure today to announce receipt of the report of the provincial committee on aims and objectives of education in the schools of Ontario. This committee which was established by order-in-council on June 10, 1965, was charged, within the terms of reference set forth in that order-in-council, to inquire into and report upon the means whereby modern education can meet the present and future needs of children and society.

It has now completed its task, and has presented its findings to me in a volume bearing the title "Living and Learning". I am also pleased to receive an abridged French language edition of the report, and a volume containing selected documents relating to the study.

Since I have only just received this report, I am not prepared to provide the detailed reaction that such a comprehensive study invites. However, the very nature of this report invites immediate comment, as I am sure you will agree when you peruse it.

Physically "Living and Learning" is a distinct departure from the traditional style of such documents, assuming many of the characteristics of modern communications media. In this respect, the report is an apt reflection of the modern mood in education.

Of greater significance is the mood of its message. I am pleased to note that this report expresses an overriding concern for equality of educational opportunity for all individuals in Ontario, a concern which, as you know, I have regularly expressed, and a goal toward which we have constantly worked. Needless to say, the insights provided in this regard by "Living and Learning" will be warmly welcomed.

Noteworthy also, is the degree of sensitivity directed toward the needs of children as individual learners in a highly complex society such as ours. This sensitivity is expressed in a recommendation which offers, as a fundamental principle guiding education in Ontario:

> The right of every individual to have equal access to the learning experience best suited to his needs, and the responsibility of every school authority to provide a child-centred learning continuum that invites learning by individual discovery and inquiry.

The report embraces a wide spectrum of education in Ontario, since, in the words of the committee in its concluding statement:

> While we were primarily concerned with curriculum, we concluded early in our operation that a curriculum cannot be formulated in a vacuum. It must exist in an educational system which permits it to function in circumstances of freedom of equality of opportunity for all. We determined, therefore, that the school system as a whole was relevant to the subject of aims and objectives.

In receiving this report and placing it before the people of this province, I wish to commend the members of the committee for their diligence, their vision, and their achievement of a common purpose. I can assure them that this fine result of their work will receive careful study and consideration.

I note with regret the passing of two of their number during deliberations. Sister Stanislaus died while attending a committee conference in 1965. Mr. Max Parnall, the former superintendent of the curriculum section of The Department of Education and departmental representative on the committee, died in April of this year. Mr. Parnall's vision was an early force in the formation of this committee, and his loss is real indeed.

In commending the committee for its work, I wish to pay a special tribute to its chairmanship. We were indeed fortunate in securing the services of Mr. Justice Emmett Hall of the Supreme Court of Canada. Mr. Justice Hall brought broad vision, ability, and experience to this committee, and I am certain that his early service to education in the west, his chairmanship of the recent Royal commission on health services, and his work as a jurist are reflected in the pages of this report.

Mr. Lloyd Dennis was appointed co-chairman to this committee in 1966. Mr. Dennis is well-known throughout this province for his dedication to the cause of children and their education, and I wish to commend him for the contribution he has made to this study.

Arriving as it does at the time of major changes in educational administration, and during a period of widespread concern for human betterment and nobility of individual and cultural purpose, this report will, I hope, be studied widely by all those who, directly or indirectly, have an interest in the destiny of education in Ontario.

To facilitate this examination, I wish to announce the appointment of Mr. Dennis as the interpreter of the report. Responsible directly to the Minister of Education, Mr. Dennis will be available during the coming months to aid those who engage in studies of the document. It is my earnest hope that in this way the recommendations set forth in the report can be assessed. It is also my hope that this assessment will be widespread, and that it will offer guidelines for the possible implementation of proposals emerging from the study.

Mr. Speaker, I am having placed on every member's desk, the copy of the report. I also have available with me, and perhaps the leader of the Opposition and the educational critics opposite will breathe a sigh of relief, this heavier volume which is the research and documentary material, it is not the report itself but I am sure they will want to make this prescribed summer reading in any event.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Shocking display of waste!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I also would like, Mr. Speaker, to say to the members of the House that we are very fortunate in having, I believe, almost the full committee with us on this occasion. They are guests, Mr. Speaker, of yours in the gallery on my right and I wish, on this occasion, to pay a very sincere tribute to this dedicated group of individuals who, in my opinion, have provided a document which will not only stimulate educational discussion but perhaps is one of the best approaches to a total philosophy of education that has been produced in any jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we, as a Legislature, owe these people not only a debt of gratitude but I wish to express to them on behalf, particularly of the young people of this province, our sincere appreciation for the work that they have contributed in the preparation of this report.

I should also like to point out there are some 258 recommendations—

Mr. Sopha: Is that the report?

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is the report.

Mr. Sopha: What is that other book?

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is the document that will be placed in the various libraries. These are the research papers, some of the briefs and so on. So, as I say, perhaps the member for Sudbury will read them this summer—I do not know.

Mr. Sopha: This weekend.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say to the members opposite, who take a very real interest in this, there are some 258 recommendations and I think they will not object too strenuously if I suggest to them that all 258 will not be implemented prior to the debates of The Department of Education at the next session of this Legislature.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, perhaps you would permit me to join the Minister in expressing our appreciation to the members of the commission gathered in your gallery for three years of diligent labours on behalf of education and the citizens of the province of Ontario.

I well remember when the commission was set up three years ago. At one time we felt its terms of reference were expanding about as fast as it was accomplishing its work. But they have now put before us a report which is very attractive, at least, in its binding and we will peruse it with much interest.

The Minister has suggested that the companion papers would be made available and I would suggest that you send my copy to the member for Sudbury and I will have him peruse them on our behalf.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I would add the congratulations of this group. Having only read the abridged edition, I would say it may be one of the most important documents that has ever been tabled in this House in the cause of education. It is an exciting document. It recognizes, perhaps for the first time, that education should be a free and open experience; it allows for all those things which so many of us have been talking about in this Legislature—the free selection of courses, the end of streams and grades, individual timetabling.

Many of these things have already begun in a few of the more experimental schools of the province. But this provides a thrust which, I think, this government will have to deal with over the next number of years. I say it is a revolutionary document.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Over several years—many years.

Mr. Pitman: Yes. May I just close, Mr. Speaker, by suggesting that this will provide a tremendous amount of activity in this department for the next number of years.

A number of these things we have suggested, of course: that special education be taken over; pre-school education and the opportunity for headstart programmes; the whole role of education television as defined in this programme. I think it is a revolutionary document because it brings into question the entire society in which we live; the end of competitiveness; a recognition of freedom and openness in our education system which has to be reflected in our society.

The cost will be staggering, and I hope that the Minister has already begun to look to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) and to the member for London South (Mr. White) for solutions as to how we can implement the 257th recommendation that education can no longer be based on the property tax in this province.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of great public importance. The press this morning carried the story that the University Avenue subway is going to be closed down part time. I would ask how does the government explain the grants of $20 million—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The member must realize from his own experience in this House, that in order to debate a matter of great public importance it must be submitted to the Speaker in the morning of the day, and approved for being placed on the agenda for this day. Therefore, the member is quite out of order, and I would ask that he resume his seat.

Would the leader of the Opposition care to ask the second part of his question to the Minister of Education which was filed yesterday; or is it taken care of by the Minister's statement?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, it might have been significant yesterday, I do not believe it is now.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): My question is to the Minister of Health. When the Ontario Hospital farm at Portsmouth was liquidated, what was done with the pure-bred Holstein herd and the farm machinery?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the Holstein herd will be sold at auction in Kingston on June 27, I believe. The farm machinery has been put to use in other farming operations of the Ontario Hospitals.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce has a number of questions.

Mr. Sargent: My question last Friday to the Attorney General was not answered, Mr. Speaker. He was not here.

Now that the province has launched legislation authorizing the taking over—

Mr. Speaker: May I just point out to the member that in his absence yesterday, the Attorney General read the answers to these questions, and I presume that they will subsequently appear in the printed *Hansard*. Am I correct, Mr. Minister?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Is this on the OPP?

Mr. Sargent: What is the policy? Can he not wait until I get back in the House?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

May I have the floor a minute?

I see that the member for Grey-Bruce is more correct than the Attorney General and Mr. Speaker because the questions are still on my unasked list. They were presumably telephoned to the Minister and he gave his answer yesterday without Mr. Speaker noticing that they were in the unasked list. Therefore, I have no objection if the member wishes now, for the purpose of having it in *Hansard*, to place those questions. The answers, of course, will be in *Hansard* the day before the questions—which is what the Opposition always wish to have. Here we have an absolute example of it, so perhaps the member would care to place his question.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. I have not heard the answer yet, so I would like to hear it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sargent: First, now that the province has launched legislation to authorize taking over and policing municipalities, will the province take steps to amend the legislation to guarantee that officers and police presently in charge of enforcement be protected either by continuity of employment or financially?

And second, what right has the Ontario police commission to despatch police to any municipality over the heads of local authorities?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am not certain whether the hon. member presented the question before or not. I thought he had. If that is so, I read the question yesterday, so it is in *Hansard*. If he read it for the record, I answered the question yesterday. I have the *Hansard* with the answer here, I believe, so that I do not think I shall read the answer to these.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have this clarified. I do not want to take advantage of any hon. member's absence, but I think it is proper, the question having been asked, to present the answer to the House whether the member happens to be here or not.

Mr. Speaker: I think that had been the attitude of the House that the answers were required as quickly as possible and if the member in question was not there, his party whip or someone else would make a note of it for him and he would have it in *Hansard* at a very early date. However, if the House wishes to change that procedure I am sure it is quite in order.

As a matter of fact, the members will remember that the other day the Minister of Trade and Development had some questions and the questioners were absent. He asked if the answer should be given and the spokesman, or someone on the other side of the House, said "let us hear it now" and we had those answers, so I think probably the best way is to have the answers out as quickly as possible.

The member for Grey-Bruce has some further questions.

Mr. Sargent: A question to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management was not answered. Will the government advise why we cannot have a public enquiry into Hydro raising its rates to rural customers by 9.3 per cent?

Mr. Speaker: The member has already asked that question.

Mr. Sargent: He did not answer it last Friday.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): It was answered Friday morning.

Mr. Sargent: A question to the Minister of Transport. Why does the G. M. Smith Transport Company continue to enjoy PCV licences when it has over 40 convictions of law breaking and continues to break the laws as recently as last week?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the matter raised by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce is known to The Department of Transport and appropriate action has been taken. As a result of the record of convictions against G. M. Smith Limited, this licensee was called before the Ontario highway transport board for review.

The review was held on December 20, 1967. As a result of that review, and in keeping with the recommendation of the board, on January 5, 1968, I suspended the public commercial vehicle licence of that firm for a period of 14 days. A few days after the reinstatement of the licence the licensee was again charged with contravention of terms of a special licence he had been issued with conditions for moving an oversize load, and a directive went out that any further special licences to that firm were to be withheld.

The licensee and his lawyer appeared before the registrar of motor vehicles after a few days and it was then explained clearly to him that, if there were further infractions of the law, there would be no further alternative but to suspend that licence entirely.

In view of that record, the operation of that firm is under constant surveillance.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Minister, I understand they are after an "X" licence. Are they going to get it?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Perhaps the member would address the Minister through the chair and ask if he would accept a supplementary question.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, if that application is made to the highway transport board, I am sure the highway transport board will have before it the record of this licensee.

Mr. Sargent: I understand he has a lot of friends in the department.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: A question for the Provincial Secretary. Will the Minister advise if and when the election process will be modernized by electronic voting machines in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I assume that this would be a matter which could be considered by the select committee on election laws when the committee is constituted.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, in your ruling insofar as the Minister answering the question when I was not here, I have the right to ask a supplementary question. Is that right, sir?

Mr. Speaker: Should the member be in the House when the question is answered, I would say yes; but I would not say so if it were the following day. The member can always place another question the following day.

Mr. Sargent: This is to the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker.

Is the government considering a programme in Ontario, similar to that in New York, where legal aid for the poor has been set up in the form of 20 neighbourhood offices, namely, the community action for legal service, and where services are provided for the poor who have trouble with their landlords, their wives, and the welfare department?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, our legal aid plan is far more comprehensive than anything that the state of New York has devised, or has in operation, not only the poor are afforded advice and counsel, but our plan is so devised that persons who are not poor are assisted to the extent that their financial status shall not be impaired to reduce their standard of living. We go far beyond the New York plan.

Mr. Speaker: Order! May I ask the children in the gallery to go out quietly.

Sorry, Mr. Minister, will you please carry on.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our plan is far more comprehensive than the New York plan and assists persons, not only in landlord and tenant cases, as the hon. member says, and their wives—cases between husbands and their wives—but all criminal and all civil matters, including juvenile and family court.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister advise when Ontario will decide that the right of a patient to die, in some cases, supersedes the right of a physician to further life by operations such as heart transplants?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I hope the day never comes when any government of Ontario will have to decide what are "the rights of patients to die, because this right supersedes the right of a physician to further life by operations such as heart transplants".

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Is the Attorney General aware that police cruisers used by the Copper Cliff police force were purchased by Inco and transferred to the town of Copper Cliff? Does the Attorney General approve of this practice; and in the Attorney General's opinion, does this not establish conflict of interest whenever situations concerning Inco have to be investigated by the Copper Cliff police?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would like a chance to investigate the facts on which this question is premised.

I would like to say this, however. My understanding, at the present time, is that Copper Cliff is a company town to the extent that the property, the whole area property, is owned by Inco.

On the question of conflict of interest, it would seem to me that in certain police activities this would not be involved. In the question of fatalities, coroners' inquests, and so on, I think that there perhaps is an area of concern. It is of such concern that we are looking into this, and I will be dealing with that area on the question later.

Mr. Martel: I have another question for the Attorney General.

Is the same force used to investigate fatalities at Inco and act as security guards at Inco? Was the same police force responsible for laying charges against members of local 6500 of the united steelworkers of America, for instance, arising out of the 1966 strike and walkout, after Inco had signed an agreement that there would be no prosecutions, and many months after the incident had taken place?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this question really contains two questions—one pertaining to matters of fatalities, which I referred to a few moments ago and which I am pursuing, and the question of laying charges for what apparently were illegal acts. I would say that Inco and no other person or corporation would have any right to restrain any law enforcement agency and I want to look into that matter also. I would not want to feel that the police enforcement agencies would be restrained if there were unlawful acts. The course of administration of justice should require that they should be followed through properly. I would not expect that anyone should bind the police by an agreement not to take action.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would entertain a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Martel: Would it not be though, that in this case, Inco police are acting as town police when it is convenient but as Inco police when it is convenient—that after Inco signed the contract saying that it will not press charges, the Inco police then assumed the guise of town police to lay charges? There is a real conflict of interest here. This is the whole point that I am trying to get at.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I appreciate the question and the point that the hon. member makes. It is associated with his former question, which I said I was going to look into in order to get the facts correct, and then I will give a proper answer.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs, notice of which has been given. Would the Minister order a review of spot zoning regulations as a result of the decision of the Ontario municipal board respecting the application of CFGM broadcasting to amend the official plan of the town of Mississauga? Is the Minister prepared to recommend uniformity in the planning of the amended area to eliminate the difficulty of developing the area resulting from the municipal board's decision?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member's question indicates, this refers to an amendment to the official plan of the town of Mississauga, initiated under section 14 (3) of The Planning Act by a private party, namely, CFGM Broadcasting Limited, to redesignate 75 acres from an agricultural to an open-space designation in order to permit the erection of 11 towers and a small transmitter building.

In August 1967, an application was made by CFGM to the municipal council to amend the zoning bylaw and the official plan then in effect. Upon receipt, the application was submitted by the council to the planning board for report and recommendation. The amendment applied for was recommended by the planning board but the council rejected the application on February 26, 1968. As is possible under the provisions of The Planning Act in these circumstances, the applicant, CFGM, applied to the Minister of Municipal Affairs to refer the official plan issue to the municipal board and, at the same time, requested the municipal board to consider the amendment of the zoning bylaw.

The Minister, as requested, referred the official plan issue to the Ontario municipal board on March 11, 1968. Following notification of all interested parties, a public hearing was held before the Ontario municipal board on April 16, 1968. The report of the board on the hearing is dated May 22, 1968.

The board order on this matter has not yet been issued. It is apparent from the board report that the board agreed with the applicant that the use of land proposed is appropriate. I have not ordered any review in this matter. There is specific legislation available in The Ontario Municipal Board Act to permit persons not in agreement with the board's order or decision to petition the Lieutenant-Governor in council for a review. It is difficult to be more specific with respect to the question asked in that there are terms used which are not readily clear as to meaning—the terms "spot zoning regulation" and "planning uniformity" are cases in point.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a question for the Minister of University Affairs.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, today was the last day of the tutorials given by the Clerk of the House and on behalf of all the members who took part in these very fine tutorials, I would like to express our thanks for the very fine job which he did.

I have a question of the Minister of University Affairs. Does the Minister agree with the statement by Dr. Glenn Sawyer, secretary of the Ontario medical association, and editor of the *Ontario Medical Review*, that:

> Medical faculties should not have to be on the constant search for funds for teaching. Money should be supplied for that purpose through The Department of University Affairs in sufficient amount to meet the standard of medical education expected by the citizens of this province"?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Minister carries a very strong conviction that all faculties and schools in our provincially-assisted universities should and do receive adequate support for the teaching programmes they offer.

In regard to medicine, as the hon. member knows, it is an extremely expensive area of the university operation. Assistance is provided through the operating grants formula with allowance for all undergraduate and graduate students as well as interns and

residents, as well as through extensive supplementary grants for new or expanded programmes which are under way.

In addition, universities are compensated by the Ontario hospital services commission for administrative services performed by full-time geographic staff in clinical teaching areas to the extent of one half of salary to a maximum of $15,000 for each approved faculty member.

In the light of the changing nature of medical education, as well as the rapid expansion now taking place at all five universities which have medical schools, it has been decided that the whole question of support, including appropriate weights within the operating grants formula should be thoroughly reviewed. Towards this end, a special committee made up of representatives of the committee on university affairs, the Ontario council of health and the council of deans of medicine of Ontario universities has been established to study the question, and to make recommendations prior to the 1969-70 fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 91, An Act to provide for the reduction of municipal taxes on residential property.

Bill 121, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Bill 128, An Act to amend The Training Schools Act, 1965.

Bill 129, The Department of Correctional Service Act, 1968.

THE CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer) moves second reading of Bill 143, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, just a comment and it could very well, I suppose, have been reserved until the House was in committee. But there has been a feeling that Ontario might very well adjust her corporation tax requirements so they are more closely parallel to information required at the federal level, in this way cutting down staff requirements and so on.

As I say, this could have taken the form of a question in committee stage, but it is a principle that I believe the government is attempting to align their taxation machinery with the other administration to cut out costly and needless duplication and to make the payments as simple as possible.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps if there is no other member who wishes to speak to this, the Minister can reply to the leader of the Opposition or make a statement.

The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think on some occasions short statements might well be given on first reading. However, this involves the general principle of the bill and may in general terms explain what the hon. leader of the Opposition has in mind. The major amendments to The Corporations Tax Act proposed in this bill will give effect to those amendments made in 1967 to the federal Income Tax Act which would have application to corporations. This is in accordance with the practice which has been followed for many years, with few exceptions, of keeping the calculations of taxable income for the purpose of our Act on the same basis as the calculation for the federal Act, and is also in accordance with the recommendation of the Ontario committee on taxation.

A number of other amendments are also being proposed. Under our present Act, certain corporations incorporated outside of Canada may own property in Ontario, obtain revenue from it, and pay no tax on the revenue to Ontario. The bill contains provisions that if such corporation owns property in Ontario, it will be deemed to have a permanent establishment in Ontario and thus be subject to all the taxing provisions of The Corporations Tax Act.

In line with the recommendation contained in the Ontario committee on taxation report, the interest payable by a corporation on overdue accounts has been set at a uniform rate of 9 per cent per annum. I should point out that under the present Act, the 9 per cent rate is applicable on accounts which are overdue for a two-month period. The current rate of interest is 6 per cent on the unpaid tax for the first two months and 9 per cent thereafter. In other words, this amendment will make it 9 per cent all the way.

In addition, we propose to increase the credit interest payable to a corporation on overpaid accounts from 3 per cent to 4 per

cent. If a corporation files a notice of objection to an assessment, and the Treasurer reassesses to allow the objection, credit interest on any resulting overpayment in those circumstances will be increased from 6 per cent to 7 per cent.

One further amendment was necessary and that results from the transfer of the administration of this Act to The Department of Revenue.

Motion agreed to, second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 144, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves second reading of Bill 145, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill 146, An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE POLICE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill 147, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): This Act contains a number of amendments that are not, by any means, related to any common theme. On the one hand, there are a number of them that bring the collective bargaining process in respect of policemen in line with the procedure to be found in other parts, or in the industrial community. One gets the impression, of course, that the evolution in regard to policemen has been very slow as indeed it has been very grudging on the part of the government.

The government has made concessions, I say, in a very grudging fashion, to recognize these people, sir, who cannot resort to the ultimate weapon of strike to obtain their desired ends. The government has been reluctant to accord them even the rudimentary things that are found in other labour relations and whereas it makes some progress, it does not go whole hog by any means and indeed, imports some undesirable features from other parts of the world of labour relations. I refer to that section that provides for compulsory arbitration of grievances.

I have said many times in this House, I hope within hearing of the Attorney General—in fact, I said it during The Department of Labour estimates—that the system leaves a great deal to be desired. Frequently, in matters of grievance, conditions of employment, hours of work, safety conditions, the contracts between the parties require a legal interpretation, and for all I know that may be more the case with police contracts than it is with some other type.

This much abused section, copied, I suppose, from The Labour Relations Act, is only capable of having afforded to it a legal interpretation by the use of one of the prerogative writs. If The Department of the Attorney General, which is responsible for this Act, is not more aware than any other sector how cumbersome and difficult the use of the prerogative writs are in obtaining the interpretation or of phraseology or obtaining compulsion of performance, then one cannot hope that any other part of the government will be aware of that.

But I ask you to observe that section which now becomes section 32, and the only way that any appeal from a board of arbitration can ever be got to the courts, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is by way of the writ of *certiorari*. It is quite a comment upon a society in 1968, in the enlightened age, the age of student revolt and the age of ultimate understanding, since we all have the facts before us and can form judgments and opinions, that The Department of the Attorney General of Ontario is still relying on legal processes that began their development in the age of the first Henry. And The Department of the Attorney General, to put it conversely, does not show any progressive attitude to reform of the law.

In respect of that I merely sum up what I have said by suggesting to the Attorney General that between now and the final passage of this bill, he might consider the addition of a subsection there which would say that in matters of law—at least, matters of law that arise from arbitration proceedings—there might be an appeal to the courts. Indeed, there might be an appeal to that separate bench of three judges that Mr. McRuer has suggested in his report.

Who knows, but it might not come into being. Would that The Department of Labour would finally some day—oh, they will some day, because there is a lag of about three or four or five years in things around here. But some day, The Department of Labour may realize that this is a totally unsatisfacory procedure.

As I have said on many occasions in the past, and it bears repeating, if you, Mr. Speaker, suffer $80 damage to your fender outside the Royal York hotel and there are 36 witnesses, 18 for you and 18 for the fender malefactor, then you can occupy the time of a division court judge for three days to determine whether you are going to pay your own loss or you get the other person to pay the $80.

But if you are interpreting a collective bargaining agreement and the decision affects the pay of 14,000 people in the bargaining unit—it might run into some hundreds of thousands of dollars—then you cannot get to a court. You cannot occupy the time of a single judge, let alone get to the court of appeal on it. The reason is in that section which has been borrowed from The Labour Relations Act and shows no denotation whatsover of a progressive attitude directed towards a more rational handling of matters of this nature.

So, as a matter of principle, I say I am very disappointed that The Department of the Attorney General, of all departments, did not make some change. If they are going to borrow from The Department of Labour in matters of law, one might expect them to improve upon The Department of Labour.

When one looks at section 1 as a matter of principle, and this is of major importance to our party, one is reminded of the strident, if somewhat crude, attitude of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) a few weeks ago when he introduced a piece of legislation and ascribed its genesis to the member who, I think, comes from Halton East (Mr. Snow).

We on this side would be entitled to say, in looking at section 1, that we see some recognition of—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I know my friend would want to be completely accurate; it was not legislation, it was a statement before the orders of the day.

Mr. Sopha: All right; fine! I am glad to be corrected.

All other aspects of my statement were correct, I assume.

We are entitled in respect of section 1 to remind you, Mr. Speaker, and anyone else within hearing, that the diminution if not the abolition of small police forces in this province is long overdue. And very many people reputable in the field of expert knowledge in the matter have said that a police force of under ten persons is unjustified in its experience.

For many years I have advocated from whatever place I have occupied in the House that the provincial police should replace the smaller municipal forces. In fact, I am willing to say that I would go so far as to hold as a matter of logic and a matter of practicality and efficiency that only the major cities in the province—that is, cities of upwards of 25,000 people or so—ought to have a municipal force. And the activities—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): You are speaking for yourself.

Mr. Sopha: All right, that is fine. I am the member for Sudbury here. The activities of the provincial police in that regard ought to replace those smaller forces.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Just listen to what I have to say and be better informed.

Mr. Sargent: He has been reading those books again.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: To impress the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), Mr. Speaker, one reason is that crime detection has become such a matter of science, with the use of all kinds of gadgetry and the employment of experts and trained personnel, that only the provincial police relying upon those devices and the skills which they develop are capable of giving the optimum type of police protection.

How many times one has seen that in the investigation of some of the higher or, if you like, the lower forms of crime; those types of crime that need a scientific approach.

I am willing to say, in that regard, that I have had opportunity to compare the efficiency of the two types of force, and I can say without reservation, in this area as in many others, the skills of the Ontario Provincial Police far exceed the skills that you see demonstrated by municipal police forces. I would qualify that by saying that I know nothing whatsoever of the skills of such police forces as the large ones in Metro Toronto and perhaps some of the bigger cities—London, Hamilton and Ottawa. It may well be that they are very competent. But I have seen them at the local level, and really it is as basic as this, Mr. Speaker, that when crime is discovered that requires any kind of a scientific approach to it at all, the local forces are just not equipped to handle it.

Rather than wait for a request to go forward to the provincial police, I have advocated here that there ought to be some initiative exercised by the provincial police itself to move into the area, in order that the detection of the offenders may be facilitated. Mr. Speaker, you and I know very well that in the detection of crime it is very much so that time is of the essence. The police forces must move very quickly.

It is worthwhile to repeat that—as I have said many times in this House, and cannot be said too often—that we indeed are very fortunate to have the excellent force that comprises the Ontario Provincial Police. Not only because of the attitude of the personnel. One is impressed by the training, the dedication to their task, the eagerness with which they perform it and, not the least, the courtesy which they dispel to all who come within their ambit. As a citizen of this province, I can say without reservation, that I would feel very well indeed if the ambit of responsibility of the Ontario Provincial Police were widened throughout the whole of the province, subject only to the responsibility remaining with larger cities.

I can appreciate, and perhaps the Attorney General would agree with me, that were they to take over the policing of the larger cities that force would, perhaps, become so large that it would be, to all intents and purposes, completely unwieldy. But I ask you to remember this, Mr. Speaker, that there are broad expanses in far reaches of this province where you encounter police forces of one or two people *a priori*, by observing the situation. You can form the conclusion, with a minimum of knowledge about how these things work, that the citizenry would be far better protected and more efficiently served and the law would be paid greater respect, if the provincial police had the responsibility of policing such areas. Particularly is that true in northern Ontario. I conclude my remarks by saying that I look forward to the day when these small forces will ultimately disappear.

I recall, and I want to remind the Attorney General, that two or three years ago, we were discussing this matter in this House. It came to our attention that in the area down around on the way to my friend from Niagara Falls riding there, county of Lincoln—I forget the name of the place, around Vineland or somewhere—there is a little community, Jordan. Within an area of 10 miles six different police forces had responsibility, which, of course, is a situation which is totally unjustified and cannot help but lead to not only conflict between them, but of wasted effort, and a consequent loss of efficiency.

So section 1 (b) as it stands, Mr. Speaker, and if the Minister of Municipal Affairs will permit, is a move in the right direction and consistent with the stands that my friend from Downsview and I have taken in this House over many years. I merely wish to say to the Attorney General, through you, that I hope that in future years it will go forward, so that we obtain the optimum of police protection by according to the Ontario Provincial Police, with their best resources of skills and knowledge, the responsibility of policing most of this province.

Now no doubt, having made those arguments, which I commend to the House, and to you, Mr. Speaker, for their logic and rationality, and opening them up to argument and, beyond question, if my friend from Grey-Bruce has anything to say to confute the propositions that I have made in support of that standard principle, the House will accord him the same patience and listening that it has accorded me.

Mr. Sargent: It seems our whole lives and everything we do, insofar as law, is controlled by lawyers and those versed in the law. I think that, somewhere along the line, some of us who are not so smart—who are not knowledgeable of these day to day dealings with the police forces and with the courts—that we sometimes wonder what the future holds for us. This bill, Mr. Speaker—on this first section here, insofar as the taking over of local forces—I would like to say for

my part, Mr. Speaker, that some day, maybe not in our time—we will look back and think that individual police forces controlled and run by the autonomy would have been the true democracy. We have the possibility of a police state being set up by whoever is in control at Queen's Park; it could happen.

I suggest that in your thinking, somewhere along the line, that we have in charge of the police commission not appointed people, but elected people. That is not now the case. We have the supreme force at the top. The police commission is controlled by appointed people, so we have all the makings of a police state and just further down the line here of Queen's Park controlling police administration all across the province. As my friend from Sudbury says, only the bigger cities would have their own police forces.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): How about the RCMP in Ottawa?

Mr. Sargent: That is another league, I am not very knowledgeable about that either.

I have the right to question and I think it is time that someone looked out for law enforcement on behalf of the people in municipalities. Where we have direction coming from one source, a set of laws set out by those in high places, controlling the lives of our people, it is something to think about. I just lay that word of caution—that we temper this by putting safety at the top, by putting in control at OPP commission level, at the top here, elected people who can be responsible to the people of this province and not to the machine in Queen's Park.

Saying that, I would like to tell the Minister again: in the event that the bill might pass here—it looks like it will—we are going to have the taking over of police forces in smaller municipalities where they need help. But it goes one step further than that, Mr. Speaker. It says that the police commission has the right to despatch police to any municipality over the heads of local authorities—it does not say that in this section, but somewhere in the bill it says that. I would like to know, in the event of your taking over a force, Mr. Minister, are you going to protect the people to continue their pay or give them continuity of employment?

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak? The member for Humber.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): I have always had nothing but the greatest respect for the Attorney General of this province, but I am afraid here that my faith in him has been a little shattered by the fact that I think he has been guilty of a breach of faith in an undertaking he made to the senior officers association of the police force of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. For many years the officers of this association have been after him to amend this Act in order to permit them to set up a separate bargaining unit. At the present time, the police association bargains for all of the police department, I think, with the exception of the chief and deputy chief.

Eighteen senior officers resigned from the bargaining unit to try to force the hands of this government. Four years ago this government promised the senior officers of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto that they would give consideration to their request.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Did the hon. member say four years ago?

Mr. Ben: I understand it was four years ago. If the Attorney General will correct me I will stand corrected. He was the one—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I was just asking for information.

Mr. Ben: At any rate, the senior officers have been in conversation and discussion of this matter with the Attorney General. Representation was made to them that the Attorney General acquiesced in their request and it would only stand to reason that he would.

As section 4—and I am not trying to deal specifically with section 4 here, but only on its principle—reads: "anybody except the police chief, or any deputy chief of police, are in a bargaining unit."

We find among the police themselves, in this particular instance in the city of Toronto, that the person who does the bargaining is a first class constable. He is bargaining to determine what salary, and what other benefits, are going to flow to people like staff superintendents, inspectors, staff inspectors, and also the sergeants. Now, I do not think that is fair in this day and age. You talk about representation. Everybody is entitled to be represented by a union of his choice. Here you have actually thrown management in with the employees. It is like the bargaining unit determining what salary is going to be paid to the vice-president of a company.

I think that is grossly unfair, and I say again that the Minister has been in breach of an undertaking that the police felt they had received from him. A draft that they had

seen—the information given me today, Mr. Speaker, was the original draft that was shown to the senior officers association, and prepared by the Attorney General—contained a clause that set up the senior officers as a separate bargaining unit. Now, I saw the Attorney General shake his head. Perhaps he can give answers to that.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further member who wishes to speak before the Attorney General closes the debate? The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I might deal with the questions raised by the hon. members in reverse order.

The hon. member for Humber used the words that the Attorney General, he thought, was guilty of a breach of faith. I am not going to take that with any umbrage, but I certainly would deny it immediately. There has been no undertaking of any sort, such as he mentioned given—that the legislation contained in this bill would have any provision for the establishment of a separate association to include senior police officers associated with any force.

I well recall the bill four years ago which was then before the House, and which I had the privilege of conducting through the Legislature. It had no reference to this matter whatsoever. I did not have the opportunity to consider the discussions on the provisions contained in that bill. Three years ago there was no such provision suggested. I think there were discussions of this move that had been put forward by certain of may I say the larger police forces, particularly in Metropolitan Toronto, Hamilton, and some others. I think it was discussed, but I believe, and I am quite certain of this, that the discussions were too late for us to consider placing amendments to The Police Act three years ago.

Two years ago, yes, we did have a very serious consideration of this provision. We studied it in conjunction with the association of municipal police governing authorities. We studied it with the police association. At that time there was a great divergence of opinion—the police governing authorities were in favour of the idea and the police association was largely against it. The reasons for our weighing it at that time, and coming down on the side of not including it, were that if you break the membership of an association into two, then you have to bargain with two different groups. You would bargain with your senior officers association, and you would bargain with the other ranks, as it were, of the men—constables. You would duplicate disputes, certainly you would duplicate your bargaining and your consultations, your references to conditions of work, pay, vacations, disciplines, and so on. All that would be duplicated, and we felt that we were not prepared to accept that last year.

We have discussed it in the interim since then, and I will say to the hon. member that in the first draft of the legislation which we were using as we approached this final draft—which has been introduced into the House—we attempted to frame a section which would cover permitting, on a permissive basis in any police force, the formation of another association for what might be called—what the police governing authorities like to consider—the management side, the officers' side, as opposed to the ranks. I am not sure that there are not many things to be said in favour of that, but there are certainly some things to be said against it. Again, you have the duplication. Again, in smaller places you have perhaps a force of 15 to 30 men. You break it into two associations, it is not feasible or practical.

In Metro Toronto, I am aware that the hon. member recounted that the senior officers have quietly and publicly announced that they have a separate association. I understand that the board of commissioners of Metro Toronto deal with them separately, although strictly, under The Metropolitan Toronto Act, they are a part of the force. Whether or not they bargain with the other men is a matter which has been causing considerable trouble and grief and dissension in that force, and I know that they have very strong feelings.

We have talked with the chiefs of many police forces, and with the municipal police governing authorities who have urged us very strongly to get a section, such as we had originally contemplated, into this bill. But, for reasons both good and sufficient, I think, and certainly in the opinion of the government, this was not included this year. Let me make this clear. There was never any undertaking given, and there has been no breach of faith in any sense of the word. They may have hoped, and had high hopes that they would accomplish the objective this year. But I think that at least another year is needed if it is a matter of education and sentiment to reach that stage. Now let me say this. The hon. member used the words "senior officers resigned from the force"—I think that he was referring to the Metro force—resigned from the association to force

the hand of this government. Well, if they did it for that purpose, that was the least effective step that they could have taken. If there is anything that could put my back up —myself personally—it would be someone who takes an action to force my hand to do something with which I am not in agreement as to its being sensible, right and proper. I do not think, in fairness to these officers, that they felt that the action would force the hand of this government. If they did, I would be glad that the government did not succumb to that type of pressure.

Mr. Ben: I would like to ask a few questions. This first draft that you spoke of, which contained a clause trying to cover this situation, was this clause shown to or discussed with—

Mr. Speaker: Order, may I just point out to the member that it is custom in the usage of the House that the Minister's statement concludes the debate. In the past we have given members the opportunity to ask questions to elucidate matters which have been raised, or were not answered by the Minister. If the Minister has no objection, I think that the question which the member has just placed falls into that category, and I would rule it in order.

Mr. Ben: I will abide by your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: May I hear the question?

Mr. Ben: The Minister has stated that there are valid reasons for having taken the action that they did. Would he please state those reasons?

Mr. Speaker: I think that the first question is the proper one in the custom of the House, and the second is not—although if the Minister wishes to refer to it, it will be in order with me. The Minister will perhaps answer the question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

The first question, I would say to the hon. member, it is our policy not to display a piece of legislation to anyone outside of the House before the members have had a chance to see it. Therefore, it is introduced first. Now, when this bill was introduced, it was shown to counsel for the Ontario police association, that is the members of the forces, and of course, I think that the government tries to be as impartial and to make the information as widespread as possible.

This is quite proper and we like to have reaction, suggestion, discussion or criticism, so that as the bill is discussed in the House on second reading or in committee, we can take into account these discussions. But I think that what the hon. member is referring to is this, and this is the way that we have approached this legislation: We have been discussing it, and I was going to refer to it in my remarks to the hon. member for Sudbury. The discussions which lead to the legislation that you see before you in this bill, have gone on for months, since last year, with the police association, the police governing bodies, with the Ontario police commission and with the eminent counsel who represent the police association—on many occasions, in my office here in this building, and with all of them present at the same time.

In considering the section which the hon. member is disappointed not to find in this bill, I think that I would be frank to say to him that in considering that matter, we framed the language among ourselves, as workmen trying to draft legislation, and we discussed it as to whether it would be reasonable and would cover the situation, and if there were any objections to this.

In our wisdom, as a final decision, we abandoned it so that there was a considerable awareness that we were trying to achieve the provision which would permit the two associations, the senior and others, but there was no undertaking that we were going to finally achieve it or that the language that we drafted would cover it, or that it would not cause disturbances and dissensions that would make it unwise.

Now to come to the reasons. I indicated one of the main ones was that there would be two bodies—for police boards and commissioners—to deal with in bargaining. You would have then a division, as it were, within the ranks – although the police governing authorities say that this is proper and that there should be one elevated body of officers and the men. Many of the small forces, and even some of the police governing bodies, said, "We cannot really assess or evaluate whether this is wise or not".

The thing is being studied. We had the police association present its case in these discussions with the police governing authorities and with the police commission. We did not undertake to do it. There were reasons of doubt as to its efficacy, and to whether it would improve, particularly in the middle-sized or lesser forces, their efficiency. That is why it was left out.

Now the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto in some respects is governed by the

provisions of The Police Act, and in others, as you know, it has its own board of police commissioners. My colleague, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, in the bill which is before the House or which received second reading I believe it was, has a provision in it changing the composition of the police commission for Metropolitan Toronto, and they have an area, or latitude—and they are the sole exception—which other municipalities do not have in this respect.

In any event, I think that I have dwelt long enough on that for good and sufficient reasons, I think, why this government did not see fit to go to that step today. I have already, since this bill was introduced, had some very sharp criticism handed to me directly and personally by some very prominent persons in police forces, and in the governing authorities of municipal police forces. This is something that I have come to expect, and to live with, but we did not see fit to produce it this year.

I must say that I had some sympathy for the remarks of the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, and I want to deal briefly if I may with some of his comments. I should like to point out first of all that there are wide provisions now in The Police Act, which I think are very justifiable, where the Ontario Provincial Police force may come in to assist municipal police forces and to provide police supervision and responsibility in the case of inadequacy or lack. I would draw the attention of the House to section 4 of The Police Act, which says, and I will not read it fully:

> Where the commission finds a municipality does not maintain a police force, and is not provided with police forces, the commission may request the commissioners to secure the proper police in the municipality.

That, sir, is where you have a breakdown—where a municipality does not accept the responsibility under section 2 of the Act which makes every city and town responsible for policing. And then, in section 5, where there is a force but it is inadequate, or not properly equipped, or not properly manned, under a similar provision where the commission finds an inadequate situation, it may then direct the attention of the commissioner, the provincial police to it and—

Mr. Sopha: Sort of like in the town of which the Minister was mayor.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, I will come to that.

Mr. Sopha: The only town of which the Minister was mayor.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I only lived in one town in Ontario, then I moved to a city.

Mr. Sopha: You were mayor.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That was a city.

Mr. Sopha: Now that has happened there.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, it has happened there. I do not know if that is really relevant to this bill but perhaps I can touch on it.

Mr. Sopha: It is what the Minister has been talking about.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, not really. I will touch upon it though.

Mr. Sopha: The Attorney General really splits hairs today.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If I may continue with my thoughts as I had them planned—section 50 of The Police Act, I think, is a section to which attention might be drawn. That is, the situation where the police move into a municipality; where there is an emergency or a situation requiring assistance, not just a normal place; or where there is inadequate policing or lack of the force. I would like to refer to that section because we have occasion, not frequently, but occasionally to use it and it reads:

> A board or council responsible for the policing of a municipality or part thereof may by resolution request the commissioner of the OPP to furnish the assistance of the Ontario Provincial Police in maintaining law and order or, investigating any offence in the municipality and the commissioner may, with the approval of the Ontario police commission, provide such assistance as he deems necessary.

Then, it goes on in subsection 2:

> Where such assistance is provided in an area for the police in which the board or municipality is responsible, there is a provision for who shall share the expense.

Mr. Sargent: Where has the Minister requested it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would point out that that section, to cover an emergency situation in the whole or part of a municipality, can only be invoked on a resolution of the board of police commissioners, the committee of the council or the council itself. It must come

through in that manner, and where there is an unruly situation, an unlawful assembly of riot situations or something of that kind, then we must request and there must be the resolution of the board of police commissioners or of the council or committee of council which handles police affairs.

Curiously enough, I think that is a saving measure but it entails delay. We had a situation in Ontario just four or five weeks ago where a group of young persons with some reputation for disorderliness—although I would not want to condemn them out of hand—were moving, and had indicated they were moving in certain areas where there had been difficulty before. And if you had to convene the council of the town or the beach area to which they were moving, and get the county council together and get a request, they would have been long gone.

They would have been there and the situation would have developed and they would have been long gone from that area. The police in that case, because it happened to be a rural area for which they were responsible, were able to keep track of the activities of that particular group, and move in and frustrate or circumvent their activity, whatever it may have been.

This section 1(b) is not designed, really, to do what is in the mind of the hon. member for Grey-Bruce. It is curious and I am almost amused to say that when we drafted that section it was purely and entirely intended to cover a situation where a town or city absorbed another large rural area by amalgamation or annexation and found itself suddenly with perhaps a township of six miles square. It would have an additional 36 square miles to police with a police force which cannot passibly take care of it all without great expansion and great expense.

One of the situations which was particularly present in our mind was Whitby town and Whitby township. The amalgamation of those created a very new and a much enlarged town of Whitby. So we had discussed it with a delegation from the town of Whitby and found ourselves powerless under the Act to have the police continue to police the rural area. So we said, "We will try to get a section in our Act which will". And that is where we used the words, "special circumstances". You will note it says:

> Where in special circumstances the municipal police force is not capable of providing adequate policing for any part of the areas for which it is responsible, the Attorney General may authorize the Ontario Provincial Police force to police such part for such period and on such terms as the Attorney General prescribes.

It is really only designed to take over a part situation and it is not designed, and I hope will never be used, to move in and take over a whole municipality. There is no thought of that.

Insofar as we were able, we had given an assurance to Whitby town and Whitby township that we would seek legislation to enable us to phase out the responsibility by continuing the use of provincial police in some part of the annexed or amalgamated area. And what we have in mind is that we may do it, perhaps over a three-year period. But we had to have legislation to make this legal. That is why it is designed. And the curious thing is—

Mr. Sargent: No consultation with the local council.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, but there was notice and I am glad you mentioned that. In the opinion of the police commissioner, it has to be special circumstances within the opinion of the commission. They have to be of the opinion that the municipality is not capable. The Attorney General may then authorize for such part and for such period; it is a temporary thing. It is intended that way, and on such terms as the Attorney General prescribes.

So first of all the Ontario police commission has to be convinced that this is necessary. Then the Attorney General, as the Minister of the Crown who has to be responsible, makes the government responsible for that action; and I think there is an ample and reasonable safeguard here. But the curious thing is, when I introduced this bill the approaches I had from the press and from some members was, "Oh, is this to meet the dangerous situation, the emergency situation such as the influx of a great many visitors from some other area on a beach, or a motorcycle cavalcade of notorious behaviour." But I—

Mr. Sopha: The Premier has a home at Grand Bend?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Wasaga Beach, Grand Bend, other areas. Some of these areas, you know—

Mr. Sopha: You are more likely to use it for a strike situation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, no, no. It is dependent on the opinion of the commissioners, as I say. It had to then be approved by the Attorney General. And I remind the hon. member for Sudbury—there is one of the duties, to see that law and order is maintained.

Mr. Sopha: Of course, and you will use it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know that I would—

Mr. Sopha: The Minister would declare the policy in the part in which the strike occurred as being adequate.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I did not need that section for that situation.

Mr. Sopha: It is a very badly drafted section.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. member should have said that before.

Mr. Sopha: "Special circumstances" only add a redundancy that leads to confusion.

Mr. Speaker: Order! When the member for Sudbury was speaking he was given the courtesy of having his speech completed without interruption. I would ask that he give the same courtesy to the Minister.

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order. I become responsible for 1/117ths of the language that emanates from this House. Therefore, I have got to be as helpful as I can in the drafting of the statutes to which I give my tacit consent. Somebody might blame me in future generations—

Mr. Speaker: Well, I might point out that—

Mr. Sopha: I want to correct the obscurantism that is in this subsection.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member is now speaking on matters which should be dealt with in committee and not on the principle of the bill. The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if that was really a point of order, but my friend has often been able to get remarks in under that guise. He did not say those remarks in his first address.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I had not heard the Minister.

An hon. member: But you had read the statutes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am simply answering points which have been raised by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Oh no, the Minister is not answering it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I come now to the hon. member for Sudbury. His first remarks were confined—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister answer my question regarding protection for police officers to be replaced?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, that is in *Hansard* already.

Mr. Sargent: It is a modification of it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Is it not the same question the member raised in his question yesterday?

Mr. Sargent: It is supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Is it?

Mr. Sargent: I have not seen *Hansard* yet.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would say to the hon. member that we cannot undertake—although I suppose one could argue it is possible—that the legislation could say, "If you take over a force you must take steps to replace the present force in some sort of employment." I do not think that would be feasible legislation, even though it were possible. The government's policy which was announced some two years ago with respect to the particularly small forces, the one-man forces, was to move to have that responsibility taken from those municipalities and assumed by the Ontario Provincial Police. These are some of the things that the hon. member for Sudbury raised in his remarks. Perhaps the same response will cover his point as well.

We did that, however, on a purely voluntary basis. A letter was written saying:

> We are prepared to assume this responsibility if you wish, and we will do it on your request through resolution of your council. You should make provision to provide employment for your present police force either by giving him first of all ample notice, seeing if you can use him as a bylaw enforcement officer, because we will not assume the enforcement of your local municipal bylaws, and then we will endeavour if he can qualify at all, to take him in and make him a member of the Ontario Provincial Police force.

But we could give no firm undertaking on that, as the hon. member will understand. That was done in a very smooth and nice way, with very little disturbance. Out of 46 municipalities I think one or two temporarily hesitated and then they all came in. Since then, in an expansion of that policy, we have moved to two- and three-man forces, in some cases to four-man forces and, in one or two cases, where there were special circumstances, it was a five-man force, one of which is Blind River. Keewatin, Hearst, Cochrane—

Mr. Sopha: They are all Liberals in Hearst.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They want us.

An hon. member: Did the member say all the Liberals were in Hearst?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We do not have any politics in this at all. It is simply a case of policing. In no case, not one single case, have the provincial police ever moved in arbitrarily, or was it a matter of being sent in. They came in at the request of the local municipalities only.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister is right. The mayor of Oshawa—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have never gone in by force, only on request, under section 50 of the Act, in an emergency situation and, in the other situation, by a letter saying, "If you would like us to assist you." Or they may come to us, perhaps, before we write them and say, "For heaven's sake, help us, we cannot afford it, we cannot get the men, our budget is such that it is going to be a burden beyond our ability to carry. Come in and take over the policing."

In the case of Blind River—I will use it as an example because it was particularly mentioned—as hon. members know, the sole industry of that town is being phased out; it has given notice it is going to disappear from that area. It is the mainstay industry of that community, the only thing they have. They have asked various departments of government to see what could be done, such as Tourism and Information, Lands and Forests, and the Attorney General, in the policing area.

We looked at it from our department and said, "We think we could assist you. Your budget is some $52,000 or $53,000 for policing; if it will help you in this situation and help your people to bear the burden of taxation, we think we can stretch a point and move in."

We have a detachment actually in the town—on the east edge of the town, on the way to the constituency of the hon. member for Sudbury, there is a detachment of the Ontario Provincial Police. They were assisting to some extent in any event and we agreed to take over the town of Blind River.

Now, we did our best and this is the answer in *Hansard*, we did our best to absorb the members of that force and every one of them was given a thorough individual personal interview. They were not able to qualify for the Ontario Provincial Police force. Although I have the statistics of members of municipal forces that have been absorbed—and there are quite a number in the takeover so far, who have come into the Ontario Provincial Police force—we were not—

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, this may not be right, but to clarify this—

Mr. Speaker: The member will state his point of order.

Mr. Sargent: I would just like to ask the Attorney General to—

Mr. Speaker: Order! That is not a point of order.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, it is.

Mr. Speaker: No, the member has the right to rise on a point of order but not to ask a question.

Mr. Sargent: Insofar as not assuming the complete complement of the police force, Mr. Speaker, I think the approach—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member is not stating a point of order.

Mr. Sargent: The point of order is he is not, respectfully, doing the takeover fairly if you give—

Mr. Speaker: Order! That is not a point of order.

Mr. Sargent: It is very important to the people of Ontario—

Mr. Speaker: The member will state his point of order and, if it is a point of order, it will be dealt with.

Mr. Sargent: How can we discuss this if you spoil the conversation back and forth?

Mr. Speaker: I would like to point out to the member that the rules and customs of this House do not allow for a conversation

back and forth, as the member put it. The member will address the Minister, and the Minister the member, through the chair.

The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I think I was going to deal with a point which I believe the hon. member had in mind in any event, so perhaps I will cover it in my further remarks.

I would refer the hon. member to the remarks I placed in *Hansard*—I am sorry he was not here at the time; we might have had a supplementary question then. However, I would point this out—in taking over a force, a municipal force, I think what we might consider doing, if this were wise or feasible, would be to say to the municipality, "We'll come in if you want us, but you assure us that you have not neglected the welfare of your present force."

To go further than that and say, "We will take them all into the Ontario Provincial Police force" is simply, I can say now, impossible. Because, by reason of age, background qualifications, education or training, they would not, in many cases, as our experience shows, qualify. I think we have learned that we can, perhaps, exert some force, or some persuasion, upon the local municipality to take care of that force.

On Blind River, incidentally, I answered a question, I believe, in the House last week. I believe three of the five members had obtained employment, one did not appear anxious to get employment and the other, for health reasons, could not take it. I think we have a concern, I know we have a concern that perhaps we did not exercise as much persuasion as we might have. I think henceforth we will be able to do something in this regard.

I would like just very briefly to wind up these remarks. The hon. member for Sudbury spoke of the grudging approach to the bargaining provisions in the Act; he thought that we were approaching this very grudgingly. I must confess I cannot follow him when he says these procedures—if this is what he said—go back to King Henry IV or somebody. I just do not follow that.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister means he does not understand.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I never knew that arbitration was exercised in those days.

Mr. Sopha: Let us not be frivolous about this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! If the member for Sudbury has a point of order, he will state it, otherwise he will give the floor to the Attorney General.

Mr. Sopha: The point is that the Attorney General must not mislead, and I can put this very briefly.

In respect of section 7, the people in your department know the only appeal possible from an award of a board of arbitration is by the prerogative writs, that is the only way it can get to the court, and I said that that is hardly consistent with this enlightened age.

If we want to permit an appeal, let us say so, on a point of law, and let us not resort to those old archaic forms developed in the time of Henry I. That is all I said.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I appreciate the clarification from the hon. member.

I would say, however, the point I was making was that these provisions were not reached grudgingly. They were reached in free and open consultation with the police association, with the governing bodies, with the council of the police association, after many discussions, and without any difficulty. It is true that the police force cannot be a union and cannot strike. It has an association which is very strong, but is denied the right to strike, and I think quite properly so, for reasons of public safety. This is accepted. There has been no difficulty in our bargaining, at any stage with the police forces. These provisions are openly arrived at by very friendly and thorough discussion and consultation.

The only change in section 7, which is section 32 in the present Act, is that it simply replaces the Attorney General by the police commission. That is generally the effect—it is only a question of interpretation, or application, or administration of the agreement. It is not a great matter of primary dispute between the parties. It is a question of interpretation or administration, as the section says. The application of the agreement. This is not an earthshaking amendment, and it was to give speed and finality to that type of dispute or misunderstanding.

In the matter of regional government I think that just one word further would suffice to complete what I would have to say on that. I can say I have indicated that the policy has been to move from this very small force to the larger one. I would point out that these

things take time. They take additional personnel and, therefore, money. They take facilities in police detachment headquarters, and housing.

We have done the surveys in various parts of Ontario. In southern Ontario, I think a different problem exists than in northern Ontario where it has been pointed out there are small forces, perhaps within a radius of 10 or 15 miles. You may perhaps have half a dozen small forces, whereas in northern Ontario you have one small force, and then 50 miles away another.

So we can effect, I believe, and I am moving towards this in our studies and in our programme, amalgamation of the forces in southern Ontario which will make for more efficient policing and which will, I think save expense. But the problem in northern Ontario is one of scattered small communities many many miles apart as a rule, and this is a case where you cannot achieve the amalgamation and a sharing of cost as you can in a very thickly settled area.

Your only recourse, really, is to assist, I suggest, by the assumption by the province of policing responsibility—to which end we should move within our means as quickly as possible. This, I believe, we can look forward to as being extended and expanded as time goes by.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

RAISING OF MONEY ON THE CREDIT OF THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves second reading of Bill 149, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of principle here, since this gives borrowing powers—I asked the Provincial Auditor last week, or perhaps the week before, and I wonder aloud as a matter of principle to the Treasurer of the province, why is it that since the province does not have sufficient cash to pay the commitments that it encounters in the space of a year, and if it is forced to borrow money to meet those commitments, why, in the accounts of this province, cannot one see a simple statement showing the amount of money the province took in, its income in a year, and the amount of money the province spent in a year?

The difference ought to be—I am no accountant—but the difference ought to be that amount of money that the province is forced to borrow. But try as one might, one cannot find anywhere in the public accounts of this province a statement showing, in simplicity, for the inexpert, the uninitiated in the field of accounting, a statement that says that.

And it is a sorry commentary on bookkeeping procedures that when one is trying to find out, as I was last week, how much money is owed, or the net deficit of this province. Did you, Mr. Speaker, see Leslie Frost out in the hustings there last week laying the inference—not like one red herring but a whole ship load of them—that this province had had a balanced budget under his suzerainty.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would come back to the bill.

Mr. Sopha: That is what he was saying in Etobicoke last week, laying that inference. Well, I am saying it is a funny thing in order to find out how much we are behind in total expenditures last year—the total receipts that you have to—that one has to have the privileged position of being a member of this House in order to call the auditor and be the beneficiary of his courtesy to assist you to find out the state of affairs.

Now, we can do that because the Provincial Auditor is in a special relationship to us—the 116 of us other than the Provincial Treasurer, presumably the Provincial Treasurer knows. But the rest of the seven million people in the province cannot call the Provincial Auditor and have made available to them his graciousness and his expert knowledge in order to be able to assist.

I really cannot understand, in this advanced age, why there is not someone, or somewhere, such a statement? In order to find out what the deficit was in the last year for which they reported, which was the end of March, 1967, the Provincial Auditor and I had to do about four separate arithmetical calculations and he had to impart to me special knowledge that he had in the translation of terms used in the public accounts.

And all I wanted to know—the single thing I wanted to know—is: put capital and ordinary expenditure together, for my purposes lump them together—it is an arbitrary difference anyways—I was speaking of expenditure.

I wanted to know how much the government spent for all purposes in that fiscal year, and how much it took in. That is the way of running the books in my office—let

me tell you—and I know it. My bookkeeper can tell me at any particular time, and in any other well operated business they are able to tell you that, because other businesses do not make that arbitrary distinction—that fine, artistic, distinction that the government of Ontario makes—about the capital that comes into the ordinary account.

I am just telling you, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Auditor had to translate terms to me in that those public accounts, we had to make four separate calculations in order to come to that figure. Why? Should the public of Ontario not know if the government of Ontario is going in the red? Does it have to be shrouded by obfuscation? It is almost as if they hired a team of experts from Outer Manchuria to help cloud it in confusion so that you cannot tell.

Really when it is a matter of tax dollars coming in or being spent, who does it matter to the taxpayer how the government identifies the expenditure? The accountant would be interested in that.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member will come back to the bill. I have allowed him a great deal of latitude.

Mr. Sopha: All right. This is the point. This authorizes the Provincial Treasurer to raise money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, and my complaint, as a matter of principle, is in the way that the accounts of the province are presently prepared. You are unable, in looking at them, without special knowledge and making additional calculations which really impose upon one, to tell how much the government is in the red, and how much the Provincial Treasurer has to borrow under the statutory authority that he now seeks from me. I would ask as a matter of principle, and in relation to this bill, that when all the public accounts are prepared that a final statement be set out showing the total amount that came in and total expenditures for all purposes—from ordinary income or capital expenditure—and the difference has to be how much this Treasurer goes in the hole year after year.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to this? The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. McNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the hon. member studied the last abridged statement for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967 or not?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I did.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, it is all there. It is impossible at the time of the Budget to say accurately what the figures will be, because the Budget figures are based on eight months actual experience and the rest of it has to be forecast information for a period of four months, so that the Budget can only be an estimate. But then, of course, it is reconciled in terms of the abridged statement later on.

I can say to the hon. member—and, I think, in all fairness—that I am hopeful that the next abridged statement will be written in somewhat simpler terms. Beyond that I cannot make any further comments.

Really, all the statutes before the House for consideration today on second reading are to authorize the Provincial Treasurer to borrow funds that are going to be required from the capital market for the ensuing year. It is a routine bill and it comes up annually and the Legislature, of course, must give the Treasurer the authority to provide for funds from the capital market in this manner.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 9th order; the House in the committee of the whole House; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

THE EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ACT

House in committee on Bill 130, an Act to amend The Employment Standards Act.

On section 1:

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, I move an amendment to section 1, clause, or subsection, b. The amendment is to read as follows:

"Director" means the director of employment standards appointed for the purposes of this Act.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Chairman: I believe that there is an amendment to section 2?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, in section 2 I would move that, in clause b, that the present clause be named number 2 (a), and that a clause (b) be added:

A director of employment standards shall be appointed for the purposes of this Act.

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 3 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 7:

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment to section 7. I move that subsection 1 be amended by striking out "48" in the second line and inserting in lieu thereof, "40".

Mr. Chairman, the Act strikes me as an Act to set standards for the unorganized workers of Ontario. It is my considered opinion that this Act should come at least close to some of the agreements that have been won by organized labour and for which they fought so hard.

I think that if we were to look at most of the agreements arrived at by industry and labour that the 40-hour week is a standard part of these agreements. There are about 2.8 million workers in Ontario. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that about 2 million of them are unorganized.

I think that the Minister, when he considers this type of legislation, should at least try to bring the legislation as close to the agreements that have been arrived at by industry and labour over the past 25 or 30 years. I also notice that what this Act is, in effect, doing in connecttion with the hours worked, is merely to make law what is actually in existence today.

There are many people working 48, 50, or 60 hours, when the normal reasonable, and healthful thing for the government to do is to make 40 hours the normal work week.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, I would like to put the stand of our party on record. We support the amendment and we support it wholeheartedly. The Minister in his statement when he introduced the bill stated that it was partially to assure modern working conditions to all employees in the province. I would like to point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that the 40-hour week has become almost a standard in this country.

The Minister further pointed out that it was to curb use of excessive overtime and perhaps create additional employment opportunities. I believe that if we have the 40-hour week in Ontario it can do nothing but create more opportunities for employment. In many areas of Ontario there are still people working 60, 70 and as high as 80 hours a week. I am sure the Minister knows this.

However, I believe that these are isolated cases, that the employment norm in Ontario at the moment is 40 hours. I believe the sooner we move to that and the sooner this Minister brings in legislation to make it law, the sooner this country will see a drop in unemployment in this province. Once again I would like to put the stand of our party on record—we intend to support this amendment.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, if I might speak to this amendment, basically for the purpose of clarification, in relation to subsection 2 on the exemptions, which directly concern subsection 14 that we are coming to, and this is in relation to the food processing industry. Have there been any changes in the regulations that are going to affect those persons engaged in the seasonal work in their fruit and vegetable canning, their processing industries.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on the amendment?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, in reference to the amendment, I would like to say a few words if I may. I think I made it very clear in the beginning, in my statements, and other remarks in reference to this matter that this bill is to provide basic protection. It does not attempt to negotiate all working conditions for people, whether they be unionized or otherwise in the province. It is to establish a set of working conditions and we have improved them by reason of this bill.

As the amendment stands, Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the members that this would place a maximum of 40 hours in the work week; over and above that, other arrangements would pertain. Union agreements do not limit work to 40 hours or even 37.5 hours in a week. They normally provide for overtime pay beyond these levels and quite frequently people seek to work longer hours and increase their pay.

I am also concerned that the economy of the province perhaps could not withstand a reduction to that point at this time, because in many instances it would create a situation in which people would have to cut down on the number of employees. I am sure the members will appreciate that when one brings in legislation such as this, there are many submissions on various points of view.

The hon. member for Timiskaming referred to the matter that people are working substantial hours beyond 48. I realize they are in some instances, but it is done on the basis of permits and we attempt to control it in

that way. So for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, and without dealing at the moment with the question raised by the hon. member for Essex South, I would oppose the amendment. In reference to his question of seasonable employment, that would be dealt with under the regulations and consideration given to their particular problems in that regard.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that there would still be many people employed who would be working more than 40 hours a week if the amendment were to succeed, just as the Minister is aware that there will be many people employed in the province who will be working for more than 48 hours a week if the bill stands as it is presently put before us.

We on this side are concerned that the bill does not provide the circumstances that are in the best interest of the labour force. We look at the material that was appended to the hon. Provincial Treasurer's Budget this year which does show warnings of an increased level of unemployment in the immediate future, particularly in the year that lies ahead. And the passage of the amendment would certainly be in the best interest of moving towards full employment and maintaining that very attractive position in the province of Ontario. So I would ask the Minister to give it very careful consideration, that such changes in the future might even get government support.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Jackson: I would just like to point out to the Minister that when the unions go after a 40-hour week, or time and a half for overtime, it is not to enlarge the pay packet. It has only one basic purpose and that is to provide further employment by making it economically sound for the company to hire more employees rather than pay the time and a half wages, and it is my opinion that this will do the same thing.

It is not going to hurt the companies if they have to, or if they choose to, hire people to work the extra hours after the 40 hours. They will be paying them at straight time rather than time and a half. So really, I cannot see the Minister's argument where he says that it might hurt some companies economically.

Mr. Chairman: Any further debate on the amendment?

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one or two comments. If we are going to reduce the work week to 40 hours, eight hours a day, you are creating a very difficult situation for the basic industry of agriculture. Quite frankly I am surprised to hear the leader of the Opposition go on record as favouring a 40-hour week. I realize the NDP have no rural members in their ranks and they might go for that.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Where were you last night when we were—

Mr. Root: What has that got to do with it? Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member for York South would desist and listen? I want to say this, that a 40-hour week with an eight-hour day means that the farmers' help would work five days a week. Now we have not developed cows yet that would stop milking Friday night and come back on Monday morning. The hens will lay all over the weekend and if the farmer did not look after his livestock over the weekend you would have the humane society breathing down your neck.

Mr. Nixon: How are you going to accommodate the 48 hours without breaking the law?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: Let me continue.

So you have a situation where you are asking the farmer to bid in the same labour pool where people have that protection. Farmers are a group of people who work hand in hand with the great architect of the universe. We work with the weather, and if you start work at seven in the morning your eight hours are up at three in the afternoon. And anyone who farms knows that is about the time when the combine is working to advantage, when you are harvesting. At that time you start to pay time and a half, so I am suggesting that the hon. members opposite who are supporting the idea of a 40-hour week with an eight-hour working day, completely forgot the basic industry of agriculture and I would hope that this amendment would be unanimously defeated.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the member for Wellington-Dufferin are completely erroneous; irrelevant, my friend says, and perhaps he is right.

Mr. Nixon: You can think of a better word than that.

Mr. Deans: I am sure I could but I would hate to use them in here. To think for a moment that we are going to hold back the progress of society because of such a thing as milking a cow on a Sunday is ridiculous. What is required in this province is that we upgrade the standards and provide more leisure time and this is exactly what this bill is doing. It is providing those people who, at the present moment, do not have the benefit of collective bargaining, the opportunity to be with their families at some time during the course of a week.

Now in the case of farmers, for the most part, seasonal employment is not affected by this bill, not affected in any way and, at the present moment, they do not comply with the bill as it is written and with the Act as it is written. There is no reason to believe that they would be forced to comply with this Act when it was changed, because the director —or whoever it is in charge—has the right, as it says in the bill, to make whatever changes are necessary and this would be taken care of there. The member well knows it would be taken care of there.

What I am interested in seeing is that those people in the parts of this province who are being paid a minimal wage and forced to work 60 and 70 hours a week in order to earn a decent living, are no longer forced to do that. There are two ways to attack it and we hope to attack them from both ways in this House.

The first thing is to reduce the hours that a person must work in this province in order to earn a decent living, and the second is to upgrade the minimum wage in order that every person working in this province will earn a decent living in a reasonable number of hours.

That is part of what this bill does. It provides for the hours and a subsequent bill, I hope, very soon, will provide for a reasonable minimum standard of wage. I think that the amendment put forward by the member for Dovercourt is an excellent amendment and one that, had he not moved, I would have moved myself.

As far as I am concerned, the time is long past when we should recognize that people should not be forced to work more than 40 hours in any one week in order to earn a decent living, and they should not be forced to work six days a week in order to make ends meet. That is what is happening right in this province today.

It is time this government woke up and took a look around them and saw what is happening to the people of this province. It is getting impossible to earn a decent living in this province. There are more and more people who are going to finance companies. There are more and more people going into debt every day in this province.

The time has come for us to take a definite stand in upgrading the standard of living of the average person. We have upgraded the standard of living of the judges, let us get down to some of the average people in this province, some of the ones who have not the benefit of collective bargaining. Let us reduce their hours to the same hours as any normal people work.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: I just want to make one brief comment. This bill, when it was introduced, was typical of the kind of bill you would expect to come from a Tory government. This is a predominantly industrial province and this province should be leading in this field. That the government should profess to be doing something to protect the interests of the unorganized and come, in the year 1968, with a bill for a 48-hour week is proof of just how far behind an industrial province this government is in its thinking. But if you wanted the thing nailed down, our friend from Wellington-Dufferin certainly nailed it down, because he revealed that at least his aspect of the party is tied to the horse and buggy. And he expects the rest of the province—75 to 80 per cent or approaching that of an urbanized area—to be tied to the horse and buggy along with him.

If he wants to push that kind of a line in the province of Ontario, he will find out what will happen in the next election.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of the motion of the member for Dovercourt will please say "aye"; those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of the motion of the member for Dovercourt will please rise.

Those opposed will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 30, the "nays" 53.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost. Section 7 will stand as part of the bill.

Sections 7 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 14:

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I would move an amendment to section 14 (1) and (2) as follows:

That section 14 of Bill 130, The Employment Standards Act, 1968, be deleted and replaced by a new section 14 as follows:

14 (1) Where an employee works for an employer in excess of eight hours in any day, or in excess of 40 hours in any week, he shall be paid, for each hour or part thereof, an amount not less than one and one-half times his regular hourly rate.

(2) Every employee shall receive an allowance of one day's pay for each statutory holiday. Such employee, if he should be required to work on a statutory holiday, shall receive, in addition, a regular day's pay.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth moves that section 14 of Bill 130, The Employment Standards Act, 1968, be deleted and replaced by a new section 14 as follows:

(1) Where an employee works for an employer in excess of eight hours in any day or in excess of 40 hours in any week, he shall be paid, for each hour or part thereof, an amount not less than one and one-half times his regular hourly rate.

(2) Every employee shall receive an allowance of one day's pay for each statutory holiday. Such employee, if he should be required to work on a statutory holiday, shall receive, in addition, a regular day's pay.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, recognizing that the government did not see fit to reduce the mandatory hours of work within reason in this province, it seems only fitting that those employees who are forced then to work in excess of 40 hours should be paid overtime for that portion in excess of 40 hours that they are forced to work.

This amendment does just that. It ensures that any employee who has to work 48 hours will receive eight hours at time and one-half, which is not unreasonable in this province. It performs a function not at all unlike that which would have been performed had you changed section 7 to 40 hours. The norm in this province for those people under a collective bargaining agreement is 40 hours.

It is not unreasonable to expect that a person with a family should be able to devote two days out of a week to being with his family. Since the government feels this is unreasonable, it is then not unreasonable that, should he have to give up one of those days when he should be with his children, that he should be at least recompensed appropriately. He should be receiving an amount that would, in some way, provide him with the finances that would enable his family to do the things that he ought to be able to do with them alone.

The amendment to section 2 of the bill requires that every employee in this province shall be paid one day's pay for the statutory holidays that are laid out in the bill. That is everyone, whether he works or whether he does not work. It also states that any employee forced to work on a statutory holiday should receive, in addition to this, one day's pay—his normal day's earnings.

I think an enlightened society would agree that if a person should have to work on a statutory holiday, he should receive considerably more than if he were able to sit at home. And I think again there is no purpose in giving a statutory holiday if a person has to do without a wage on that particular day.

So I would move that these sections be agreed to and become part of this bill.

Mr. De Monte: Mr. Chairman, as we look reasonably at the section as it was brought down by the government, it means that a man, in order to earn overtime, has to either work eight hours a day, six days a week, or a little less than 10 hours a day, five days a week.

I think, as the member for York South mentioned in the discussion on the previous section, that we are an industrialized province. We must accept the fact that many men work at long and tough jobs and that when they have worked eight hours they are pretty tired and, even for a health measure, my friend's amendment should stand.

As I said before, on the amendment to the previous section, this is in keeping with the normal union agreements arrived at by collective bargaining between union and management. I think this Act, which is designed to protect the unorganized workers in Ontario, should allow for overtime for all hours over 40 hours and I would like to support the amendment of the member for Wentworth.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak to this section, I can only repeat most of my argument on the previous sections.

Once again it comes to mind that the Minister has said work conditions have wide acceptance in this province. I believe, and my party believes, that the 40-hour week and time and a half for anything over eight hours in the day and 40 hours in the week has wide acceptance—that it is almost the accepted practice throughout industry. The Minister has also stated that it will help people with little or no bargaining power—people that do not belong to unions.

We have the feeling that the Minister is not really honest when he says this—that he has no intention of helping these people. Because, in one breath he says that he is going to help the little group that has no bargaining power, and then he turns around and brings through a bill that does just the opposite—that really helps the employer that wants to work the people more than the normal work week.

I would like to point out again in this House that the prime purpose, and the only purpose, that was in the mind of the union organization when it brought forth time and one-half provisions for overtime and holidays, was that the companies would find it more economic to hire additional employees than to pay the extra money.

I would like to suggest to the Minister that it would be no hold-back to industry to grant the 40-hour week. It is no hold-back to grant the time and one-half provisions, and it would definitely create employment in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment, and I would like to point out that it has become the practice of our society to have a number of statutory holidays, and pretty well the whole industrial and business community grinds to a standstill on these days. I think that the unorganized workers, those who need legislative assistance, should also be entitled to their pay for these holidays. They are the ones who are often getting the lowest wages, and to be penalized without a salary on a holiday to me is extremely unjust. I feel that this amendment that the hon. member for Wentworth has proposed is extremely necessary and called for.

It has been stated that this amendment is to protect the unorganized workers, and after hearing some of the thinking of this government that has led to this bill, all I can say is that it should be a great incentive to the unorganized workers to get organized.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Chairman, in this section there are two of the new provisions in this bill. Namely, that there shall be paid to employees time and one-half for work beyond 48 hours, and, secondly, that an employer shall pay to an employee who works on the holidays set out in the bill time and one-half for his hours of work. These provisions have been brought in and are those which we feel the particular industries that are most affected can afford and support at the present time.

We are not opposed to, but in fact are in favour of bettering conditions, and that is just what this bill does. We are establishing employment standards under it and that these will be changed from time to time as circumstances permit. We want this bill to be a benefit to the working force as well as to the economy as a whole in this province. To impose conditions wherein, for example, we would pay a person for a holiday, plus his regular pay, if he worked, would impose a charge that industry, particularly in the service field—and this is where most of the impact comes—could not afford at this time. We would find that, in many instances, they would be cutting down on the number of employees.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I feel that we have gone as far as is possible and economically wise at the present time—to provide the best provisions we can not only for labour but for the businesses that employ them, and so that labourers will retain their positions, and businesses will require the maximum number of employees. For that reason I would be opposed, and I would hope the House would oppose, these amendments.

Mr. Deans: I wonder if I might ask the Minister on what does he base his opinion that these industries cannot afford it?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We have carried out a number of surveys. The industries are particularly in the retail trade, small stores throughout the province, or in hotels, restaurants, and those areas wherein it is largely people that work with not many skills. They do a good job, but the margin of profit is not very high, in some of those types of institutions. And I am not talking about the large department stores. I am talking about the small retail firms, situated in the smaller

towns and villages throughout this whole province. We have done a considerable number of surveys. They are not complete yet, but we have been doing them, in reference to the minimum wage field, and there are preliminary surveys as well as more detailed ones. We looked at it very carefully before we brought in the legislation that is here today.

Mr. MacDonald: You are perpetuating the pockets of poverty.

Mr. Deans: Well, let me ask the Minister, is it the practice of this government, then, to base everything on the minimum? Is it to be the practice that we are going to base all of the standards on the very, very minimum areas—as my leader says, "the pockets of poverty"? What about all of the people who reside and work in the Metropoliton Toronto area, the Hamilton area, the Peterborough and the Oshawa areas? These people have to make ends meet on the meagre allowances that you people put forward as the minimum. There is no point in making your judgment on some place where it actually does not really exist. Start dealing with the practice. Start dealing with what is happening around this province. Start thinking about the people who are struggling from day to day.

There is no point in giving a man a holiday if you are not going to pay him for it. Absolutely no point at all. The average man has as many payments every week as his pay packet will enable him to pay. If he gets $100, we find that it takes every dollar of it to make ends meet. There is no point in giving him Friday off if you will not pay him for it, because he cannot afford it. You are not giving him anything. For goodness sake, become modern. Waken up. Realize that people are entitled to a day off with pay.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, could I add a little bit to this? I go back to the little or no bargaining power statement of the Minister. His attitude, and this government's attitude, is to wait for the unions to win it, then bring in legislation after it has already been won and say: Well, look what we have —we have an enlightened Act, ten years after it has already gone into effect, through the unions.

Might I say, that if this is the fact, then the people in Ontario should take a much greater look at unionism and a much greater look at this government.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of the amendment, please say aye. Those opposed, please say nay.

In my opinion the nays have it.

Section 14 agreed to.

Sections 15 to 39, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 130, as amended, reported.

THE WAGES ACT

House in committee on Bill 131, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 131 reported.

THE INDUSTRIAL SAFETY ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill 132, An Act to amend The Industrial Safety Act, 1964.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 132 reported.

THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE, 1961-1962

House in committee on Bill 133, An Act to amend the Ontario human rights code, 1961-1962.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 133 reported.

THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT, 1965

House in committee on Bill 134, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Sections 1 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 134 reported.

Clerk of the House: The honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

RESOLVED:

That an income tax shall be paid by every individual who was resident in, or had income earned, in Ontario, being 28 per cent of the tax payable under the Income Tax Act (Canada) in respect of the 1969 taxation year,

as provided in Bill 136, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Resolution concurred in.

THE INCOME TAX ACT, 1961-1962

House in committee on Bill 136, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

On section 1:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the Provincial Treasurer informed us on second reading that this was simply to give the government of Canada notice that in fact we wanted our 28 percentage points of the income tax revenues that are payable under the federal statute. The abatement of 28 per cent is arrived at by agreement between the government of Canada and the government of Ontario and, as I understand it, this agreement runs out in 1968.

I wonder if the Minister might indicate if the 28 per cent that is enacted by this bill could be amended before a full year comes around, in order to take advantage of either a more generous apportionment reached by agreement with the government of Canada or a unilateral decision taken by this government, that we have to have more revenues from the source?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think I explained on second reading that at the January conference of Finance Ministers, this matter was raised with the then federal Minister of Finance. Prior to the adjournment of the meeting, it was agreed that there could be another opportunity to pursue this matter if, by agreement, it is determined there will be a greater abatement or if the province elected to levy and collect income tax above and beyond the abated percentage.

It is against that possibility, I think, that I suggested we would have another opportunity to do this in the fall session of the House.

In any case, it has become practice, by agreement with the federal authorities, that we give notice in this manner. At the moment—until we do have a conference and until the agreement is changed, and hopefully, we will be able to persuade the federal authorities to abate more than 28 per cent. But in any case, at this particular point in time, we are assured we will have another opportunity to give further and amended notice in time if time and circumstances warrant.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, what is the deadline for the present agreement? Does it run out on the last day of 1968, or does it just continue until some other arrangements are arrived at?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, the last agreement was for two years. I am not sure what the expiry date is, but it is two years, ending probably at the end of the calendar year, or the end of the fiscal year. I am not sure which it is.

The present agreement is for only two years.

Mr. Nixon: So you expect to be renegotiating that agreement before the end of 1968?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh yes. It is very essential. As a matter of fact, this also was agreed to at the January conference. It was recognized that there would be another conference, with respect to either renewal of the present agreement, or amendment to the agreement, but there will have to be a meeting between now and the end of the year.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 136 reported.

Clerk of the House: The honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

RESOLVED:

That the Treasurer of Ontario, when he deems it advisable for the sound and efficient management of public money or of the public debt or of any sinking fund may, from time to time and on such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable, purchase, acquire and hold,

(a) securities issued by or guaranteed as to principal and interest by Ontario, any other province of Canada, Canada or the United Kingdom; and

(b) securities issued by the United States of America; and,

(c) securities issued or guaranteed by the international bank for reconstruction and development payable in Canadian or United States currency; and,

(d) deposit receipts, deposit notes, certificates of deposits, acceptances and other similar instruments issued or endorsed by any charter bank to which The Bank Act (Canada) applies,

and pay therefor out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill 137, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, is this a standard resolution? I do not recall having that before the House in previous years.

Resolution concurred in.

THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

House in committee on Bill 137, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act.

Sections 1 to 19, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 20:

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: With respect to section 20, I move that section 47 of the Act as re-enacted by section 20 of this bill be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:

> Lieutenant-Governor in council may provide for the manner of executing securities and coupons if any attached thereto and may provide that any signature or signatures upon the securities and coupons attached thereto may be engraved, "lithographed, printed or otherwise mechanically reproduced".

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Provincial Treasurer could explain why it is more useful to him that it not be laid down that the Deputy Treasurer be the countersigning authority?

Hon. Mr. McNaughton: It is to provide for flexibility, Mr. Chairman. The new amendment provides that the Lieutenant-Governor in council would decide the manner in which the securities issued by the province will be executed. That is for each issue. The order-in-council will provide for who will sign the securities.

The previous amendment required that the Provincial Treasurer and either the Deputy Provincial Treasurer or an officer of The Department of Treasury and Economics would sign the securities. It was rather too precise. There was not enough flexibility in it. So that in each instance, this will now be set out in the authorizing order-in-council.

Mr. Nixon: Well, it seems to me that the original bill had quite a bit of flexibility in it. Either the Deputy Provincial Treasurer or such officer of the department who might be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in council. What more flexibility would you want than would be included in that rather extensive group?

Section 20, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 21 to 24, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 137 reported.

Clerk of the House: The honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

RESOLVED:

> That remissions of any tax, fee or penalty granted under The Department of Revenue Act, 1968, or any other Act of the Legislature, may be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill 138, An Act to establish The Department of Revenue.

Resolution concurred in.

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

House in committee on Bill 138, An Act to establish The Department of Revenue.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. Nixon: Can the Provincial Treasurer tell the House what sources of provincial income would not come under the responsibility of this new department? I guess there are some, like the revenues from transport?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Chairman. At the moment the revenue that would accrue from the sale of motor vehicle licences would not come under this department. Frankly, that is the only principal one that comes to mind at the moment. There are probably a few others, but that would be the principal area of revenue.

Section 4 agreed to.

Sections 5 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 138 reported.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT, 1961-1962

House in committee on Bill 139, An Act to amend The Public Service Act, 1961-1962.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 139 reported.

Clerk of the House: The honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

RESOLVED:

> That the money required for the purposes of The Ontario Labour-Management Arbitration Commission Act, 1968, shall, until the 31st day of March, 1969, be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided by Bill 142, The Ontario Labour-Management Arbitration Commission Act, 1968.

Resolution concurred in.

THE ONTARIO LABOUR-MANAGEMENT ARBITRATION COMMISSION ACT, 1968

House in committee on Bill 142, The Ontario Labour-Management Arbitration Commission Act, 1968.

Sections 1 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 142 reported.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain resolutions, certain bills without amendment and certain bills with certain amendments and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain resolutions, certain bills without amendment and certain bills with amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 21st order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

(Continued)

On vote 606:

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, under the Ontario water resources commission, I would like to raise the matter of the Lake Ontario shoreline bordering the township of Saltfleet and of the Hamilton Bay—two areas that desperately need attention.

Each year we are plagued with the problem that a person cannot get near the water for the smell. I think that maybe it is time something was done to relieve this problem.

One of the things that might be done is that we could begin by cleaning up the shoreline. Last year, that area known as Confederation park in Hamilton was closed to the public for swimming and it looks as if it is not going to be any better this year. It may be, but it does not look that way. The area of the beach of Lake Ontairo bordering on Saltfleet township has been, over the last years, polluted with dead fish, and it takes some time to get this cleared up.

They float in from the lake and I think that we ought to find out why they are dying to begin with and why they—

An hon. member: Old age!

Mr. Deans: Old age? I see, thank you very much.

An hon. member: The biologist from the bush!

Mr. Deans: I would suggest though that part of the reason that the fish are dying is because of the cesspool that is known as Hamilton Bay. Maybe the Ontario water resources commission ought to know and start cleaning this terrible mess up.

How the people living on the beach strip in Hamilton can live there is beyond me. There are days when you drive across there and the smell is intolerable. You cannot open your windows, because you could not live in the house if you did.

This is the responsibility of the water resources commission, at least in part. I would ask that the Minister instruct the commission to go in there and do everything necessary, regardless of cost at this time, to clean this horrible mess up before it gets to the state of Lake Erie, or you will not be able to do anything with it.

We cannot afford to get to that point, and the cost, when it reaches that position, will be astronomical compared to the cost now. Let me say that I recognize that it will cost a lot at this time. We must take the step now, regardless of cost, or we are going to find ourselves in the position where this lake will not only be unfit for swimming, it will be unfit for drinking because you will not be able to purify it.

I would ask that the Minister take steps in that direction immediately.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, I understand that plans are under way in the city of Hamilton to put in secondary treatment plants in all the industries along there and they all have programmes under way to clean up their pollution. I understand the problems of OWRC in that some of these works have not even been completed, but when they are it will relieve a lot of the problems of the area.

Mr. Deans: If I might just ask the Minister. Quite a number of streams that run into the lake, in that area, are not fit for human use for a variety of reasons. I realize that the

OWRC have been looking into the problem of Redhill creek, for example, trying to find what can be done to assist it.

I think that the time has come when we can no longer go along with the land fill programme that we are using. This is what is creating a lot of the pollution in the streams that are running through that area, and perhaps the OWRC ought to step on Hamilton's toes a bit and get them to do something about the dump situation on the mountain.

Since we are talking about water pollution, I would hesitate to tell you that the air pollution up there from the dump is pretty bad too. Maybe we could clear two areas up at once.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, last night there was some discussion about the possibility of a grid system for the supply of water; not so much a grid system, but an integrated plant for provision of sewage facilities in various parts of the province. The Minister raised the question of economics and I was wondering what studies the commission has done to utilize the modern steel pipe construction in wide use in the United States, as I understand, rather than the concrete type that we are using.

Steel construction can be laid much more quickly; there is not nearly the same need to worry about contours of land; you can put higher volumes of water through very high pressure lines; they give greater flexibility; and your cost of pumping is in the order of less than a cent per 1,000 gallons per mile. Would the Minister give me any information on what investigation the commission has done on these more modern types of construction pipeline?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand from the officials here that they know about it and it has been used in the city of London, but they find that it is no less expensive than the type that they were using and, of course, they feel that they should use the pipe that has been tested, and proven.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the reason that I bring up this matter of the steel pipeline is because of the greater flexibility that you can get, sir, in the amount of water going through. You can move pressures of up to 800 to 1,000 pounds per square inch and get a much larger volume through a given size of line. You can use a much less width, or diameter pipe, about half the diameter for the same amount of water possible, and the speed of construction is much greater. They can lay 30 or 40 miles in one day.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I understand that steel pipe has to be protected both inside and outside and it is felt—again, I suppose that research is going on in this all the time—that the pipe they are using is perhaps the best method. I would think that there will be research done on this by OWRC, and if they can find that they can move more water cheaper, I think that they would be very interested in that.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I urge that the commission investigate this as a means of economically providing the province with a provincial grid system for water supply—more so than any other way—and at a much earlier date than possible under conventional construction methods and materials.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, I just have a brief question. The member for Wentworth mentioned sanitary land fill or dumps. I would like to ask the Minister whether, before a small municipality or township can establish a municipal dump, do they have to have permission from the Ontario water resources commission? I mention this because, in my own area, several townships have established dumps, and after a period of time a lot of this turns to liquid and it is showing up in lakes as far as 20 miles away.

I would like to know if there is a control over this or if they have to have permission from the OWRC before they establish them? Or does the OWRC come in after the damage is done in many cases?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, they must get approval from The Department of Health before they establish a dump for landfill.

Mr. Jackson: In the case of mine tailings, several of the smaller mines are dumping directly into lakes and the one in question is Larder Lake. For many years, this lake was a tourist attraction; it contained some of the biggest lake trout and each year they held a fishing derby. For the last five or six years, they have been unable to catch a decent amount out of this lake. All along one side of the lake, which is fairly big, the trees have died off, and it is because of the mine

tailings that are being dumped into this lake. I brought this up once before and they told me that the OWRC checked into this each month or so to make sure it was not polluting the lake. The pollution is obvious and I cannot understand why the OWRC has not stopped it. I cannot see any reason for it. Just to the east of the lake there are many pond holes and low spots in the land where the tailings could be dumped without any ill effect to the land.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the dumping of tailings in Larder Lake is something that happened many years ago, or at the beginning of the mine. And am I right now that the Larder Lake mine is closed?

Mr. Jackson: Kerr Addison mine, and they are still dumping tailings into Larder Lake.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is under the control of the Ontario water resources commission, and all mines today are inspected and come under the control of OWRC as far as dumping tailings is concerned.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would maybe, as a personal favour, look into it and let me know why they are still dumping tailings into it, and why they are still polluting the lake.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes. I would be pleased to.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): I should like to know what is the current assessment of these sanitary land fills? Are they now somewhat under a cloud, as the member for Timiskaming hinted; are they becoming the source of pollution themselves? Or are they still considered a good measure in all places?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would not say that it is a good measure in all places. I think they have to be picked out very carefully, and they must control the seepage from these landfills, so that it does not get into any streams.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I know of two that are right on the borders of a lake and are dumping right into the lake.

Mr. Chairman: Has the Minister any comment?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Is that sanitary landfill, or is it a dump? What type of material is it?

Mr. Jackson: It is a dump.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: This is contrary to OWRC regulations and, if you will let us know where it is, we would like to have a look at that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I would not tell you some of the things about this commission with such forcefulness if I did not assure you first that it is only because I know so much about this commission from personal experience with it.

The first thing that ought to be said about it is that, in my decade in politics, this is the most classic example of empire building that is has ever been my misfortune to study. There is no doubt in my mind at all, none whatsoever, that this commission wants to become the most gigantic water selling and transmitting agency that there is in the world, and it directs itself toward the advancement of that empire.

In doing so it breaches a fundamental principle of national justice, and that is that this commission is a judge in its own cause. It is both in the business of selling water, construction of the works, and providing water and sewage services. It also sets the standards, not only for itself, but for everybody else that is in the provision of that essential public service. And I say, sir, that that is a violation of a fundamental axiom.

I do not know whether it is a good analogy or parallel or not, but one observes that in the selling of liquor in this province, which is a government monopoly, the sale of the product, the standards, the restrictions and the control of its sale and use are rigidly separated and given to another body. And the two functions are kept separate. I am not protesting to you that that is a good analogy, but it is illustrative. But, of course, that principle is completely disobeyed in respect to this commission. This commission is in the business of selling water in a big way, and—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I am not going to be frivolous about it. I am drawing attention to the analogy.

It is in the business of carrying away and disposing of sewage in a big way. And being

in business, it is also the judge in respect of the standards, the qualities, the restrictions, and all the rest of the indicia about it. In that way, that to me, I protest to you, violates a fundamental principle. In other words, the commission cannot possibly be disinterested and objective. And I was not too concerned about that until it came home to me, by way of a brush with this commission, and I had an opportunity to observe the way in which they work.

Apparently, in the field of pollution, their attitude seems to be that where there is a conflict between two contending parties as to whether a body of water will be polluted, then as far as the commission is concerned, it is all right to pollute the body of water, provided that the contending parties agree that it be polluted.

To state it that way, of course, Mr. Chairman, removes any quality of objectivity about the matter of pollution in those circumstances. Gone is the question. Gone is the consideration, independently and objectively, of whether the body of water in the first place ought to be permitted to be polluted.

Apparently, there is no consideration of that at all. But this is purely the adversary system, and if they hold a hearing, and those who are immediately concerned about pollution of the body of water come to an agreement, settle the matter so to speak, then as far as the commission is concerned, acting in its placid, judicial capacity, it judges for all that—whatever label you put on it. They are judges.

Now, the commission, acting as judges, take the attitude that if the parties are content that the body of water be polluted, then that is fine with the commission. Of course, you will see, Mr. Chairman, that the broad public interest which would be referable to independent assessment of that body of water, as to whether in the interests of the public and from the long-term point of view, pollution of the body of water ought to be permitted, has completely gone out the window. And the commission walks away from such a list as that feeling that it has accomplished its purpose because it has achieved harmony between the contending parties.

Well, I can say that the member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) has been attending my words, and he knows the precise example of which I speak. I will tell the House another startling thing. I have said, when I had my place where my good friend from Niagara Falls now sits, and I have said since I came to this place in the House, that in respect of an overall water policy of the government of Ontario, there is evidence that there is an almost total lack of liaison between the departments who deal with water.

I have said, I do not think Hydro talks to the water resources commission about water. I do not think the water resources commission talks to our conservation authorities—or I should say the branch of the Minister's department. I do not think any of them talk to, or listen to The Department of Lands and Forests.

In the precise example of which I speak, with which the member for Wellington-Dufferin is familiar, sir, when the question of whether that body ought to be polluted came before the commission for judicial decision, one of the servants of the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) was there. He said to the commission, presumably on behalf of the Minister and through the chain of command and the hierarchy of that department—he spoke with the approval of the Minister—he said to the commission, "I hope you will not make the order. We ask you not to make the order to permit pollution of this lake."

And he gave reasons for that and, of course, the reasons were very trenchant, were very compelling, because that agent of the Minister of Lands and Forests pointed out the pollution of that body of water might cause adverse effects on that major watershed of the eastern part of the province—the Timiskaming-Ottawa system, and the pollution that was at hand and was being dealt with by that judicial body could, without stretching credulity or torturing logic, affect in a very adverse way the Timiskaming-Ottawa system.

I tell the Minister of Lands and Forests—I do not think he is familiar with that case—I report to him that, notwithstanding the representations and the importunings made by his agent on that day, the result is that as far as the water resources commission is concerned, the contending parties who left in conflict that day, settled their differences between them, having agreed that the body of water be polluted. Notwithstanding the representations of The Department of Lands and Forests, that body of water is going to be polluted.

That begs the question, a very legitimate one, to ask, in matters such as this, why is there not communication between this Minister, the chairman of the commission and either the Minister of Lands and Forests or

someone in a very senior level in the department? One must draw the irresistible inference that the word and the representation, or the weight of The Department of Lands and Forests in circumstances such as this is not very great, and whatever cogent arguments The Department of Lands and Forests can bring to muster then, sir, are rather shrugged off by the water resources commission.

That is what happened in this case. The Minister, if he wants to see whether I am right or wrong, then let him just ask the responsible people—with whom, presumably, he is on very good terms—of the intercourse of communications—to let him see the file and have a look at it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What case is it?

Mr. Sopha: This was the case of the pollution of Cobalt Lake by Agnico silver mines. I inform my friend from York South that, notwithstanding the arguments, and there were many, made at an open hearing, against this, the way the commission walked away from this was that the parties had settled the matter between them and it is all right with us; subject to certain conditions. But my complaint is that it lacks objectivity, that it lacks the judicial aspect; it lacks weighing the argument and coming to the correct decision in the circumstances.

And in the field of pollution in this province—this brings a smile; the record had better show how hilarious the Minister thinks all this is. I say that in the matter of pollution in this province one would hope that the water resources commission, in exercising its function by statute, would look at these problems from the point of view of what is in the broad public interest. This is not litigation; it is not a court case. What we are dealing with here is the ultimate effect on the people who use those waters now and the generations to come.

Whatever decision they came to, having been born and raised in Cobalt, and seen the depredation to lakes, having been to Kirkland Lake and seen it there; having been to Timmins and seen it there; having lived in Sudbury and seen it there; then let me say I must rather pessimistically form the conclusion that no matter the protestations made today by mining companies, and especially the smaller ones—no matter what exhibitions of good faith they make about the care they will take and the steps they will take, that ultimately when those companies—and so many of them have disappeared, gone into the mists of yesterday in their corporate form—then the damage is done. There is no one in later years to turn to in order to exact, at least in monetary terms, the rectification that is required.

I predict that the decision having been made by the commission to permit that lake to be filled up—the member for Wellington-Dufferin is going to get up and say that they are going to leave four feet of water—

Mr. MacDonald: Activate the sludge.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, they are going to leave four feet of water and that is going to be his reply. Well, I will anticipate him a little and tell him that no matter what protestations they make today, I have no doubt whatsoever that lake will become part of what we call the slimes during my lifetime in Cobalt. The same as the Buffalo slimes. The same phenomenon will exist after that lake is filled up, so I leave it to The Department of Lands and Forests in the light of that decision. It made its representations about the ultimate effect on Lake Timiskaming from that condition, and The Department of Lands and Forests will have to take the ultimate responsibility of those tailings being carried downstream into Mill Creek, and the effect upon that great lake.

And let me say this to the Minister, that in the very early stages of this whole business I had the advantage of having a ride in one of its aircraft and seeing the area where Mill Creek empties into Lake Timiskaming. And from the air one can observe these mill tailings that have been carried down and already have affected a wide part of the area where that creek flows into the lake.

What is my plea? My plea is very simple in this aspect, Mr. Chairman, that this commission puts away for all time this attitude of being the quasi-judicial body to effect settlement between adversaries, and that it approaches its task with the highest qualities of the judge, attended by objectivity and shrouded with the public interest. The commission's decision will then be determined solely by that which is in the public interest.

I want to turn to another matter and remind the Minister that two years ago I took the time of the House for an hour or so to review the situation of water and sewer services in the municipalities adjoining the city of Sudbury. I pointed out at that time that since the city of Sudbury had been built upon rock, the natural expansion of that city

was into the area covered by soil, known as the valley area—that is to say, the townships of Blezard, Capreol, Hanmer, Rayside, Balfour, and Dowling. And I must say—the Minister of Municipal Affairs would permit me I know—

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I wonder if the hon. member would permit me to make a comment on what he had to say; you are going into another subject.

Mr. Sopha: Tell me you are going to reverse your decision.

Mr. Root: I just wanted to point out that at the hearing there was no evidence that anything was put into the lake that was not already in the lake. Tons of arsenic were being taken out of the tailings that were in the lake. The Department of Lands and Forests were there and their comment was they did not want to see any deterioration of the waters. At the hearing a commitment was made by the town of Cobalt to get their raw, sanitary sewage out of the lake.

There was no agreement to pollute this body of water; the tailings are presently in the lake. They were being processed and moved to another part of the lake.

There was nothing actually being put in the lake that was not already there and tons of arsenic were being taken out of the tailings and the sanitary waste that was already polluting the lake. It was agreed by the mayor of the town that they would take steps to get this out of the lake. The matter was not shrugged off. I just wanted to make that comment.

The hon. member did make a good presentation at the hearing—we listened to the statements of the groups who appeared before us. They did not make the final decision on how the waters of that lake are to be protected. The decisions are being made by the industrial waste branch of the commission. I just want to make that comment. I would not want to read in *Hansard* that these decisions are made by bodies other than by the water resources commission.

Mr. Sopha: I want to say to my hon. friend from Timiskaming, through you, that we cannot convince the vice-chairman of the water resources commission that the tailings are not now in the lake—and I call for support from the member who represents that constituency. They are going to be put in, 700,000 tons of them. And it is idle and nonsensical for the vice-chairman to stand up and say to me that the tailings are in the lake. He knows very well what we are speaking of, that the north portion of the lake is today empty of the tailings and permission has been granted or is going to be granted to this mining company to put 700,000 tons of tailings in that part of the lake.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, can I, with your permission, just add to this? The member for Sudbury has pointed out something that is true, that the tailings that are going into this lake are being moved from the outside of the lake, from what formerly was the lake. But they are being moved back into the section of the land that we call Cobalt Lake and it is a scenic part of that area.

When this mine finishes we are going to have just exactly what the member for Sudbury says, nothing but slime with a little bit of water over it. At the moment we have something that beautifies the town a little bit.

An hon. member: Tory government.

Mr. Jackson: But when this finishes we will have nothing but an eyesore for the rest of time. I cannot help but agree with the member for Sudbury, that the water resources commission has abdicated its duty somewhere along the line and just gave up and said, "Let the mines do what they want," because that is just exactly what is happening.

By the time this commission gets around to stopping them from polluting the little lakes around the area, the mine has closed up and gone.

An hon. member: Certainly!

Mr. Jackson: I will have to support the member for Sudbury on this.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the hon. member a question. Would you like the mine closed?

Mr. Sopha: I would.

Mr. MacDonald: Red herring.

Mr. Jackson: The Minister is talking silly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

The member for Timiskaming has the floor and a question was directed to him by the Minister.

Has the Minister finished his question?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, I think so.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the member for Timiskaming will answer it now.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister. This mine does not have to close down just because they have tailings to move. There are many other areas where, with a little pipeline, they could put these tailings.

It is nonsense to say that they have to pollute a lake to stay in business; this just is not true.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am not saying it is true. I have never discussed this with OWRC, only I heard a week or so ago that, if they could not do something with this refuse from the tailings they are taking out of the lake, that they were going to close their mine. Now I do not know—that is why I asked the question.

Mr. MacDonald: You get pushed around too easily.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I have not been pushed around at all yet, but I have asked the question of the member that represents the area—if he would like the mine closed? If, that is, they will not do something else with their tailings.

Mr. MacDonald: But you are—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is a fair question. I cannot see anything wrong with it.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a stupid question.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You do not want to answer it.

Mr. Jackson: As I have already stated, there is—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Timiskaming has the floor.

Mr. Jackson: —there is no need for the mine to close and there is no need for the government to take their word for it that they are going to close.

If they would go up and take a look at it, rather than sitting at a meeting and taking their word for it—take a look at the real situation—they would know that there is no truth in the mine's having to close because of the fact that they have to move their tailings another half mile or so. It is possible and it should be done.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I asked him a question—

Mr. Sopha: The member for Timiskaming is perfectly right. Knowing the areas as I do, I went to that hearing and suggested that the commission require them to put the tailings in Cart Lake. Cart Lake is as close to east as Cobalt lake is to the north and I never heard, at any time, a single argument of any cogency from that mining company that Cart Lake was unfeasible.

The first argument they gave was that Cart Lake would drain into Peterson Lake and would ultimately affect the watershed to the east. I said by way of reply, "Build a dam at the north end of Cart Lake". Cart Lake is merely a depression; it is not in a drainage pattern. It is so typical of the shield; there are many depressions in the shield that can be filled up. They just do not form part of any dendritic—I think that is the right word—drainage pattern. They are merely depressions.

I said to the commission, "Have them dam that end of Cart Lake and fill it up". I have no doubt that when they get that filled up with their tailings they can find another to put them in. They do not have to put it into Cobalt Lake.

All right now. If this business of closing the mine is going to come up, weighing the ultimate effects—the possible adverse effects—on the Timiskaming-Ottawa system to the east. I want the record to show how many employees would be affected—the member for Wellington-Dufferin will bear me out—about 25 employees. That is the size of this operation.

If that subject is exhausted, I want to return to the other that I raised. I was reminding the Minister that two years ago I made a speech here, in which I advocated the study of the municipalities adjacent to the city of Sudbury to assess the water and sewage needs. As I say, Mr. Chairman, as I informed you, the reason for my interest is that that is the logical area where expansion of the city of Sudbury is going to take place.

I was very encouraged after I made that speech that the water resources commission charged, I think it was Kilborn—I look at my friend from Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers)—he nods—it was the Kilborn firm, to make a study. That firm took much too long to suit me, but the commission did not keep in touch with me about it, or did not inform me how the study was going. From time to time I ask my old buddy from Nickel Belt there and he tells me what is happening. However, eventually they reported.

My complaint is that this business has just not gone ahead fast enough. If you will permit, Mr. Chairman—you are in charge of the relevancy of debate here—I want to point

out to you that, because of the tardiness of this commission in this area and the provision of water and sewage services, I want to show you how those affect our broadcast in other areas of government responsibility and particularly, in the field of housing.

In those municipalities, those people who want to build houses, which are so desperately needed in the Sudbury area, are trapped in a vicious circle from which they cannot escape. On the one hand they are unable to get CMHC loans, because of that policy that they will not lend money where there is no sewage and water services. They cannot build the homes in order to increase the assessment, so that they are able to pay for the provision of sewage and water services. So you see, Mr. Chairman, they get into a vicious circle from which they cannot get out.

One of the major difficulties—and my friend from the Nickel Belt will appreciate this—is the multiplicity of municipalities. There are far too many municipalities in the valley which comprises the riding of my friend from Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) and my friend from Nickel Belt. There ought to be some readjustment of those municipalities, so that the commission is dealing with fewer local governments.

But, Mr. Chairman, the matter drags on. It drags on and one does not see any initiation of the work to provide the necessary services to these people. Building is retarded. The provision of homes for the expanding population of our community is inhibited. In the meanwhile, on a happier note, the mining industry is expanding at a very high rate and many more hundreds of jobs are being provided, as a result of that expansion, to people who will need housing accommodation. So really, Mr. Chairman, my protest is that it goes back to my earlier assertion. This commission has become too big.

I think that that description of it is neither unfair nor inept. It has just too much to do, to attend to the local needs of a community, such as the example that I have cited. On the other hand, a very persistent complaint about their attitude is—and I have said this to my friend from Wellington-Dufferin—they walk into the city of Sudbury—I only know what I read in the newspapers and what I am told by the various civic officials. If a member of the Opposition pleaded to hear something at first hand from a government body, then he would think that he was afflicted with deafness, because there are never any oral droppings that ever emanate to a member of the Opposition. Well, he is just not advantaged in hearing from a commission what they intend to do.

To show you the high-handed attitude of this commission, from time to time we have been aware in the city of Sudbury that the commission writes a letter and sends an emissary up to the city and they say, "Look here, you have to build a sewage treatment plant at the cost of some $5 million." The member for Wellington-Dufferin will correct me, that is the figure that is bandied around in the community. Of course, the city fathers look at this emissary like he is something from outer space and the natural question is: Where do we get the money to do this? Where do we get the money?

I maintain, and I will always maintain, that at the point where we had the advantage of having Mr. Desmarais on that commission, until he decided to join his brother's empire in Montreal, that we might have seen the reality of a change in government policy, whereby the consolidated revenue fund would be charged with the capital cost of the provision of these very expensive sewage treatment facilities. But, unfortunately, I forget now—I think it is something like six or eight cities in the province of Ontario—that have not got these facilities, of which Sudbury is one of the leading examples.

But that went out the window and we are still polluting, by the disposal of raw sewage, the watershed to the south and west of the area and the Penage Lake area, a very beautiful recreation area. We advised against the dumping of sewage into the Kelly Lake chain. Now, there is just no way out and there will not be any way out until the Prime Minister of the province decides finally and ultimately that mining companies should pay taxes like the rest of us.

That is the political decision that has to be made. If the mining companies ever started to pay their fair share of taxation, rather than enjoying the tax immunity that they do, these things could be provided.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): They might move out.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, they might move out! So the last subject that I wanted to deal with perhaps I will leave. Are you taking these in order, the various items, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with votes 606, 607 and 610, which are all part of the water resources, so the debate has been ranging on all of these things.

Mr. Sopha: I wanted to say something about this northern Ontario water resources survey, but I will reserve this for later.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I was rather interested when I listened to the great number of fines that went out to various companies.

In an article written by a Mr. Greenslade in 1967, one of the interesting parts was that there was a farmer fined for dumping cow manure in a creek. He was fined $500. You listen then to the companies that were fined $200, and $18 and costs, and so on. The comparison between the two is rather interesting.

I would like to read a few excerpts from this article dealing with the various areas of water pollution in the Nickel Basin. This is going to take some time, Mr. Chairman. Shall I go on?

Mr. Chairman: The member may continue.

Mr. Martel: I am quoting:

> Wildlife experts of The Department of Lands and Forests say that all around Sudbury there are small lakes now barren which once teemed with fish. Because of pollution dropped from the air, game fish can no longer survive.

And:

> Conservation clubs, municipal governments, chambers of commerce and various other groups have at one time or another voiced their protests about the situation.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. What has this got to do with air pollution?

Mr. Martel: No, I am talking about water pollution, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member will please refrain from discussing air pollution.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, this is water pollution. I just finished reading that there are small lakes, now barren, which once teemed with fish, and you wonder what type of pollution I am talking about. They did not die from swimming around in the air. They were formerly swimming around in the water and they no longer exist, and so I presume that I am talking about water pollution.

Mr. Chairman: I presume also that the member is. Will he please continue?

Mr. Martel: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The interesting part that I am getting to is that we fine someone $500, and last year we fined the public utilities of the CNR another $500. We have got all kinds of laws in this country that could fine some of the large industries for pollution, and to my knowledge, in my area, nobody outside of this poor farmer, and the CNR, the publicly owned utility, have been prosecuted for water pollution. A rather interesting fact!

It being 6:00 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

ERRATA

Page	*Column*	*Line*	*Change to read:*
		Thursday, May 16, 1968	
3011	2	46	for the operation of schools. Eighty per
3012	1	8	introduced today will relieve the association
		Tuesday, May 28, 1968	
3511	2	36	writers, I have no researchers. I discovered
		Monday, June 3, 1968	
Contents		1	Presenting report, Province of Ontario Council for the Arts, 1967-68, Mr. Davis 3763
3763	1	13	the report of the Province of Ontario Council for the Arts for the year 1967-68.
		Wednesday, June 5, 1968	
3991	1	37	spring to the Minister's defence, when he

No. 117

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 12, 1968

Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett, continued 4365

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 4394

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
(Continued)

On vote 606:

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, prior to recessing for dinner, the hon. member for Sudbury and the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Jackson) were discussing—and conveyed to this House—that the OWRC were part and parcel of helping Agnico Mines Ltd. pollute Cobalt Lake. I might say at this time that the hon. member for Sudbury was the legal counsel for the town of Cobalt. I asked before the dinner hour if these people were interested in seeing this mine close down, although it is a small operation and reclaiming minerals that had been milled once before and are now known as slag in Cobalt Lake.

I think, if I recall correctly, the hon. member for Sudbury said that they only employed 25 men, so it could not matter less.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I did not say that at all!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You did not say it, but that is what you implied. I would think that 25 men employed in Cobalt, or one or two men, mean a lot to the economic stability of that town. As I closed the question, there was an uproar from the NDP saying that I was drawing red herrings. I was not. I was not in on the hearing but I had talked, some three weeks ago, to a consultant of the mining company. He advised me at the time that if they had to pump their waste to, I think the hon. member called it Cart Lake and I think that this was right, the expenditures and the cost of pumping would not allow them to operate this mine. It would not be economically possible to do so and they would have to close down.

Mr. Sopha: So they said.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, that is what they said, and I was concerned about that because it was brought out on the floor of the House and to my attention. I thought that everyone was settled and satisfied. But when it was brought here, I decided during the dinner hour that I would get hold of the consultant for the mining company and find out from him just what he thought about it. I would like to read some correspondence into the record that perhaps will clear up this matter.

This is a letter addressed to the OWRC by the solicitor of the mining company, Schibley, Righton and McCutcheon, and he said:

> Gentlemen:
>
> At the conclusion of the hearing at Cobalt, the chairman of the commission recommended that the interested parties should confer together. We are pleased to advise that a meeting has been convened for the purpose by the mayor of Cobalt on Monday, April 15.
>
> Representatives of the townships of Coleman and Bucke, the town of Cobalt and the tri-town planning board will be in attendance. The aim of the meeting is to review the supplementary submissions made by Agnico Mines Liimted, and hopefully to work out a plan which meets with the acceptance of everyone and which will permit the withdrawal of any objection to the operations at Agnico. We shall, of course, immediately advise the commission of any developments at the pending meeting, and should the commission wish to be represented thereat we are certain that everyone would agree thereto.
>
> The chairman, indicated that this type of conference should be held prior to April 30, 1968, and we are somewhat anxious that we be given a full opportunity to complete these discussions.

That is signed by Schibley, Righton and McCutcheon. A letter from Schibley, Righton and McCutcheon to OWRC on April 16:

> Gentlemen:
>
> We wish to report that a meeting was held at Cobalt on April 15, 1968, at which there were in attendance the mayor of Cobalt, the reeves of Bucke and Coleman townships, the chairman of the tri-town

planning board, four councillors of the town of Cobalt, Mrs. E. Gordon, solicitor, Mr. J. Blair of Kilborn Engineering Ltd., Mr. Kirk of Agnico Mines Ltd., and the writer.

At this meeting the information set forth in the supplementary report of Kilborn Engineering Ltd., dated April 4, 1968, was reviewed, and full explanation was given of the steps to be taken to ensure that Cobalt Lake would not be polluted by the operations of Agnico Mines Ltd, and would be left in a state acceptable to all interested parties.

During the course of the meeting, all representatives—

Mr. Sopha: Except me and The Department of Lands and Forests.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Have you finished?

During the course of the meeting, all representatives of Agnico Mines Ltd.—

Mr. Sopha: Except The Department of Lands and Forests, at least.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We heard that this afternoon, and that is not right either.

During the course of the meeting, all representatives of Agnico Mines Ltd., absented themselves to permit others to consider their positions jointly in the hope that a revised plan and undertaking might permit them to register approval of the tailings operation to the commission.

It was brought to our attention that the change of location of the sewage outlets would involve the town of Cobalt in considerable cost, and we subsequently offered a contribution of $5,000 toward such cost, recognizing that the withdrawal of these outfalls would benefit not only the town but will advance the ambitions of the township, the planning board, and even the plans of Agnico Mines Ltd.

On the other hand, it was indicated that favourable consideration would be given to an operation which would leave the tailings covered with four feet of water.

We trust you will bring these developments to the attention of the commission. You may expect to hear further from all concerned in the immediate future.

Signed,
R. P. Schibley.

And on April 22, addressed to the Ontario water resources commission from the tri-town and area planning board:

Gentlemen:

We are enclosing copies of two motions passed by the tri-town and area planning board at our regular meeting of April 17, 1968.

The first motion, relative to the above application, was passed with the understanding, first, that Agnico will take immediate steps to wash present exposed tailings from their previous operations into the lake as outlined by counsel, Mr. Schibley; second, that a minimum water cover of four feet be maintained over all depository tailings from this or any subsequent operations, also as outlined by Mr. Schibley; third, that tailings be deposited only in the northern section of the lake, unless further agreed; fourth, that in every phase of this operation, the aims and ambitions of the planning board to develop Cobalt, along restorational lines, be given consideration as recognized by Agnico and mentioned by Mr. Schibley at the meeting of April 15, 1968. All the above subject, of course, to any agreement entered into or approved by the town of Cobalt, the townships of Bucke and Coleman, with Agnico Mines Limited.

The second motion refers to pollution of Mill Creek by agencies other than Agnico.

Mr. Sopha: Sure, another mining company.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We were not talking about this one this afternoon, though.

We realize you are aware of it, but we wanted to be on record as opposed to this pollution, and further recommended, first, that these operations be requested to consider steps to remedy this undesirable situation. Second, that plans be implemented to contain the pollution already present in and along this watercourse.

Finally, we would like to acknowledge the courtesy extended in inviting the planning board to participate in this problem and to commend Agnico Mines Limited for their considerate and co-operative attitude.

Sincerely,
W. S. Lavery,
Chairman of the tri-town and area planning board.

I have the copy of those resolutions here, but I do not think I will read them in the records. I think that is proof enough.

And then a letter from Ontario water resources commission on April 13 to Schibley, Righton and McCutcheon.

Gentlemen:

Thank you for your recent letter of April

16, 1968, covering the discussions of the meeting held at Cobalt on April, 1968.

Your letter was referred to the commission with the result that the municipalities in the tri-town and area planning board were requested to submit their present views on your client's application.

Based on written replies from the town of Cobalt the townships of Bucke and Coleman and the tri-town and area planning board and information gained from the hearing on March 19, the commission further reviewed and considered the application of Agnico Mines Ltd. for a discharge of tailings to the north section of Cobalt Lake. Accordingly, the following resolution was passed by the commission on April 25, 1968:

After the full report by Messrs. D. A. Moody and J. H. Roote to the commission under section 32 (a) 2 on a public hearing held by Messrs. Moody and Roote in the town of Cobalt on the 19th day of March, 1968, under section 32 (a) 1 of the Act, on the application of Agnico Mines Ltd. for approval to discharge spent tailings from the company's silver reclaim mill to the north section of Cobalt Lake, the same is hereby approved subject to Agnico Mines Ltd. submitting an addendum to application No. 1C-67 1, already on file with the OWRC outlining:

1. The modifications the company will make to the proposed method of introducing tailings to Cobalt, to ensure that the control measures outlined to represent this, at the townships of Bucke and Coleman and the town of Cobalt, and the tri-town and area planning board, at a meeting held on April 15, 1968, in Cobalt, are implemented, and

2. A suitable, over-all water pollution and land rehabilitation programme that will ensure no deterioration of the quality of water in Cobalt Lake, over the period of actual operation of the company tailing mill and, also, following cessation of this operation. Such a programme should include reference to water sampling and analysis: the method of controlling the flow from Cobalt Lake; the shoreline improvements of the lands bordering on Cobalt Lake, which are presently under the direct control of Agnico Mines Ltd.

It is therefore requested, that Agnico Mines Ltd. submit to the commission, at its earliest convenience, a written proposal which will satisfy the above resolution of the commission. If your client, or representatives of Kilborn Engineering Ltd. desire to meet with staff, at the commission, to discuss this further submission, we would be pleased to arrange a mutually convenient time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think after what we have heard this afternoon, that the OWRC were wrong in this, I would think that they are right. The people—elected representatives in the area—asked for this, and I think they can be assured, that after this operation is completed, Cobalt Lake will be a better, cleaner lake. This has been proven. And, of course, we could read more in the records to prove that.

Mr. Sopha: Well, two things are absolutely clear. The necessary inferences, from what the Minister said, are twofold. One, that if, at any hearing of the board, there is an agreement between elected representatives and the company that desires to pollute the lake, then the jurisdiction, or the interest in, of the OWRC is at an end. That is the necessary inference, and let the record declare that, aside from The Department of Lands and Forests that were there protesting against this decision, there were several other interested citizens and bodies that asked the commission not to permit this mining company to fill up the lake. So when the day comes that Cobalt Lake is converted into slimes, as are the Buffalo slimes which was formerly a lake, then the people of Cobalt, aside from the elected representatives whoever they might be at that day, can put a placard on those slimes and write on it, "Erected to the folly of the OWRC".

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You will never see it.

Mr. Sopha: That will be the fitting monument. Now, the other necessary inference—and the people of Ontario ought to know this because out in the body politic there are a good many people who have a good deal to say about pollution—they ought to know that it is clear, that the foundation of government policy, in respect of pollution, is this—and I think I state it fairly—that when it comes to a violation of efficiency of commerce, then commerce must have pre-eminence over pollution. What else could be the basis of the hurling of that interjection at the member for Timiskaming: You should close the mine down? So we must conclude that we can have all kinds of idealistic thoughts about control of pollution, and we could wish that we would not have pollution, but when we meet the hard world of reality—the choice between commercial activity and pollution—

we will take the pollution every time, we will suffer it. There is no other inference to be drawn from that interjection.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You did not prove—

Mr. Sopha: We have to suffer. Now, Mr. Coplice is a very intelligent young fellow, very qualified, but I fear that Agnico took him here. I said to Mr. Coplice along the way, "If we put it to them that they ought to use Cart Lake, then you should put the onus on them, let them have the onus. They hired Kilborn, they had all the experts. Let them show that Cart Lake is not feasible, or some alternative site, instead of accepting the word that it would make it economically prohibitive." I refuse to believe it and in the absence of proof in the form of documentation—as my friend, the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) likes to say—in the absence of that I am unwilling to accept the word. I am unwilling to allow them to fill up that lake as they are going to do.

One final thing ought to be said to make the matter complete. The attitude of OWRC throughout this whole thing did not do them credit. From the outset, the commission acted like a cunning lawyer. I was lucky enough to anticipate it. When we first raised the matter with OWRC that Agnico was filling up the lake, and at that time—indeed they were filling up the lake, the south end of the lake within a few hundred feet of the sewage outlet—they had already piled up their tailings above the water surface. When we acquainted them with it, in a very cunning way OWRC wrote back and adopted the maxim *ex turpi causa non oritur actio.*

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Oh!

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes. "Look who is talking," they said. They alluded in their letter to the fact that the town of Cobalt was putting raw sewage into the lake. In other words, the reply was: You are complaining about Agnico but you are putting raw sewage in yourself. I thought that over, and when we went down to the grand offices over at College and Bay I anticipated that they would raise it. I spoke to the council ahead of time in an endeavour to outflank them, to end-run them. Lo and behold, when we complained about Agnico filling up the lake, the OWRC said: "Well, what about your raw sewage?" The mayor said to the commission: "What do you want us to do? Do you want us to build a sewage treatment plant? You come in and assist us to do it and we will be glad to co-operate with you."

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I thought you suggested that.

Mr. Sopha: Indeed I did. But, you see, one had to have a great deal of curiosity about the attitude. You are complaining about a company polluting a lake and instead of dealing with the issue you have raised, they pull the old dirty hands doctrine, like a cunning lawyer. They say by way of reply: "Look who is talking, you are polluting the lake yourself." Well, let me tell you, of the recollections I can fetch up in my memory, no marathon swims have been held in Cobalt Lake and—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: If you were born there.

Mr. Sopha: I was born there. Indeed I was born there. I have an interest in that lake. I have an interest in it. It adds something to the town and I do not like to see the water resources commission coming in there and letting somebody fill it up.

But that was the attitude. I outlined the attitude at the beginning of this. I can only conclude this. Surely, I acted for the town of Cobalt. The town folded, it folded in the face of this—and it boils down to this: Agnico is giving the water resources commission a snow job. They bought it and if they start to put in the 700,000 tons of tailings, there is no doubt in my mind to say to my friend from Timiskaming, they are going to fill up that lake and—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You have got him hooked before—

Mr. Sopha: Well he represents those people. He knows about the problem.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not think he agrees with you, all the same.

Mr. Sopha: He knows the problem. But the obligation on the Minister, I would think—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well I would be careful—

Mr. Sopha: I would think, having felt himself in the invidious position that he has, that his obligation is to allay the fears of the people of Ontario. Put it this way—I think the people of Ontario should know, as a result of what the Minister has said in this House today, they should know once and for all that pollution control has to give way to commerce. Because where a people and their livelihood, depend upon commerce, the strength of our economy, our people, our system and everything else depends upon our commercial activity.

The people of Ontario should know. Maybe it would make for an economy of words about pollution—make for an economy of words and groanings and moanings among the body politic. Maybe people will realize—once and for all—that we have to accept pollution, rather than in any way inhibit it. If the Minister will not inhibit a company employing 25 men, he is certainly not going to inhibit any company employing more.

That is the story of our life. That is the story of KVP where the court enforced the law and this Legislature changed the law and permitted the pollution. That is the story that my friend from Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) is now going to embark upon and I will not anticipate him, save to make this comment on the story of International Nickel, by way of parenthesis. It must be seven or eight years ago that this mighty commission came into Sudbury and at great expense prepared a very compendious report on the pollution of the waters in the Sudbury area by International Nickel. It has never brought that company to the book in any way to add a surcease to it. But, I remember a comment by the chairman of OWRC at one time—well, maybe it was the vice-chairman, I do not want to be unfair about this—one of them. They always travel together and if you meet one, you meet the other. They made a comment that it would cost a lot of money for Inco to correct the pollution. Well, if you are talking about costing a lot of money, I do not know who has got more of the green stuff than Inco to correct it. I always took the position as a matter of principle—underline that, as a matter of principle—that this American company came here to extract the ore from ground that belongs to the people of Ontario. One of the prices of extracting that ore—one of the costs—is to do it as free of pollution as is reasonably possible. That is one of the costs.

The other cost is that they pay some municipal taxes. The only thing the Premier (Mr. Robarts) of this province ever does about municipal taxes is to put the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers) on another committee.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order. That is not in order.

Mr. Sopha: Well when The Mining Act came up you reviewed the whole mines taxation thing—can I not just make one comment? But that principle has never got home to the OWRC to this date. That commission is subservient to commerce and in no event interferes with commerce. Well the Minister can read all that correspondence into the record that he wants. I would like to hear some letters from The Department of Lands and Forests; that question remains unanswered. Remains unanswered, that a—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I have not seen any.

Mr. Sopha: —that a senior official—maybe he was not so senior, I even forget who he was—he came from somewhere, I do not know where. He had the uniform on, you would think that he was Minister of Lands and Forests, Mr. Chairman, generalissimo of an army the way his people go around in uniforms. We will send them all to Viet Nam if Canada has a commitment over there. But one of his officials came to the hearing and put the position of the department. Now it is quite obvious to me, I can tell by looking at the face of the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) that he never heard anything about this—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Nobody else did either.

Mr. Sopha: There is a lot goes on that he does not know in his department, but it further underlines what I have always said. Do we need more evidence? I have said it many times in this House regarding the policy toward water in this province, its use, its possible pollution and its conservation, that there is no liaison in that department at all. None at all.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, of course, that is what you say, you cannot prove it.

Mr. Sopha: No liaison, I have proved it. I have demonstrated it in this example.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You have not even proved that.

Mr. Sopha: Have not proved it? Does the Minister question my word?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do.

Mr. Sopha: You are accusing me of an untruth, are you?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, what have you been doing all evening?

Mr. Sopha: Well, I asked Mr. Herridge if it would be all right if one of his people was appearing at the hearing. The date of the hearing was March 19, and Mr. Herridge said yes, they would be represented, so I will have to get an affidavit from Mr. Herridge and find out the name of the man.

But no one else here, Mr. Chairman, takes the Minister seriously, not nearly as seriously as he takes himself. And my word will be accepted that there was a man there from Lands and Forests.

Finally, just before I sit down, I want to state that point again so that everyone within my hearing will hear it: I do not see the function of OWRC in relation to pollution as being to effect settlements—that is not what they are paid for, that is not what they exist for, to effect settlements between contending parties. They are paid to be objective and to determine in respect of a body of water what is in the interests of the body politic as a whole, the public as a whole, and they bring all the qualities of a judge to that issue and that is the only issue there is before them, none other.

They must decide the issue before them on that basis and not out of concern for the contending adversaries at all, because were it otherwise, then eventually every body of water in this province would be polluted. They are supposed to be the protectors of the public interest, and when reasonable, to prevent the waters from being polluted. So we have lost the battle in this one, but the people in the Cobalt-Haileybury area, other than the council, will be aware of what was at stake here and how those in the employ of the public service failed us so dismally.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to say I am sorry that the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) is not here tonight because at a recent planning board meeting in Cobalt, they spoke of making Cobalt a tourist area, and the hon. Minister was the guest speaker that evening. One of the things said was about the natural beauty of this area, and I cannot see how the planning board could possibly go along with what they are doing to that lake, which is the only beauty spot in Cobalt.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Is the member denying they wrote that letter?

Mr. Jackson: I just cannot see why they did.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I can show it to you.

Mr. Jackson: I cannot understand why they did. This does not excuse the Minister's department, however. But let us go a little further. He also said there were other sources of pollution in this area. What is he doing about these other sources of pollution? If we go on into Lake Timiskaming right at the moment—one of the greatest tourist attractions, one of the places in northern Ontario where you used to be able to put a boat in and get your catch of pickerel within three hours at the very least—now you can fish for three weeks and not get your catch.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You are not a very good fisherman. I was up there last year—

Mr. Jackson: The Minister has been very lucky.

Not only this, but in Lake Timiskaming at the moment there is a green growth in the water and this has been mentioned, it must have been mentioned, to the Ontario water resources commission. The Minister must know about it. What are they doing about this? The only thing I can see they are doing is sitting back and agreeing with certain elected officials that he has not named, other than the planning board.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I named all the municipal officials in the area.

Mr. Jackson: I will have a talk with them when I go back. Nevertheless, what is the Minister doing about it? Is he going to just sit back and say, "Well, they have agreed so we are going to let them continue polluting it." We are going to kill the tourist industry because Agnico Mines wants to say in operation for the employment of 25 people, as the member for Sudbury has pointed out; we are going to put the tourist industry out of business in Timiskaming. Is this what we are going to do? Or are we going to tell Agnico and a few others to get it cleaned up? And then do what the planning board said they were going to do, and what this government tells us every day we should do in the north—draw in the tourists. We cannot do it unless this government takes firm steps to clean up the lakes and get the fish back into them and we will never do it with the attitude that the Minister has shown here today.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): They will do a study.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member, I would say this, that OWRC and the government of this province are going to keep 25 men employed in Cobalt and we are going to clean up the lake and it will be cleaner with this operation going on than it is at the present time. Now, need I say more?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Yes, you should say more.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I have three unrelated topics that I want to discuss briefly.

The first one is that, having listened to this discussion about the situation in Cobalt Lake, there are two or three rather overriding considerations that seem to emerge from it. I think we have to get one thing clear, that the professed objective of this Minister and the government is to clean up pollution.

If this is your professed objective, you should not, in the course of relating this whole incident, have indicated, unwittingly perhaps, in your narrative, two or three occasions in which you were trying to justify this pollution because there was other pollution. For example, at one point in the argument you said—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. MacDonald: I have the floor, have I not, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: A point of order?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The hon. member for Sudbury this afternoon said that the creek was polluted through the operation of this mine, and I was clearing up a point.

Mr. Sopha: I have no doubt about it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, you are saying it again, but it is not from this mine.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if the creek was polluted by areas other than this mine and OWRC was told in a hearing, it would seem to me that the interest of OWRC and the Minister would not only be the further pollution that might come from here, but that they would zero in with vigour on other sources of pollution—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Which we have done.

Mr. MacDonald: —and that they would not use as an argument—I am accepting the word from the hon. member for Sudbury now—that OWRC would not be advancing an argument by saying, "but you are polluting the lake." Surely nothing could be more relevant than that the town of Cobalt is polluting their lake. If the town of Cobalt is polluting the lake, OWRC should have said, "Look, these people are not going to pollute the lake and, moreover, one split second after we are finished with them we are going to get at you because you are polluting the lake." Then you would have given the impression that you were really interested in achieving your professed objective.

Let me make one other comment in this connection. The Minister interjected completely irrelevantly and indicated his whole attitude and the attitude of this government —and in this I agree with the hon. member for Sudbury—when he interjected this afternoon, "Would you close the mine down?" Let me say something to the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, would you?

Mr. MacDonald: Let me say something to the Minister. If this government is really intent on cleaning up pollution there may be occasions when you will eliminate jobs.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Right.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. If you are intent on cleaning up pollution and you are not kidding the public, you are not presenting a hypocritical front, you will make certain that there is no pollution. There may be occasions when you will have to say, "Fine, these 25 jobs go by the board, because we are not going to continue to pollute our environment in this province of Ontario." And if you do not stick by that principle, then you are really bowing to the contention the hon. member for Sudbury put forward, that when it is a clash between commerce and continued pollution, you are willing to let commerce go on even if the continued pollution survives. Now, make up your mind; one way or the other.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We have it made up now.

Mr. MacDonald: It may be made up in terms of principles, but the whole point that we are making on this side of the House is that in terms of the implementation of those principles, when there is a conflict between commerce and continued pollution, you permit them to be breached time and time again. And you permit them to be breached because of the pressure from the vested interests who try to make a profit out of reclaiming the silver from the tailings in the lake or whatever it happens to be. You may be interested in that but you should not be interested to the extent of permitting them to continue the pollution.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We can do two things. We can clean up the pollution and employ people.

Mr. MacDonald: If you can do both, fine, but too often the pollution is continued under the excuse that you must have the jobs. To get up and read letters from lawyers saying

that the mine is going to close down is neither here nor there. It is an art, a trade of lawyers, to threaten and cajole to achieve by any means, the objectives of their clients.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not read any letter from a lawyer into this.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the way that they operate, and if you are going to be a patsy for the pressuring of these lawyers then you will never clean up pollution.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am not and I never will be.

Mr. MacDonald: This Minister is a big tough fellow but there is no bigger patsy when it comes to this sort of thing. Let me tell the Minister a story. I do not want to go into the details of Sudbury because some of my colleagues come from there, and they are more knowledgeable. But I will tell the Minister a story which has a very interesting moral.

During the last election in Sudbury, a canvasser for the New Democratic Party at one time was knocking on the door of a home—and he did not know who lived in it—in a certain suburban area of Sudbury. The man opened the door and he happened to be a man in the management of Inco, and when the canvasser got talking with him, he discovered that this man was voting NDP, and he was taken aback. He said, "How do you explain the fact that you are in management of Inco and you are going to vote NDP?" The man replied, "I will tell you why." He said, "Until the NDP are elected here, the people who sit in the board rooms of New York are never going to clean up the pollution in Sudbury."

And as a matter of fact, I am on the hon. member for Sudbury's side in terms of the argument insofar as Inco goes that neither the Tories nor the Liberals will clean it up, because they are both in the pocket of industry.

That was a good story and it had a moral, too. And the people in Sudbury are catching onto the moral.

My third unrelated item that I wanted to get to is in the category of a little bit of pollution added to the accumulation which is forming in our environment.

May I start by asking the Minister a question. I hear whisperings to the effect that there may be a delay in the regulations for coping with pollution enanating from boats that did not have adequate equipment to cope with waste disposal and therefore it was going into the lakes. These regulations, the implementation of which has been put forward to next January 1, may be postponed again. Is there anything in that rumour? Or is the decision now firm, that as of January 1 next, all boats must have the necessary equipment?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that I have not heard the whisperings, and I do not know where they are. Of course, we did not say that they must all have holding tanks by January 1, 1969; we said by July 1, 1971—when the regulations first came out.

Mr. MacDonald: You said in July 1968.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sorry, we did not. If you would read the regulations, we said that all boats must have holding tanks by July 1, 1971.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister looks like a cat that has been eating the canary. He thinks that he has beaten the Opposition down!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You should hear the whisperings out in the hall!

Mr. MacDonald: He must think that he is playing marbles with the boys in the school yard. You are in the big game now, and this is important business that the Minister is supposed to be looking after, not playing little games. Smiling like he has just pulled off a coup!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I can play your game any time!

Mr. MacDonald: What was the regulation that was to go into effect on July 1, 1968, and that was postponed?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That all new boats built after July 1, 1968, must have holding tanks. Older boats could use macerator-chlorinators till July 1, 1971. We are going ahead with that regulation starting January 1, 1969.

Mr. MacDonald: It is on the record again; what the Minister said is on the record.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It was on the record two weeks ago.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, sure. The Minister had this on the record two years ago—that by 1970 all pollution in Ontario would be cleaned up.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is not 1971 yet.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, you—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: And you said that you were going to have 67 members in '67, and where are they all?

Mr. MacDonald: There are few more ludicrous statements on record than the suggestion that we would have pollution cleaned up by 1970, and we will discover that. However, the general point that I wanted to make with regard to this, Mr. Chairman, is that we face a problem today in trying to get all small pollutions cleaned up. The inevitable and the natural argument is, "Why are you picking on me when there is larger pollution?" I have had boat owners put this to me and, as a matter of fact, it has some validity. The amount of pollution that they are going to make by comparison with a regular flow of raw sewage into the same lake, which is often the case, gives their case validity.

I, for one, have taken the argument of saying, "Look, we have reached the stage where we have got to halt every contributing factor to pollution, or we will become a victim of it. We will never catch up to it." This is the reason I am stressing this point with the Minister, because on occasion the argument is advanced by the hon. member tonight, and by others on occasion, that the OWRC will bow to it.

Or you get to the point where you start charging a company like O and M up in northwestern Ontario. Then, when they come up with a very belated plan, you withdraw the charges. If you have got to the point that you have to charge them, fine them. And then you say you mean business. You should not be persuaded to withdraw charges just because they have offered a plan!

I can tell you of a place in northern Ontario—I am not going to mention names—but it illustrates the point that I want to make. I am not certain as to the authenticity of the exact detail of it. I can tell you of a place in the north where the water has been polluted by a big wood industry for years; in 1965, the OWRC said to them "This must be cleaned up." Twelve months later they presented a plan for cleaning it up. Twelve months after that the OWRC said "Your plan is not satisfactory." So the net achievement of coming to grips with pollution over a 24-month period was the exchange of two letters.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Is that right? Are you sure of that?

Mr. MacDonald: This is the kind of thing that has gone on.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Are you sure of this specific instance?

Mr. MacDonald: This is the kind of thing that this Minister has got to quit doing if he wants to achieve his own objective so that he will not be awfully red-faced by 1970. The ramifications of it, Mr. Chairman, are going to be a little difficult to cope with.

I was interested in attending that very useful conference that your department held on pollution at the Inn on the Park.

I happened to be sitting at a table where there were farmers, predominantly, and it was interesting to see the problem faced by those farmers. There were some farmers on the Grand River who used to have their farms up on the banks of the river. Everybody in the community envied them because they had a magnificent drainage system. They never had their yards bogged down in wet because all the water, sewage and everything, went down into the river. They were in a magnificent position, but unfortunately now they face the fact of accumulating pollution that they, down through the years, have been contributing to.

If they are to halt the pollution of the Grand River they have got to stop it, and it may cost them thousands of dollars to get an alternative drainage system in. Maybe this was not the way to make political friends—but I argued with these farmers that if they wanted industry to stop pollution, they had got to stop. The fact that you are contributing only a little cannot be used as an excuse to justify industry contributing a great deal. Everyone has got to cut it out. Otherwise our environment is going to be fouled increasingly and we will never be able to get on top of the problem.

I think that that is the essential lesson of the discussion that we have been having here in relation to specific details. If we do not live up to and enforce it we will never solve the problem. Quite frankly, I do not think that this Minister ever will, but I will give him a chance.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Give me two more years.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): If I may, I would like to continue where I left off this afternoon when the House adjourned. I was interested to hear the Minister go after my colleague from Timiskaming with respect to closing down of industry. This article I have was written in 1967 and it deals with International Nickel, and KVP, and the CNR

and the article quotes here what would happen if they were forced to control the pollution. Asked why the authorities' answers had always been the same, the reply was the control of pollution is an expensive operation and such action could increase production costs to an extent where industries might have to either close or curtail the number of employees.

I am just wondering if the Minister is really saying that he thinks Inco would curtail its production in the Sudbury area, or if the CNR is going to move if the pollution of the Vermillion River is cleared up or if McLellan Mine, which I understand, and I will read and quote "is polluting Lake Wahnapitae already" or if the Brown Paper Company will move. Does the Minister think that any of these four industries are going to move if they are forced to clean up pollution? I have my doubts.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say as for the first three I had no thoughts at all that they might close. They have programmes now which will satisfy OWRC and they will be cleaned up by 1971.

I think you mentioned Brown Paper. I do not know. That could go, I understand, but I do not know But I understand there may be an area in there that if they were crowded too hard at the present time they could close their operations.

Mr. MacDonald: So you are going to let them pollute.

Mr. Martel: They have been crowding the government for quite some time, Mr. Minister, back to about 1946, I believe. They have been crowding the government with this—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They are not crowding—

Mr. Martel: —cudgel which they hold over the heads of Canadian governments, or provincial governments, that if you slap them too hard they are going to move out. And this says that all companies have to do in Ontario, in Canada as a whole, is threaten that they are going to move out, and everything stops.

Let us go on and reveal this pollution. There is one area I have brought up since I came into the House to at least three different Ministers and certainly I have never received an adequate answer. I have gone over to the OWRC with this problem. Again I am talking about the problem on Highway 17 in the Copper Cliff area. I would ask this Minister how much he really thinks it would cost. How much would it cost to finally culvert in that creek, which has cost 11 lives and 168 accidents in the last seven years? And does this government really intend to do anything about it? The member for Sudbury has spoken there; the member for Nickel Belt has met with you people. How long? How long? This problem has been discussed now for at least ten years, and you cannot culvert it in.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You want an answer?

Mr. Martel: Yes I do.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say that this question has been asked by the hon. member to, I think, three Ministers that I know of here. Of course, I do not know whether OWRC is responsible for this, but nevertheless I can bring you up to date as to what is happening as far as OWRC is concerned.

In May of this year, a resolution was presented to the commission, endorsed by some ten municipalities in the Sudbury area relative to this matter. The commission has agreed to undertake a complete study of the problem as requested by the resolution—particularly the determination of whether or not a correlation exists between the occurrence of fog conditions and the quality of water being discharged from Inco to Copper Cliff Creek. That is underway now. As soon as we get a report on that, if the hon. member would like, I could get in touch with him, but I cannot give you any more than this evening.

Mr. Martel: I hope this will not be too long forthcoming. You have already been ten years in waiting for it.

The next point I would like to move onto is Lake Wanapitae, from which as you are aware, the city of Sudbury might eventually have to draw its source of water. McLellan Mine is operating out there, and I just want to quote—and this is written by an independent journalist:

> The unfortunate thing about all this is that each day a recently developed mine near Lake Wanapitae is pouring thousands of gallons of filth daily into what was relatively pure water. At present one can go five miles out into the lake from the shore of Boulin's Bay and see the pollution in the water with the naked eye.
>
> This apparently goes on with the blessings of the Ontario water resources commission which gave McLellan Mine per-

> mission to conduct an open pit operation and dump its waste into a small pond which drained into Lake Wanapitae. It did not bother to check up or clamp down when the mine sank a shaft and began tunnelling. Pollution is not hard to see or follow. It flows downhill along with the water.

Now it is like this. I have heard that it is not being polluted, I have read in the paper that the government says it is not being polluted, yet you can see it for five miles with the naked eye. What is happening?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say I fished that lake two years ago, and I did not see any pollution nor did I know there even was a mine dumping in the stream that ran in there. Would you tell me what stream, and what mine is doing this, so that we can do some surveillance work on this, please?

Mr. Martel: McLellan.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: McLellan.

Mr. Martell: McLellan Mines. They were given permission to conduct open-pit mining, and have now sunk a shaft and are beginning to tunnel. Just right as you come into Skead; by the track, near Skead, and dumped right into the Wanapitae.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What stream are they dumping into?

Mr. Martel: There is just a bit of a pothole there, and the water seeps right into the lake, right beside it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It is not a stream running in the lake? Or is it part of the lake?

Mr. Martel: No.

Mr. Shulman: Why does the Minister not know what is going on?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Again we are in that area all the time, and we have never heard of it from anyone else. If there was a problem, I do not know why the member did not write to me months ago, and I would have looked after it.

Mr. MacDonald: This was a public article written by a man and was published in the paper—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I have never seen it, nor had we heard about it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: I would like to go on, Mr. Chairman, and speak about the only burning river in Canada. It is a rather strange sight to see the river burning but nevertheless it burns. The CNR was find $500. But the CNR is not the sole polluter of this river. Low Phos, who claim they are trying very hard, do attempt to control it but nonetheless are not very successful and occasionally it overflows and for miles down the river you can see foam and green water and apparently the OWRC are occasionally phoned. They send an officer in, he investigates, it is plugged up, and sometimes I am told even before they get back to Toronto they get a call to say it is over-flooded again.

I am just wondering if the Minister would look into both these aspects, particularly because children of Capreol used to swim in the river, but this is condemned in the summer now and they cannot swim there now. The only place they can go to swim is three miles away; they cannot even swim in the river, it is so bad. I am wondering if the Minister would have this checked thoroughly, and have this pollution of the Vermilion River stopped completely?

If the Minister is not going to answer, I will continue. An interesting sidelight in this article, Mr. Chairman, is:

> For years now, Capreol's mayor, Harold Prescott, has been battling this situation but his has been a voice crying in the wilderness. It is an open secret that had it not been for the power of his union, he would have been among the unemployed or transferred a long time ago.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for Sudbury East has the floor. I was just trying to get some order for the member so he could speak.

Mr. Martel: From Capreol the Vermilion flows west, then south. Ten or 15 years ago it teemed with fish; today it teems with filth, not just from Low Phos in Capreol but some more of it that is picked up in the open, from the waters flowing in, polluted by the town of Onaping, and the Inco and Falconbridge Mines in the Levack area. Again, will the Minister see to it that the pollution by Falconbridge and by Inco in the Levack area is checked to see that this pollution is stopped?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would think that perhaps it might save him time and save the House time, when he goes back to Sudbury, so I will see that one or two inspectors go

up from OWRC and tour this area with him. How would that be? Then you will get a first-hand report instead of reading that old—

Mr. Martel: Fine, Friday afternoon, Mr. Chairman. They could even drive me home.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: I should like to examine this matter of the Ontario-Minnesota Paper Company and withdrawal of the charges, and I should like to know from the Minister when the water resources commission first observed pollution of that body of water at Kenora?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I think I answered a question to the hon. member that is in *Hansard*. I have nothing more to say about it this evening.

Mr. Sopha: No, no. You did not tell us in the answer, unless my memory is playing me false.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, you had better—

Mr. Sopha: You did not tell us when the condition first started. I should like to know that now.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: When the mill was built.

Mr. Sopha: Then if that is the case, that would be certainly a number of years. What justification would the Minister possibly have, a charge having been laid in a court of law, so that he could feel free to exercise his prerogative with the magistrate's hearing of that charge?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I answered that, and this is in *Hansard* as well.

Mr. Sopha: You certainly did not and—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I gave the reason why, and it is in *Hansard*.

Mr. Sopha: Oh yes, you said that they undertook to correct the situation. I want to say that that is unsatisfactory, as Bobby Kennedy would have said, that is unacceptable. The Attorney General would agree with me, I am quite sure, he would agree with me that no Minister of the Crown has the right to interfere with the processes of our courts of justice. In other words, just who do you think you are, that you go into a magistrate's court and interfere with the process of justice when a charge is laid?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I did not go—

Mr. Sopha: It is nothing short of contempt for court. The laws of the province are there to be obeyed and presumably some responsible official of the water resources commission laid that charge. I would think—to say the least—it is a rather startling act for a Minister of the Crown, for whatever reasons. Adopting that word from my friend from Downsview, a high-handed act.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: There is nothing funny—notwithstanding what the Minister of Reform Institutions as an observer might think about it. There is nothing humorous about it at all, and the people of the Kenora area are left—no doubt they have been suffering from this activity for a long time—with this: The Minister contends that he has some assurance from the company, but my information is that those assurances have been given before. The assurances have not been lived up to—and this is a fresh assurance that the Minister got. Aside from the interference with the process of justice, it ought to be added that it certainly looks suspicious. Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General's agents in the province who are paid by the public to enforce the law do not withdraw their charges. Once a charge is laid before an appropriate court, it is proceeded with. A Minister pretending to act under the environment of his office to go in and withdraw a charge certainly indicates something about the attitude of that Minister toward enforcement and respect for the law. Before that charge I would also like to know—and it is not in *Hansard*—if the Attorney General was consulted whether that charge should be withdrawn.

And incidentally, I would like to know who made the representations and where, when and in what environment those representations were made, that led to the withdrawal of that charge. All those are legitimate questions.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I must say that there were representations from all the paper companies in Canada because we were discussing the over-all problem. There was not only one, and I felt and I said, and I still maintain that before we charged one company we should charge them all. I asked them in the early part of January if they would file plans with OWRC that would be suitable and accepted. Some of them were not in. As you know, you do not make a plan overnight to clean up pollution, because they are large projects. I felt if we were

going to charge one paper company, we should charge them all. They should all be charged because one was as guilty as the other, and—

Mr. Shulman: Why did you not charge them all?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well that is my business, I believe.

Mr. Shulman: It is not your business, it is our business.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is my business as Minister.

Mr. Shulman: You are supposed to be representing the people of this province.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not believe in charging anyone if they will co-operate and do the things the government is asking them to do.

Mr. Shulman: But they are not co-operating.

Mr. Sopha: This is the first time that this ever happened to me—it is not a precedent—but I called up an employee to confirm that this was so, that the charge was withdrawn—that was somebody in Mr. Coplice's office, I forget his name. I was informed by an employee of the OWRC who was disenchanted with his Minister, to put it mildly.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Better not identify him any further; he will be fired in the morning.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. This is the first time it has happened to me—this employee treated the matter with some seriousness, and did not feel that the Ontario-Minnesota Paper Company—is that an American company by the way?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I do not know. I am not interested in whether it is American or Canadian. It is a company operating in Ontario. Why should I be?

Mr. Sopha: Well some day we are going to discover something he does know. Do you want to bet?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would not want to bet on that.

Mr. Sopha: Do not bet more than a nickel.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who is leading that discussion over there?

Mr. Sopha: Well, the matter was serious to the employee. He was so disenchanted with his Minister that he called a member of the Opposition to protest about him. That is how the matter came up. After I heard from the employee, I called that very nice chap, very courteous on the telephone—in Mr. Coplice's office. I called Mr. Coplice—he was not in—but this other chap confirmed to me that that was so, that the charge had been withdrawn. I thought it fitting we should ask the Minister if he ordered its withdrawal. Now we know who gets to the Minister. We have established it.

Mr. Singer: He has not told us though.

Mr. Sopha: We know that if you are big enough you can not only pollute the waters of our province but you can breach the law, perhaps. They were not convicted, but—

Mr. Singer: The charges were withdrawn.

Mr. Sopha: —some indication of their attitude to the charge can be seen because they undertook to correct something. There is an inference that can be drawn from that. An inference of guilt can be drawn from it because they agreed to correct it. But notwithstanding the laws of the province, it makes you wonder what kind of an activity we are engaged in here, in the late hours of the night, passing laws that are solemn commands of this Legislature. Solemn commands —the Attorney General might take note of that —there is something in the philosophy of jurisprudence there. We made solemn commands in this Legislature, and those commands are then flaunted by the Minister of Energy and Management Resources from Sharbot Lake. Now they must have a different school of jurisprudence in Sharbot Lake, but he flaunts the—

Mr. Chairman: Vote 606, please.

Mr. Sopha: —and exercises his prerogative which he thinks he has got—that I contend he has not got—to interfere with what happens in the magistrate's court. His answer —if he wants to talk about his answer—amounted to this: That Ontario-Minnesota says that some time it will clean up the pollution—some time. And when I ask him, as a supplementary question, when will they clean it up—this is the hallelujah chorus he sings—he does not know. As soon as he gets in a corner then *ignorantia legis non excusat*—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Sopha: —is the maxim that he adopts. I think I am in enough trouble with *Hansard*.

Well, that is it. It is a sorry commentary, Mr. Chairman, it is a sorry commentary. During this day there has been a fruitful discussion, a deal made with Agnico—and they have snowed them all. You should have been here to hear about that project.

Now the Ontario-Minnesota Paper Company has them by the gargle and it makes you wonder—it really makes you wonder how much money we are spending here—about $32 million. I have got to sit down in a deep fit of depression because we are not getting our money's worth out of this outfit.

Mr. Martel: I would like to get off this for a moment and find out if the Minister can find out when the bylaws for the sewer-water project in Hamner-Blezard will be submitted to the municipality? Most refused to send in their resolutions respecting the water system until they are assured that their sewer system will go. Not that they distrust anyone, but they want guarantee. I spoke to them this evening and they would like me to find out if the Minister knows when these bylaws will be forthcoming so that they can sign them and return them along with their resolutions for water?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am advised they were mailed today.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I received a report some weeks ago and made an enquiry of the Minister concerning a proposed approval of a sewage disposal plant in the Vaughan township, I think in the neighbourhood of Richvale, following application of some developers in the township for provision of some sewage facilities. These facilities would serve the hospital in Richmond Hill, its new school in Vaughan township and a proposed development in Vaughan.

Could the Minister tell me if approval was actually given to that project?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think I advised the hon. member a couple of weeks ago, and it is on the record, that as soon as a final decision was made I would advise him. We have informed the hospital and school to go ahead with their projects because we will come up with our project to take care of that at least.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the reason I ask this is that first of all I would hope the Minister would give careful consideration before approving any plan in that area other than for a temporary plant, a small plant to serve the hospital and the school, one that will serve the over-all drainage area. I understand the Minister has a plan that was proposed by consultants for tht over-all area and I would ask in connection with that, that they give consideration to enlarging a plant at the base of the drainage area—the Don River there. And, instead of moving untreated sewage for a long distance through a large pipeline they consider moving the effluent through a high-pressure steel line to another place of treatment, if that effluent is considered to require further treatment, whether it be in a Metro Toronto plant.

I would appreciate getting the Minister's views on such a proposal that they not consider building a huge plant which will carry untreated sewage many, many miles across Toronto. Would the Minister consider it feasible to enlarge the existing plant now in Thornhill to serve that area at the bottom of the natural drainage area and then move the treated effluent by another means in a big main through a high pressure line, for example, to another plant if they feel it requires further treatment before being put into the lake?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I might say whatever works are proceeded with to take care of the immediate problem they have out there, will be temporary.

I cannot tell you whether I approve of this type of plant or what type of plant it will be. I think I will have to leave that to the engineers of OWRC and their personnel to recommend to the department and to the municipalities involved there as to which they think is the best. Whatever that recommendation is after consulting with them that is the one I would approve of.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the OWRC will consider a plan that suits, as it sees best, the over-all needs of an area and not be too concerned about what the municipalities necessarily consider temporarily to their best advantage. It seems to me the responsibility of the water resources commission is for the over-all need of an area, regardless of municipal boundaries. I would hope that they would have confidence, within their own engineering staff, to tell the municipalities what they will provide and provide it.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise a matter with the Minister which has come up in this House before with other Ministers and, needless to say, unsuccessfully.

This is the rather frightening situation down in Nanticoke in reference to water pollution.

This government is in the process of building or is about to begin building a new Hydro plant down there. This matter came up in committee the other day and at that time I asked the officials from the Hydro why in the world they were not putting cooling towers in. Let me explain that the—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we have a vote coming up for Hydro.

Mr. Shulman: This has to do with water pollution. And I believe this has something to do with this Minister—very little to do with this Minister but something to do with this Minister's department. The situation is that this particular Hydro plant is going to be pumping some 100 million gallons of water a minute in and out and it is going to come out warmer. It is going to be dropped into the lake warmer.

Studies all over the world have shown that this destroys the fisheries and this is very important in Lake Erie. This matter has been brought up in front of the appropriate government member who said, those studies are in different climates and that does not necessarily apply here. It pretty well sums up Conservative philosophy. They do not want to learn from anywhere else.

At the committee meeting the other day I asked the Hydro officials why they did not put in a cooling tower which would completely clear up this particular problem and he answered in three words, "unnecessary and expensive." This is really going to be a great tragedy because you people, and I say you people, are going to destroy the fishing industry in Lake Erie. This extra heat in the water is going to do so. We have studies, so many studies.

They have been printed in the *Wall Street Journal;* they have been printed in the air pollution and water pollution bulletins that come out of Washington weekly. They just are not read by the government. This is going to encourage the growth of algae.

There are already some hundreds of square miles of dead water in the centre of Lake Erie. This is going to produce a new area of dead water near Nanticoke which is going to grow out toward the centre of the lake and you, you as this government, are going to be responsible for the death of that lake.

Once again, I have appealed to the Hydro, I have appealed to the Minister responsible for air pollution but it just does not get through so I, once again, appeal to this Minister. Let us see if we have any better response. I say, for goodness sake you are responsible for water pollution. Get in touch with the people who are responsible in your government for Hydro and insist that they put in a cooling tower because if they do not in the year 1971 which you referred to as when water pollution will be cleared up, I am going to come back here and I am going to say you are the man that killed Lake Erie.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 606? The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I have a little trouble. I was trying to follow last night this whole story of Ontario-Minnesota. I was listening to my friend, the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith), and I was listening this afternoon and this evening to my colleague from Sudbury. I have looked at page 3551 in *Hansard* and I just do not follow the Ontario-Minnesota story. Now it is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that in January, 1965, the Minister said to all pulp and paper companies, you must clear up the pollution immediately.

They all understood it and that included Ontario-Minnesota. Then apparently, as far as I can understand it and I can only refer to what has been said in this House and *Hansard*, as far as I can understand notwithstanding the pronouncement of the Minister, of his officials, in January, 1965, Ontario-Minnesota ignored him. Figuratively, they thumbed their noses at him. They said, we are not awfully interested in great pronouncements from the important Minister of Energy and Resources Management; we are not going to do very much. So along came the Minister and on December 20, 1967, he laid a charge.

Now that was pretty serious because the Minister was annoyed. He was being ignored and he had authority under the statute to—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: May I correct the hon. member, I did not lay the charge.

Mr. Singer: Anyway in his name, a charge was laid.

Mr. Sopha: He withdrew it.

Mr. Singer: Yes. In his name and with his authority, a charge was laid, because a Minister of the Crown should rightly get annoyed if somebody thumbs their nose at him and somebody says: I am going to ignore your directions, I am not going to pay any attention to them. If I was a Minister of the Crown—any one of my colleagues here were Ministers of the Crown—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You never will be.

Mr. Singer: I know you said that last year. I pay no attention to this kind of rambling. I am just saying that as a Minister of the Crown you should have a certain dignity—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I have.

Mr. Singer: And a certain sense of value of your office.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I have.

Mr. Singer: A certain sense of importance.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I have.

Mr. Singer: And a certain sense of authority.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I have.

Mr. Singer: Well, you do not show it in this House and you do not show it outside the House. So let us be sensible and let us get down to the fact that I am talking about—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Is this a personal attack, or are we going anywhere?

Mr. Singer: Make him sit down.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: On a point of order. Is this a personal attack, or are we working on an estimate?

Mr. Chairman: Let us stick to vote 606.

Mr. Singer, Mr. Chairman, I would be the last one in the world to personally attack the hon. Minister. He is a Minister of the Crown, and I am sure he does his job—not very well, but I am sure he does his job within his ability.

Now let me say, sir, he issued an order, in January of 1965, to a pulp and paper company who figuratively thumbed their noses at him.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You said that once.

Mr. Singer: So he said to his officials, this will not do. You cannot thumb your noses at a Minister of the Crown. We must lay a charge. So December 20, 1967—and I am quoting from page 3551, Mr. Chairman, I could not be more in order than to quote from *Hansard*—

December 20th, 1967; a summons was delivered to the company, in Kenora, on January 11, 1968. A charge was laid on December 20, and we told Ontario-Minnesota—stop polluting the rivers and stop polluting the lakes.

Well, apparently the charge was withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: It was not apparent, it was.

Mr. Singer: Did you want me to read the—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Certainly. It did not say it was "apparently withdrawn".

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister insists, so let me read the whole quotation here. I am reading now from page 3551, and this in answer to a question from my colleague from Sudbury. He asks this question—I will read the whole page:

I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management which is very helpful and constructive. There was a charge laid earlier this year, perhaps in the month of January, 1968, against the Ontario-Minnesota Paper Company of Kenora, for polluting the waters with industrial wastes. What was the specific charge? Was the charge later withdrawn? Why? Has the situation of pollution, to which the charge has been related, corrected. If not, why?

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me make this abundantly clear. I had no intention of reading this in. I thought the facts were quite simple, and I could have condensed them, but it is only at the Minister's insistence that I am reading the text.

The hon. member for York South interjected at that time. He said: "That sounds like a familiar story".

The Minister of Energy and Resources Management replied:

Mr. Speaker, information against the Ontario-Minnesota Paper Company, in Kenora, was laid in Toronto on December 20, 1967; a summons was delivered to the company in Kenora on January 11, 1968; the company was charged that they did unlawfully discharge material, namely, wood and chemical wastes, during the period of 8 months commencing April 1, 1967, into the Winnipeg River, contrary to section 27, subsection 1, of The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act. The company subsequently advised me they had recently received a report from a consultant they had retained to advise them on this subject, and were on the point of presenting proposals to the OWRC for a programme of pollution abatement.

This being the case, I agreed to withhold prosecution, to give the company time to submit its report, which it did on April 13, 1968. This report was discussed at the Ontario water resources commission, at a meeting in Toronto on April 30, 1968.

In answer to the fifth and sixth parts of the question, the situation of pollution, to which the charge related, has not been corrected, simply because, although progress has been made on the plans, the physical facilities have not yet been installed.

Now I would not want to leave the story incomplete. My colleague from Sudbury then asked—

Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? Would the Minister explain to us, if the serious step of laying a charge in a court was taken? Then why has the situation not been corrected by the end of May?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I would think the hon. member knows, that after a plan is received and approved, you do not build the remedial measures overnight. It takes time. I would expect if it is remedied 18 months or two years from now, they will be making very good headway.

Well then the member for York South got in and he said:

"They have been procrastinating for a long time." Then the Speaker came in, and we got off on something else.

So the issue is very simple, Mr. Chairman, and, in case the Minister believes I am attacking him personally, let me assure him I am not. It is merely because we have a desire to enquire about these things. We are concerned about pollution of our rivers and our lakes. We want to know why this unusual procedure took place. We want to know why the charge was withdrawn. We want to know who wrote the letter. We want to know what the letter said. We want to know what the report said. We want to know when the pollution is going to stop.

As I pointed out last night, Mr. Chairman, it is more than passing strange when the Minister reads to us—and he read to us—"I do not know the names of 15 or 18 people who had been charged and convicted. Some of them pleaded guilty, some of them did not. They had been fined from $25 up to $1,000." We asked the Minister whether or not he had ever heard of the injunction procedure in the Supreme Court of Ontario, and he scratched his head a bit, and said, "Yes, we did launch one action asking for an injunction." He did not tell us about the result of that. Whether or not the Minister really believes that he has a job to clear up pollution, I think, Mr. Chairman, we are entitled to know the full story about Ontario-Minnesota.

His answer on pages 3551 and 3552 is far from complete. He did not table the letters; he did not tell us what the representations were that were made; he did not tell us what the plans were; he did not tell us who signed the letter; he did not tell us about a target date; he did not tell us whether or not it was reasonable to believe the pollution would ever be cleared up; he did not tell us whether the charge had been permanently withdrawn, or if it was going to be brought back; he did not tell us whether counsel had been instructed to initiate proceedings before the Supreme Court of Ontario, to ask for an injunction.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, we here are not satisfied with the conduct of this Minister, and if he wants to take it as personal, he may well do so. We are not satisfied with the conduct of this Minister nor are we convinced about his seriousness in clearing up pollution. And when I talk about this Minister, I talk about him and all the civil servants who are charged with the responsibility of clearing up pollution.

It is high time, sir, if there is an answer to this problem, caused by the Ontario-Minnesota Paper Company, that he tabled all of the correspondence; that he told us why he had reason to believe it was well in the public interest to withdraw that charge; that he had reason to believe that, within a period of whatever number of months he wants to say, there was reason to believe that the pollution would be cleared up.

I say, sir, he needs tell the people of Ontario the reason why these representations were accepted; by whom they were made, and if there is any reason, at all, that the people of Ontario have to believe, that the Minister and the officials in his department are seriously progressing along the line of removing the pollution caused by Ontario-Minnesota. There is nothing on the public record, either on pages 3551 or 3552, or in what he told us last night, or in what he has told us today, that sheds any light on this. All we get is bombast from this Minister, and it is high time that he indicated, to the members of this Legislature, to you, sir, and to the people of Ontario, what he proposes to do about this very serious situation.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Has he got an answer for that?

Mr. Singer: He has no answer. He just sits there and snarls.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out one other aspect and, perhaps, take the heat off the Minister for a moment.

Mr. Trotter: Why do that?

Mr. Burr: Well he has been scorched rather badly the last half hour. There has been mention made about the threats of various industries to move away, if they were pushed too far.

Only last January, the mayor of Niagara Falls, New York, reported—or complained—to the international joint commission that five firms, one of them a Dupont and one a Union Carbide, had threatened to move down south because the restrictions and enforcement of regulations was much easier down south.

Now, we have this same problem in Ontario and Canada. We had it in Windsor, when our city council tried to get steps taken to clean up the air pollution. The company said that if we got too tough, they would move somewhere else. Now, the only solution is to have national standards.

The United States has not got them yet, and we have not got them. But even when we get them, and the United States gets them, there should be international standards, so that companies cannot have any place left to hide. My question is, really, what is the Minister doing to prod the federal government to establish standards for water pollution, and to give leadership to the whole country? What is our Minister doing to promote this down at Ottawa? I know that they have closed up shop down there. The Minister Pépin did say that he was getting interested, but they closed before he could bring in any legislation. Goodness knows what will happen after June 25, but what is he doing in that area?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think that this is one of the great problems that we have in Ontario. We have standards in this province; there are no standards in any of the states adjoining us; and there are no standards in the adjoining provinces. So, although we have standards—we have the Act and we can do all of these things—I think that we can be fairly reasonable and not drive every industry that might locate in Ontario, or already be here, into a sister province or another state. Now, I am not saying that when we start to enforce the regulation on some of the larger, more profitable industries, that they will move. I do not believe this, but we can drive out industry before they get here, if we get too rigid.

We will not let a new industry come in unless they comply with the regulations as set by the OWRC. We—and I hope we will again as soon as a government is formed in Ottawa—were discussing with the former Minister standards between the provinces adjoining Ontario so that if we were to get a pulp and paper industry locating in northern Ontario and we wanted them to meet our standards they would not move across the Ottawa River and locate in Quebec where there are no standards.

An hon. member: That is what they did!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, that is what they did, and this is our problem. Until we do get —or the provinces adjoining get—regulations, it makes it very difficult. I do not think that there is anyone in Ontario who wants pollution. Also I do not think that anyone in Ontario wants to drive a large industry to another province. I think that we are trying to do what is right with both the people and the industry that is here and trying to locate.

I know that I did not answer the question but it is of great concern to this government that we meet with the provinces and the other states and if we do not come up with a national set of regulations that we do agree that we must do certain things to clean up pollution in the Great Lakes and provincial waters.

Mr. Burr: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest that if our standards are the highest then we should take the leadership in doing this.

Mr. Sopha: Two things are absolutely clear. One is that the sooner the water-selling function of this commission is separated from pollution control the better the common weal of the people of Ontario will be.

I have alluded to that before and it is perfectly clear to me that one commission the size of this body, this gargantuan body that is growing all the time, simply is unable to cope with the two aspects of the business, the sale of water and the pollution control. I agree completely with my friend from York Centre when he says that they should get into the business of selling water as Hydro sells electricity.

That is fine as long as that aspect of your enterprise was separated. I do not want to suggest a name, but let us have something like the "pollution control commission"; it might be feasible. I leave that for those who are knowledgeable in the field. And encompass within the frame of that commission both air and water pollution; I do not know. Perhaps it should be reserved for water pollution, but the functions of this commission ought to be separated; on the one side it is an enterprise, and on the other, it is a regulatory body carrying out the solemn legislative command of this Legislature.

The other moral, I say to my friend from Downsview that flows from the whole thing, and I suggest if somebody sees the Premier one of these days, I suggest most seriously that the Premier as the president of the executive council should look into the practices of this Minister, for whom he is responsible. Indeed, he should look into the doings of this Minister, who, self-confessed, has gone in and interfered with the processes of the administration of justice. Indeed, the Attorney General should be concerned about

this, also. This is nothing short of a perversion of our edifice of justice by his interference in that court.

Now, the second ancillary thing that flows from it is that not only is that an unjustified —an unexplained—act, but obviously the background of this is too embarrassing to the Minister for him to relate it when challenged in the clearest language by my friend from Downsview. He wants to play footsy with this Legislature and he arrogantly sits there and refuses to disclose just what went on. Let one of the lesser members of the body politic try to do that, and you see how far he gets. What other conclusion can we come to, I ask the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman? That was a sinister process. What other conclusion can fair and reasonable men come to than that?

When asked to disclose what went on between the Ontario-Minnesota Paper Company and the Minister, he arrogantly refuses to disclose this. So the only conclusion that one can come to is that there were sinister influences at work. The public in reading this have got to come to that conclusion that this Minister has been beholden, in a very improper way, to a pressure group from outside, and he has bowed to influence. I am putting it that way in virtue of your silence.

Mr. Singer: It is a proper charge for the hon. member to make in view of these unusual circumstances.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister sits there and says nothing.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would like to make it outdoors.

Mr. Sopha: He makes it in here where it counts!

Mr. Singer: And you are supposed to be responsible.

Mr. MacDonald: What kind of barnstorming is this anyway?

Mr. Trotter: You will not even try to answer.

Mr. MacDonald: And you a Minister of the Crown!

Mr. Sopha: A shameful—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. What is this member trying to say or insinuate?

Mr. Singer: He is not insinuating.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You said that it was the most serious charge he could make!

Mr. Singer: That is right!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What is the charge about, what?

Mr. Singer: About you.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What did I do? What does he mean by it?

Mr. Trotter: You bowed to influence.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What does he mean, "bowed to influence"? I wish that he would explain that.

Mr. Sopha: I maintain that, in view of your silence after the remarks of my friend from Downsview and your refusal to disclose what went on between you and Ontario-Minnesota that led to the withdrawal of that charge, the only conclusion that reasonable men can come to is that there were sinister influences. Do you understand? Are you capable of understanding the English language?

Mr. MacDonald: Produce the letters! Tell us what went on and why you withdrew the charge.

Mr. Sopha: In the light of your refusal I am suggesting here that the Premier of this province, as your senior and the man who appointed you, has a duty to make an inquiry into how you perform your office.

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: If you will not do it, then the Premier has the duty to come in here and tell us in no uncertain terms why one of his Ministers went into a court of justice and interfered with the processes of that court. Now, that duty is owed to us and to the people of Ontario, and if you had more sense than apparently you have, you would not sit there, basking in the reflected glory of all your officials and try to treat us in the cavalier fashion that you do. I want you to know that we resent it over here. We have our duty. We have our duty which we endeavour to carry out and when a question is put to you in a decent way and it calls for an answer, then your silence is nothing short of the very height of inexcusable arrogance.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 606. The member for Parkdale.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in a matter that concerns the policy of OWRC in the Brampton-Bramalea area. I know that for some time there has been difficulty in that area, particularly in Brampton, in obtaining proper housing. One of the main reasons for it is because of the policy, or the lack of policy, of OWRC and the problem is this.

In the city of Brampton there are about 34,000 people living there.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think that question was answered last night by one of our colleagues and it has to do with the area. There is a joint agreement between all the municipalities out there. They have agreed—the agreement has gone out and it is before the Ontario municipal board now for approval—to clear up that whole area.

Mr. Trotter: How long did this go on? I know there were negotiations going on for a considerable length of time.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Approximately two years.

Mr. Trotter: About two years and it is now before the OMB.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They are in agreement—

Mr. Trotter: Thank you.

Mr. Sopha: I do not know if he is answering any questions.

I want to return to the matter of the water and sewer services in Blezard, Hamner, Rayside and the township of Capreol-Hamner. I have a special interest in this and I want to see people in Sudbury provided with housing. Housing cannot be built in the valley, so to speak, until sewer and water is provided. I raised this matter before dinner and I would like to know when those services are to be provided in that adjacent area to the city of Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I answered that question. It was asked by the member for Sudbury. The agreement left—

Mr. Sopha: I am the member for Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, the member for Sudbury East. The agreements were mailed out today from the offices of OWRC and—

Mr. Sopha: After I spoke?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, it was after supper that I answered.

Mr. Sopha: After I spoke?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I do not know when it was. It was after we came back at 8 o'clock, anyway.

Mr. Sopha: They were mailed out today?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Today, yes

Mr. Sopha: For all these?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: Well, when is the deadline?

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): It was April 12.

Mr. Sopha: Next year?

Mr. Demers: This year.

Mr. Sopha: When is the thing to be completed?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There is actually no deadline set by OWRC. They are mailed out to municipalities for their signatures and when they are returned, they will be dealt with.

Mr. Sopha: My goodness, the commission has been very slow in this. I made that speech two years ago here. Goodness gracious, I am always complaining, and I do not want to sound like some members, but if these conditions existed in the southern part of the province, if they existed in a municipality adjacent to Toronto, these three organs of public opinion down here, these three Metro newspapers, would raise such a howl that you would have to do something. But the farther you get from the centre, the more lethargic government can become. Really, these municipalities—my friend from Nickel Belt will bear me out—did everything they could to assist them. They amalgamated to give themselves a wider tax base, more financial resources. Now Capreol-Hamner is going to amalgamate with Blezard and an application went forward yesterday to amalgamate the municipalities in the western side. So they are trying, and why this commission drags its feet in the way it does—

Mr. Demers: They have not signed the agreements.

Mr. Sopha: Oh indeed, it is two years—

Mr. Demers: They have not signed the agreements yet.

Mr. Trotter: Just like the Brampton area.

Mr. Sopha: As we vote this $45 million, it is obvious to me—$45 million in vote 606 and 610, I totalled it up; I said $32 million before

but it is $45 million—and I hope that commission will not think I am picking on them because they are very fine people, but it is obvious to me that they have too much to do. They have more to do than they can do efficiently, and they are spread out too thinly across the province.

Up in Red Lake, let history record—a person almost hesitates to refer to it—but before they got moving in Red Lake three or four children had to die of hepatitis. In the result, let it be said by way of epitaph to those children, I think that Red Lake situation led to a whole revision of the method of financing and the provision of water service, because it is perfectly apparent that many municipalities just have not got the financial resources to pay the cost of provision of these services. How long ago was it? We were at that hearing last July, were we not? It was in mid-July and that programme had just come out. It was announced by the OWRC that they would build the plant. I think I called Mr. Caverley at that time, on the day of that hearing. They had just announced the programme that would provide the capital plant for this. A whole year has gone by now until here they have just mailed the things to date.

I say to the Minister, in all seriousness, I have my responsibility here and my constituency is wider than the environs of the city of Sudbury. I am interested in these outlying areas not out of the desire to encroach on my friend from Nickel Belt and my friend from Sudbury East, but because I know the effect of the outlying areas upon the city proper.

Mr. Demers: Get your friend Gravelle to sign the agreement.

Mr. Sopha: Who?

Mr. Demers: Get our mutual friend Gravelle to sign the agreements.

Mr. Sopha: I will call him tomorrow. If that is what is holding it up, but—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): How can he sign it? They just mailed it today.

Mr. Sopha: But what I complained about is that a whole year goes by and I hear that the thing is just in the works now. This should have been started a year and a half ago. My memory tells me that when I made the speech here, about those municipalities—the vice-chairman of the water resources commission is not here tonight; he gets a *per diem* allowance.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is on a 48-hour week.

Mr. Singer: Well, 48 hours plus.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

An hon member: He is paid over $10,000 a year.

Mr. Sopha: One might think he would be interested in this vote.

I made that speech in March and they announced after the speech that they would make the survey. I wish the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) was here to listen to this lesson. They made the survey and it would be completed by December 1, they said. These facts are seared on my memory, you see, because I am so interested in it. It was not completed on December 1—that would be December 1, 1966—it was not completed until well into 1967 and now they have had a further year to do something and they have not done it. In the meantime, you see, no houses are being built. That is the whole point. No houses are being built in those valley municipalities and the situation is getting worse.

Mr. Chairman, something has got to be done—it will be done; I am quite sure it will be done eventually—to separate some of the functions of this commission so that it can perform more efficiently. One cannot fail to observe—and I ask people to be fair as we sit here voting this $45 million—that out on the street, on almost every occasion that expert people in the field come up against this commission, and the commission deals with them, they are yelling blue murder. So it was in Brampton. So it was in St. Thomas. I was down in St. Thomas last October to speak in a political meeting and the whole topic of conversation was the treatment of St. Thomas by the commission.

I do not pretend to know the details, but it is apparent to me that almost every time somebody comes up against this commission, there is a reaction against them of antipathy and adversity. I can recall getting lengthy letters from the municipal engineer out in Brampton about his contract with this commission. There has got to be something wrong. There has got to be something wrong with the way they do business, with the way they spend our $45 million.

For myself, I never liked the way they treated the city of Sudbury. I never liked their cavalier attitude, and their peremptory commands, the way they drifted into that city and started to tell us about building a

sewage treatment plant to the cost of $5 million, which we have not got to start off with, and have not got any hope of getting. Our debenture debt is up almost to the limit allowed by law now. So I just say to that Minister, and I would say it to the Premier if he were here, that the time has come to have a look at this $45 million and maybe get the management consultants in—maybe hire that Walter Gordon firm; what do they call that, Clarkson Gordon—to come in and have a look at this outfit and see if it cannot be readjusted so that they spend all our $45 million, that is the people's $45 million, in a little bit more satisfactory way and with more despatch.

I say that from personal experience, especially in relation to those long-suffering townships and some of their conditions. If you went into the hearts of Tennessee and Mississippi and Alabama you would not find their equal. So Canadians do not need to look down their noses at people in the southern United States. You would not find their equal, because they have not got the ordinary rudiments, and I said it before in this House, and I say it again, that surely a fundamental necessity of looking after the health and common weal of our people is that they have at least sewer and water services. At least—and that right supersedes the water resources commission dragging its feet in the provision of it. That right is far, far ahead of it.

I most reluctantly, in this form, become party to the vote of this $45 million this year because I have had too much experience with this commission now. Too much without coming to the conclusion as a reasonable man that there is something wrong in the state of Denmark. Something wrong, and there is a footnote. I would have to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that a man that is getting—what do you say, $10,000 a year—

Mr. Trotter: It is over $10,000 a year.

Mr. Sopha: Moonlighting at $10,000 a year, one of those moonlighters—not like the vice-chairman of Hydro, he is always here. The vice-chairman of Hydro is always here, but a moonlighter up there getting $10,000 a year—

Mr. Trotter: Not even here!

Mr. Sopha: Over and above the $12,000; he has got a lot of gall in not being here. And he is pocketing the money and goes away laughing and scratching all the way to the bank—he does not have to produce even by attendance. I do not know, it looks to me as if the Premier is losing his grip. He is not here most of the time and he cannot keep the troops here. If I were the Premier, the very minimum I would insist upon, is one of moonlighters that I appointed over there be here to give some *quid pro quo* for the $10,000 that he gets. I suggest that and commend it to common sense. If the Minister had any decency, he would send the messengers up looking for him, to bring him here. Perhaps we could hear an articulate word from him and what we are getting for that $10,000.

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this vote, I think we have seen tonight as extraordinary a performance as I have ever seen in this House in 13 years. The Minister has been asked to provide information with regard to the withdrawal of charges that has been described as interference with the courts. In the instance of the O and M those details have been asked for, indeed the charges have been put even in the form of questioning the integrity of the Minister, mainly because he has bowed to outside influence and has sat there silently.

Well, Mr. Chairman, as a person who listened to that aspect of the debate, I have no other conclusion but that the Minister has something to hide. He has refused to even acknowledge anything. He just sits there silent.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) that since the Minister has refused to reply to questions regarding OWRC withdrawal of charges against O and M—even in the face of the accusation that he has wrongly bowed to influence—this House reduces the moneys under vote 606 to $1 until full explanation has been given.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by the member for York South that since this Minister has refused to reply to questions regarding OWRC withdrawal of charges against O and M—even in face of the accusation that he has wrongly bowed to influence—this House reduces the moneys voted under vote 606 to $1 until a full explanation has been given.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I judge from what is being drawn to my attention, that I have been unfair to OWRC. The charge was not withdrawn by OWRC, it was withdrawn by the Minister. I would appreciate it if it would be his withdrawal rather than OWRC's withdrawal.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the member would like to alter the motion so that we have it properly on record.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is only going to delay clearing up pollution.

Mr. Trotter: Ho, ho, that is a feeble answer.

Mr. Chairman: The motion should read "that since this Minister has refused to reply to questions regarding his withdrawal" rather than "OWRC's withdrawal."

Those in favour of the motion will please say, aye.

Those opposed will please say nay.

In my opinion the nays have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise. All those opposed will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, those in favour are 25 and the nays 41 .

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost.

Vote 606 agreed to.

On vote 607:

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, was this a confidence motion?

Mr. Chairman: It was 25 against 41.

Vote 607 agreed to.

On vote 610:

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, on vote 610, I notice that this is quite a reduction from last year's budgeted amount and wonder if the Minister could inform us of the reason for this?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, we realize that this is somewhat lower than last year but we hope that this is a more realistic estimate—

Mr. Chairman: Order please. I wonder if the Minister would permit the chair to explain what has been done? We have had vote 606 which was Ontario water resources commission; 607 Ontario water resources commission; and 610 under the Ontario water resources commission in the same manner in which we had taken the conservation authorities branch.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, on vote 609—the vote on Ontario Hydro—

Mr. Chairman: Vote 609 is yet to be called. We are discussing vote 610.

Vote 610 agreed to.

On vote 609:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Muskoka.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks on this vote. The estimate before the House relates to the development of nuclear energy as a source of electric power generation in our province. Although power generation by this means is a scientific development of fairly recent origin, dating from perhaps 18 years ago, Ontario Hydro's interest in nuclear energy and commitment to the development of generating stations using such a technique goes back to about the beginning of that period of time. As a result, Ontario Hydro has today, in relation to its capacity, as large a stake in nuclear-electric development as any utility in the world—including those in Great Britain and the United States.

The subject of supplying power produced from nuclear reaction was discussed in this House during the time I have been here by the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), when he was vice-chairman of Ontario Hydro in 1957 and 1958. In the current session, we have heard in this House from Opposition speakers for the first time since then, I believe, certain critical references to our nuclear programme. Though more than a decade has gone by since the subject was first introduced, such comments are welcome. They appear to be based on misconceptions, yet, we should be pleased to note the interest now being taken in the subject.

The commitment of Ontario Hydro to the atomic power programme adopted and developed by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited—which is an arm of the federal government—has proven in the results obtained, to be fully justified. Not only is this the case, but our engineers and all associated in the Canadian reactor policy are more enthusiastic than ever about the technique and its future.

Comparisons may be made with methods employing nuclear reaction adopted in other countries, but the salient fact is that each country must adopt the technique best suited to its own circumstances and resources.

Ontario Hydro is and always has been keenly aware of the desirability of using uranium in Ontario mines for the purpose of generating electricity, as an alternative to the purchase of imported coal. As far back as 1953 the commission announced its intention

of participating with AECL in feasibility studies as to production of electricity from nuclear sources. This was followed by the assignment of a number of Hydro engineers to a study group with engineers from AECL. This group was entrusted with the responsibility of examining the prospects of producing nuclear-electric power.

The result was that Canada adopted for this purpose the design technique of natural uranium as the fuel, with heavy water as a moderator. The advantages of this system were amply demonstrated in the plant constructed at Rolphton on the Ottawa River, a 20,000-kilowatt station known as "nuclear power demonstration," or NPD for short. The decision to proceed with the Rolphton station, in co-operation with AECL and Canadian General Electric was made in 1955. The plant has been operating successfully for six years —consistently, reliably and safely producing power for Ontario. It is worth noting that up to the end of 1967 it had delivered a total of more than 609 million kilowatt-hours of electricity into the provincial grid.

Owned by AECL and Hydro, this prototype plant has, year after year, met or exceeded the winter peak target set for it. It has provided invaluable information to help with the operation of the 200,000-kilowatt Douglas Point station on Lake Huron.

Technical difficulties encountered at the Douglas Point nuclear plant last year were held up by some as evidence that Canada's programme to develop uranium reactors as an economic source of low-cost electricity is threatened with failure.

In reality, however, the problems with Douglas Point, which is the first full-scale nuclear station to be built in this country, are similar to those experienced by utilities in other parts of the world. Prototype equipment, whether it be nuclear or conventional, has teething problems.

On March 8, Douglas Point, which had been operating at 75 per cent of capacity since the middle of December, reached its maximum output of 200,000 kilowatts. After a week of operation at full capacity it was, during the favourable power situation experienced at this season of the year, shut down for planned maintenance and modification. It was back on the line again in mid-April and commissioning tests at up to 100 per cent of rated capacity and more are continuing.

Douglas Point has not diminished the confidence of either this government or Ontario Hydro in the natural uranium, heavy water reactors which are the foundation of the Canadian nuclear programme. Douglas Point's performance of recent months speaks for itself. It works, and works well. Just how well is indicated by the fact that during the three-month period from December 15 to March 15 its output was available to the system 85 per cent of the time and, following a planned shutdown for inspection, Douglas Point is now producing its full rated power of 200,000 kilowatts.

The government of Canada, through AECL, owns the $85 million Douglas Point plant. The station's nuclear component was designed by AECL. Ontario Hydro designed the conventional portion and constructed the plant at AECL's expense. The commission operates the station for AECL and buys the energy it produces at the same rates the commission buys power from inter-connected utilities. Hydro will purchase the plant when commissioning tests are completed, at a price which will make the cost of power fully competitive.

Certainly some unfortunate difficulties were experienced in getting Douglas Point on the line. But as the months pass and the forecasts become facts, there is more and more confidence in its performance.

In 1964, Hydro made a major nuclear commitment with the decision to proceed with construction of a 1,000,000-kilowatt plus station at Pickering. The first two units of this plant are being financed under a co-operative arrangement with Ontario Hydro contributing approximately 40 per cent of the $272 million cost, the government of Canada 33 per cent, and the province of Ontario 27 per cent.

The vote in the estimates, sir, shown under item 609 includes the province of Ontario's contribution during the current fiscal year.

Under the plan, the two governments will obtain full recovery of their contributions with interest, and repayments are expected to begin in 1971. Again, AECL is responsible for the design of the nuclear portion of the station through its power projects division.

Last year, Hydro announced it was proceeding with two additional units, raising Pickering's capacity to more than 2,000,000 kilowatts and making it one of the largest nuclear stations under construction in North America. Hydro itself will finance the entire $256 million cost of these two additional units. It is hoped to have power flowing from the first unit by 1971, even though construction delays caused by work stoppages during the past year have set back the programme. Unit 2 will follow later in the year, and units

3 and 4 at Pickering are scheduled for service at yearly intervals.

If things go as planned, Pickering and Douglas Point will be supplying power equivalent to the electrical requirements of two million Ontario homes by 1973.

Mr. Chairman, I am able to say tonight that Ontario Hydro plans to make a major new commitment in Canadian heavy water reactors before the end of this year. The new developments will involve 3,000,000 kilowatts of nuclear capacity. In all likelihood, the size of the generating units will represent another step up to the range of 750 kilowatts each. I should point out that Hydro is not yet able to put all of its kilowatts into one technological basket, and to maintain system balance it is expected that an additional 1,000,000 kilowatts in conventional thermal generation will be committed.

This will mark the first time that nuclear power has formed such a large part of new scheduling.

Experience gained at Douglas Point is pointing the way to better design and construction and improved operational techniques —refinements which are being incorporated in the Pickering station as part of a systematic programme that reflects the Hydro's basic responsibility—that of producing a reliable supply of electricity at the lowest possible cost.

We believe that the Canadian natural uranium heavy water reactor offers us the best means of doing this. Hydro, of course, is constantly reviewing all techniques to ensure that it can take advantage of new developments. There are those who advocate that the national research council should be involved in this work. We would welcome their participation in the nuclear power field.

When the Douglas Point project gave indication of trouble, critics of our nuclear programme were off and running. Hydro was accused of being too bold, of gambling, of— in effect—putting all its nuclear eggs in one reactor. I suggest that there are two ways of getting to the top of an oak tree. One is to climb it; the other is to sit on an acorn and wait for it to grow.

As has been pointed out by Ontario Hydro's chairman, it would have been nice to experiment with a number of concepts in addition to the design that uses Canadian natural uranium as a fuel and heavy water as a moderator. But, given the limited financial and scientific resources of a country the size of Canada, we could have spread ourselves so thinly that nothing at all would have been achieved.

Hydro could, of course, have stood by and waited for others to develop an acceptable system—then adopted it. But it chose to go ahead in partnership with others—go ahead with a system that is uniquely Canadian, using as fuel the relatively inexpensive natural uranium with which our province is so richly endowed.

Innovation is venturesome, even under the best of circumstances. But had we not gone ahead when we did, it is very probable that we would be lagging behind other industrial nations; and, I suspect, be facing accusations at home of timidity and lack of enterprise. Evidence to date suggests Canada's approach has paid off. In a period of about 15 years, the Canadian-designed power reactor has moved from the concept stage, through demonstration, and full-scale application. Now, the engineers are confident that this will be a highly economic proposition.

Adding to their confidence was a recent prediction by a leading American consulting engineer, Alexander Kusko. Looking ahead to the years 2000 to 2030, he stated: "Nuclear plants using heavy-water and breeder reactors will supply all of the bulk power directly by cable to load centres."

In this province, Ontario Hydro's objective is to obtain the largest practicable proportion of its new resources from nuclear energy, supplemented by hydro-electric development —including pumped storage. Studies have been going on for about 18 months, and Hydro is planning to make the new commitments in its nuclear programme— to which I referred—later this year.

Power demands in a consistently expanding economy such as Ontario's can be predicted with reasonable accuracy. Plans can be drawn up to meet these demands. But execution of plans to reach goals within time targets is distinctly another matter—nature and the human element being what they are.

Fortunately, nature co-operated admirably in 1967. When Canada's centennial year dawned, Ontario Hydro, of necessity, was due to break all records. More than 1,000,000 kilowatts of new generating capacity was scheduled—the largest one-year increase in the commission's history. One that would have met expected demands with a reasoned or calculated margin of reserve.

That 1,000,000-kilowatt goal, as is now well known, was not achieved. In fact, only about half of the new equipment scheduled for service actually produced power. The reason for failure can best be described as a combination of circumstances. These circumstances included late deliveries of equipment

in certain cases, failure of certain equipment to meet performance standards, and—equally serious—a strike by 3,000 construction workers which began in May of last year and was not fully settled until early January, 1968.

The strike, in which wage rates and benefits were not factors, was the first in 16 years of harmonious relations between Ontario Hydro and the member unions of the allied construction council. It brought work to a virtual halt on a $1.25 billion expansion programme and caused completion dates to be deferred on about 280 projects.

The strike stemmed from the commission's refusal to grant four major concessions asked for by the council. These were: that Hydro recruit exclusively through the member unions; that the unions determine the sources of equipment and machinery installed at construction sites; that jurisdictional disputes be settled by a tribunal in Washington; that non-working foremen be members of the bargaining unit.

The commission felt that to accede to these demands would be to relinquish its responsibility as trustee of a publicly owned, province-wide enterprise carrying on activities in a variety of union and non-union labour markets. We held, in short, to the position that we could not deny to any qualified contractor or worker the opportunity to bid or work on Hydro projects.

The strike affected projects ranging from minor line work to major generating stations, whose output was essential to Ontario's future power needs. It was to meet these needs that Hydro planned the present expansion programme, designed to provide within 10 years more than double the commission's present generating capacity of about nine million kilowatts.

Just for the record, Ontario Hydro has been planning for and constructing generating capacity to meet power demands which have doubled every 10 to 12 years for the past 40 years. This means that under its current expansion programme the commission will add in 10 years a kilowatt total greater than that developed in its previous 62 years.

This obviously calls for planning on a massive scale. I mention it only so that the facts may speak for themselves in answer to criticism which suggested that poor planning was a contributing cause in the past winter's sometimes tight power supply situation. If there is anything certain to focus attention on Ontario Hydro, it is the possibility of a power shortage. The possibility was raised early in December. Reaction was immediate, and those who expressed themselves ranged all the way from knowledgeable optimists who believed that all would work out well to vociferous critics crying gloom and doom.

When the construction strike began, only about one-third of the more than 1,000,000 kilowatts in generating capacity planned for 1967 had been installed. The late deliveries mentioned earlier and failure of other equipment to meet standards had already slowed the programme. The combination of the two —the strike and the equipment factor—left the commission with resources much smaller than anticipated to meet the peak power demand, which normally occurs in December. If things had gone according to plan, our total resources would have been almost 10,000,000 kilowatts, and power reserves would have been closer to the acceptable level.

While the actual margin of reserve was considerably less than desired, a few factors were operating in Hydro's favour as winter approached—including the forces of nature. The levels of Lake Ontario and Lake Erie were both above normal—a matter of great importance since the behaviour of these two bodies of water affects nearly 3,000,000 kilowatts of hydro-electric generation on the Niagara and St. Lawrence rivers—and levels of water storage elsewhere across the province were generally good.

With this co-operation and employment of other measures, Hydro managed to get safely over the peak periods of consumption—as it confidently expected to do. When needed to maintain reserves, additional power was obtained in the normal way from neighbouring utilities in Quebec and the United States, and by utilizing a block of 300,000 kilowatts of interruptible power—that is power supplied to certain industries who get substantial rate discounts to compensate for the possibility of brief occasional interruptions.

The peak power demand—which is to say the maximum sustained demand over a 20-minute period—is normally made on the Hydro system on one of the business days in the week preceding Christmas. The relatively balmy weather we had before Christmas was not normal, however, and as a result the new peak of 9,214,300 kilowatts was not reached until January 8.

The commission met the peak demand by using the insurance avenues I have mentioned, and by pressing into operation every possible resource at its command. This meant, among other things, that power which might have been produced by large economic generating units, was produced by smaller, less efficient units at up to three times the cost.

When I say "power that might have been produced by large economic units," I refer particularly to 600,000 kilowatts of new power that was scheduled for service in 1967 on completion of units 6 and 7 at Lakeview generating station, on the shore of Lake Ontario west of Toronto. Units 6 and 7 have been rescheduled for operation this year. When all eight units are in service they will bring the plant to its ultimate capacity of 2,400,000 kilowatts, making it one of the largest coal-burning generating stations in the world.

The Lakeview plant illustrates the revolutionary pace at which Ontario is expanding. At full production its output will be greater than Hydro's province-wide demand in 1947. Delay in completion of units 6 and 7 at Lakeview was not only frustrating to Hydro planners, it was costly. Delaying the operation of one of these 300,000-kilowatt units for four months—a period in which it could have produced 700 million kilowatt-hours of electricity —meant that $3 million worth of power production was lost forever.

Reviewing further what might be called the winter of our discontent, there's the matter of the commission purchasing power from interconnected utilities in the United States. When the storm blew up in December over the alleged possibility of a power shortage, news reports quoted statements by persons I can only describe as highly uninformed as saying that the commission would be forced to buy "expensive" power from American sources.

For the record, again, let me say that Ontario Hydro is constantly exchanging power throughout the year with interconnected utilities in the United States—buying and selling huge quantities when it is most economical. This is as much insurance for those utilities as it is for Hydro. As an example: despite the long, dark, and sometimes cold winter, our system conditions were such that the day after Christmas, the commission was able to assist utilities in Michigan with about 300,000 kilowatts.

One more note about these so-called expensive imports from the United States. During 1967, Hydro sold approximately $1.5 million worth of power to United States utilities, and bought only about $669,000 worth. This, of course, means that rather than being an importer of electricity and an exporter of dollars, the commission was actually an exporter of electricity and an importer of dollars, earning more than $800,000 on the exchange. The 1968 situation is expected to be comparable.

So much for Hydro's balance of payments —a salutary situation that I am sure all here would like to see projected on the national fiscal scene. Generation reserves are becoming a matter of increasing importance to the Hydro operation. Where 10 years ago we thought in terms of a 14 per cent reserve, today we need to think about considerably more. There are several reasons for this, among them the fact that the huge, complex, thermal-electric stations now being built provide more operating problems through the year than hydro-electric plants, which now form the bulk of Hydro's generating facilities.

Consider the Lambton coal-burning station near Sarnia, now planned to be in service in 1969 but originally scheduled to deliver its first power later this year. When a generator the size of those being installed at Lambton is removed from service, the Hydro system is deprived of 500,000 kilowatts of power. Consequently the question arises, why install such large units?

The answer is that experience is proving—at least in the case of thermal stations—that the larger the unit, whether coal-burning or nuclear, the greater the economy. The Lambton station was originally planned as a two-unit plant, with a 1,000,000-kilowatt capacity. The size was doubled when studies indicated that several million dollars could be saved in engineering, construction and other costs by increasing the size of the station to 2,000,000 kilowatts.

Lambton, and the earlier-mentioned Lakeview plant, are two of four thermal stations in partial operation or under construction which will ultimately add a total of more than 7,000,000 kilowatts to the Hydro system. The others are Hydro's latest venture into the super-giant class of thermal electric plants, the 2,000,000-kilowatt Nanticoke station near Port Dover, at the eastern end of Lake Erie, and the $528 million Pickering nuclear plant, on the short of Lake Ontario east of Toronto.

Preliminary work at the Port Dover site began last fall. Power from the first of four 500,000-kilowatt units is expected late in 1971. Again to illustrate the growth of our system: The capacity to be installed at Nanticoke will about equal Ontario's share of the power resources at Niagara Falls. Continuing the trend, options were taken up recently on sites on Lake Ontario for two

more thermal stations, both in the 2,000,000-kilowatt range. One is located about 20 miles west of Kingston, and the other approximately five miles west of Port Hope.

Construction of a modern thermal plant takes from five to seven years. Those whose passion is planning will be quick to realize that the commission is already looking beyond the bounds of our present expansion programme. It is preparing, in fact, to meet demands expected to top the 22,000,000-kilowatt mark by 1980. That is a year, incidentally, in which one-third of our resources may be nuclear.

Hydro's faith in nuclear generation has prompted a double-barreled question that warrants an answer. Why has the commission continued to build coal-burning plants? Frequently coupled with this is the charge that such plants add to the problem of air pollution, particularly in metropolitan areas.

First, the reason for having committed coal-burning plants. Simply, it is because of operating considerations. A nuclear generating station is what is known as a base load plant. That is, its operation is such that it meets the power demand through most of the 24 hours of the day. But other generation is required to meet brief peak demands. We believe that coal-burning plants, operating in conjunction with nuclear stations, provide the most economical balance for the Hydro system.

Hydro-electric plants, of course, still have an important role in Hydro's programme, but I must emphasize that their capacities are not enough to offset the base-load features of nuclear stations. Coal-burning plants are less expensive to build than nuclear and can be stopped and restarted more quickly and more economically. Nuclear plants, with their high capital cost and comparatively low fueling expense—thanks to natural uranium—serve the system best when they operate around the clock.

As to air and water pollution—those subjects which were much in the news in the last year, and which I spoke about at length in this House recently—I would only reiterate that Ontario Hydro is by no means indifferent to the health of the people of this province. It is ready to adapt every proven further means which will ensure cleaner air, and, in respect to the water used for cooling purposes at its thermal plants, is working closely with the government departments concerned.

The advent of the giant thermal station is changing the pattern of power production in Ontario. By 1970, the commission's thermal-electric capacity will be greater than our water-power resources for the first time.

Ontario Hydro is nearing the end of the line as far as available water-power sites are concerned. The remaining sites being studied for economic development—most of them in the James Bay watershed—have an estimated combined potential of approximately 1,000,000 kilowatts. But several river projects are currently either under construction or in the planning stage.

In the north, a total of $48 million is being expended on two sites on the Mississagi River. The Aubrey Falls development, 68 miles north of Thessalon, is scheduled to add 130,000 kilowatts to the Hydro system in the fall of 1969; and the 215,000-kilowatt Wells station, under construction downstream, is scheduled for completion in 1970.

Also, development of a site at Lower Notch on the Montreal River, southeast of Cobalt, is underway. Still in the north, $1 million worth of rehabilitation work at the Kakabeka Falls station near Fort William, which included a new dam, is now complete. In eastern Ontario, both units at the new 139,500-kilowatt Mountain Chute station on the Madawaska River went into operation in late 1967; and a few miles downstream, a two-unit extension to the Barrett Chute plant is scheduled for service this year. Still farther down the Madawaska, construction is under way on a two-unit addition to Stewartville generating station, scheduled for service in 1969.

In relation to our coal-burning stations, last year we purchased about 5,500,000 tons from Nova Scotia and the United States. The recent imposition of lockage charges on the Welland canal has added considerably to the cost of imported coal. These charges will increase fourfold over the next four years, and by 1971 will add about $250,000 to Hydro's yearly coal bill.

Costs, of course, are going up on all sides, and no one knows it better than Hydro. After fighting the rising tide for a number of years, the commission was forced last November to concede that escalating wages, salaries, interest rates and prices in general were continuing to push costs beyond Hydro's capacity to absorb them.

The result was an announcement of increases in interim rates averaging about 6 per cent for power supplied to the 354 munic-

ipal utilities in the Hydro system. Evidence —if any is needed—that Ontario Hydro has aided the municipal utilities in holding the line, may be seen in figures showing that the average residential cost per kilowatt-hour in 1967 was 1.14 cents, compared with 1.18 cents in 1957. Average costs for commercial and industrial customers have similarly declined.

Looking at it another way: Between 1949, the base year for the consumer price or cost-of-living index, and today, the cost of living has increased by more than 50 per cent. We are now paying over $1.50 for what we bought for a dollar in 1949.

Yet, during that same period, the cost of electricity to the average municipal residential customer in Ontario increased by only 12 per cent—or little more than one-tenth of a cent per kilowatt-hour. Besides supplying power to the municipalities, Hydro also serves more than 500,000 customers of its own in rural areas. There has not been a general rate increase to these customers in 15 years, thanks in large part to the introduction of a variety of cost-saving techniques.

Last year, however, the same inflationary pressures which brought about higher interim rates, resulted in a deficit on Hydro's rural service operations. An upward adjustment in rates to these customers will, of necessity, be made in the near future. Though some of the specific details are still to be worked out, the proposed increases are merely designed to meet rising costs and carry the commission through the next two years.

I am not attempting to minimize our increase in rates, but we do have to meet our growing costs. And one of the major causes for the rising costs is high interest rates. The commission now has to seek funds in a market in which interest rates are the highest on record. Our borrowing must cover new money requirements as well as refinancing of maturing bonds. It was only a decade ago that Hydro could borrow money at 4 per cent. Our most recent bond issue carried a rate of nearly 7 per cent.

But the money is needed and the piper must be paid, for we cannot delay projects in anticipation of more favourable borrowing conditions. Forecasts for this year anticipate a power demand approaching the 10,000,000-kilowatt mark. And we are forecasting a gross capital expenditure for the year of $281 million—up 20 per cent over last year. Rounding out the forecast is the sobering expectation that the system's operating and maintenance costs in 1968 may rise as much as 15 per cent.

The commission's primary objective for 1968 is to get construction back into high gear. Ground lost because of the strike must be made up. We have underway a programme involving almost 8,000,000 kilowatts of new generating capacity for completion by 1974.

We are also looking forward to the joining of our east and west systems in 1970. The first step will be completed this fall, when a link-up with the Great Lakes Power Corporation will make possible the transfer of limited amounts of power between northwestern Ontario and the rest of the province. Upon completion in 1970 of the 500 miles of line now under construction, a full interchange of power over commission facilities will be possible, giving Hydro a completely integrated system covering an area of 250,000 square miles.

I want to conclude, Mr. Chairman, by a brief reference to our marketing programme. While mention of a marketing programme may sound inconsistent in light of what has been said about our margin of reserves during the past winter, the explanation is that the programme is designed primarily to encourage greater use of electricity during off-peak hours. Since it follows that the greater the amount of electricity consumed in the valleys between the peak periods, the lower will be the general over-all unit cost, the programme is in line with the basic commission policy of maintaining the cost of power at an extremely low level in relation to all the inflationary pressures with which we are burdened today.

And with the huge expansion programme we now have underway, it is important we continue to demonstrate the merits of electricity and present them effectively to the people so that this new capacity may be fully utilized as it comes into service. Our job is to keep ahead of the province's demand for electric power. Last year, we just made it. This year, with harmony restored in our relations with labour, and improvements on other fronts, we are confident we can surge ahead in the race.

But no matter how big the margin may become, there will be no respite. For as Ontario grows, Hydro must grow, leading the way into a future which will require the equivalent of seven or eight power grids the size of our present system by the year 2000 —and that milestone is only 32 years away.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:05 of the clock, p.m.

No. 118



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, June 13, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 13, 1968

Tabling final sections, report of MTARTS, Mr. Haskett 4397

Ontario-Minnesota Paper Company water pollution, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon 4397

Talks between the UAW and Massey-Ferguson, question to Mr. Bales, Mr. Nixon 4398

Timber exported from Ontario, questions to Mr. Brunelle, Mr. T. P. Reid 4398

Third readings 4399

Estimates, Department of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Simonett, concluded 4399

Estimates, Department of Trade and Development, Mr. Randall 4420

Royal assent to certain bills, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor 4426

Estimates, Department of Trade and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 4426

Recess, 6 o'clock 4433

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 1968

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today our visitors in the galleries are: In the west gallery, George Vanier secondary school from Willowdale; and in both galleries, students from St. Anthony's separate school in Toronto.

Later today, we will have joining us, students from Mount Hope public school in Mount Hope; from the high school of commerce in Windsor; and from Jarvis public school in Jarvis, joining us.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to table the final sections of the report of the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study. In so doing, I express the gratitude and admiration of the government to the committee members and staff who have worked so hard, so long and so well on this assignment.

I am confident that their report will prove to be a significant factor in future development and progress, not only for the region they are examining, but also for other areas throughout the province where the experience and findings of this study will be most useful.

Two years ago, the first section of the final report of the transportation study was tabled. Its title was "Growth and Travel: Past and Present." Today, I am tabling the second section, entitled "Choices for a Growing Region"; and the third section, entitled "Transportation for the Regional City: Statement of Principles and Recommendations."

Mr. Speaker, this report has important implications for the people of every municipality in this region. I shall welcome the comments and suggestions of the hon. members when they have examined its contents.

To begin that important dialogue, several hundred persons, representing municipal and other interests in the region, will meet this afternoon at the Queen Elizabeth building of the Canadian national exhibition to hear presentations on the report.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Motions.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier.

In view of the refusal of the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) to disclose information pertaining to the withdrawal of pollution charges against the Ontario-Minnesota Paper Company, sir, will the Premier table any correspondence which passed between that company and the government of Ontario, in relation to these charges?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I reject the suggestion in the question that there was any refusal on the part of the Minister to disclose information to the House. On May 29, he was asked a similar question by the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), and his answer is set out there. I will not repeat it now. As far as the government is concerned, there is no correspondence that has taken place between the government and this company, in relation to these charges.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Premier if he is aware that last evening, when the money was being voted for the department, the Minister was not able, or not prepared, to give the Opposition the information associated with this matter? This is of obvious public concern, in view of the pollution that has been taking place in that part of the province, and elsewhere. Surely, there would be some correspondence between the government and that company over the years, pertaining to this, and I believe it should be available for the public record.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, may I say there has been correspondence between the Ontario water resources commission and the company, but the government has not been involved in this. The OWRC, through its own powers, laid the charges; the Minister answered the circumstances of why those charges were withdrawn. He put this information before the House in reply to a question, and there is simply no correspondence, I am informed, between the government *per se*.

There is correspondence between the Ontario water resources commission, of course, and it extends over a considerable period of time. But the government was not involved directly in these withdrawals, and there is no correspondence to be tabled.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the Premier that the OWRC is not part of the government. The Minister, last night, refused to give the information associated with the withdrawal of charges; and surely, it is that correspondence, between the OWRC and the company, that should be a part of the public record.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour.

Are the talks, under the auspices of the Minister of Labour, between the UAW and Massey-Ferguson continuing, and can the Minister report any progress?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the talks are continuing and, quite frankly, it would not be fair to either party if I were to discuss the progress, in reference to this matter, at this time.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have a question to the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker—several questions really.

Is it true, as stated by Dr. J. A. Hannah, head of associated medical services, in the current issue of the *Ontario Medical Review*, that the number of laboratory tests, per thousand persons, performed in Ontario, is up 654 per cent in the past five years?

Is Dr. Hannah correct, in his statement in that publication, that the cost of laboratory services has increased by 294 per cent in the same period?

Are Dr. Hannah's statements true, that many such tests are unnecessary and unrelated to the diagnoses?

Is it true, as Dr. Hannah suggests in that publication, that the accuracy of much of the laboratory work being done in the hospitals and commercial laboratories is dubious?

What steps does the Minister intend to take to rectify the situation, and does The Department of Health keep surveillance over the accuracy, number and cost of laboratory services? If not, why not, and if so, why had action not been taken earlier?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I will take the questions as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests. What class of timber has been exported from Canada, to whom, and from where is such timber exported under the authority granted to the Minister by The Crown Timber Act, section 14, subsection 2 of the revised statutes of Ontario, 1960, for the period since the statute has been operative?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Rainy River, he has referred to Canada but I assume he means Ontario.

Since 1900, the export of wood from Crown land has been controlled by order in council. In 1947, the Prime Minister of Ontario announced a new policy which would eliminate the export of unprocessed wood by 1958. To bring this about gradually, quotas were established for all companies which had exported in 1947; and these were to be completed by 1958. Special arrangements were to be made for those companies whose licences and agreements were purported to grant export privileges beyond 1958.

These were advised, by the Minister, of the volumes and species to be exported, and that approval to export would be on a year-to-year basis. In 1967, the government reviewed the policy stated in 1947 but, due to the unemployment, it was not opportune to finalize a policy in that year, so it was decided to continue to export on a year to year basis. The present status of export from Crown lands is governed by two orders in council, approved in 1967, which authorized the export of an annual volume of 100,000 cords of poplar—may I mention that we utilize only about 5 per cent in the province—and a total of 50,000 cords of other species or their equivalent cut in Ontario.

In addition, special permission is sometimes given to export small quantities of fire-damaged or fire-killed timber for short periods only. Export from Crown land, and I think that this will be of interest to the member, declined from 623,256 cords in 1947 to 202,074 cords in 1957, to 68,207 cords in 1965, which is considerably below the total volume authorized by order in council of 1967.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That is all the timber that is exported under this? Do you have the figures per year for 1960 onwards?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We would be pleased to give this information to the hon. member for Rainy River, for 1960 to 1968.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motions:

Bill 50, An Act to amend The Securities Act, 1966.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, on Bill 130, The Employment Standards Act, I would like to say that in my opinion this Act is not really the charter it is supposed to be for the unorganized workers of this province. I do not really think it does the job as it was annunciated by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales) for those in the province of Ontario.

I wanted to make that comment because I think there is a lot of work that has to be done in terms of raising the economic standard of living of the people of this province. The government ought to get on with that kind of job and produce the right kind of charter that will give those people that promise in terms of increasing their standard of living.

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 130, The Employment Standards Act, 1968.

Bill 131, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Bill 132, An Act to amend The Industrial Safety Act, 1964.

Bill 133, An Act to amend the Ontario human rights code, 1961-1962.

Bill 134, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Bill 136, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Bill 137, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act.

Bill 138, An Act to establish The Department of Revenue.

Bill 139, An Act to amend The Public Service Act, 1961-1962.

Bill 142, The Ontario Labour-Management Arbitration Commission Act, 1968.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I did not have the opportunity to make a few remarks on Bill 142 during the second reading debate but I do want to take this opportunity briefly to commend the Minister for introducing this type of bill. Its content and reasoning and the drafting which, in my opinion, is done as well as any bill that I have read, bring about a pretty clear cut idea of what we are trying to do.

We all know that this legislation to establish competent arbitrators in the field of management-labour relations is long overdue. We are sure, in the union movement, that it will tend to relieve a lot of the concern and the agitation that has developed over the years because of the lack of competent arbitrators. I was speaking to one group particularly, in Hamilton two days ago, and they tell me they have at the present time some 60 cases waiting to go to arbitration. This is a lesser number than they have had for many years because over many years they have had to pick up and resolve cases by direct negotiations that were slated for arbitration and in the grievance pot when the contract came open. This, of course, diverted from the real purpose of a collective agreement.

Speed is what is needed in this regard. We hope that the board will be established as quickly as possible and that they will get down to work and establish the panel of arbitrators that will be available for the two bodies to clear up the grievances that grow between collective agreement termination dates.

One of the real problems in regard to long delays in establishment of arbitration boards and their reports has been what happens to the grievor when there are delays of six months, a year, a year and a half, and two years. What happens to his seniority? What happens to his capability of finding another job if the arbitration is ruled against him? All of these combine to put hardship upon the grievor when he has to wait so long for his grievance to be adjudicated.

Again, I compliment the Minister on this bill. We hope it can be put into effect as soon as possible and remove this problem that we have had for so many years.

Clerk of the House: The 24th order: House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

(Concluded)

On vote 609:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, unfortunately it was not possible for me to hear the comments made by the vice-chairman of Hydro last evening. I know that he is always anxious to have an opportunity to put Hydro's case before this

House and on previous occasions he has lamented bitterly when this opportunity was denied him.

In the past year there have been some changes in the business of Hydro and some changes in Hydro policy, which I think should be discussed in the House at this time. This particular vote, which provides the funds for our participation to pay for the province's share in the construction of one of the nuclear power generating plants, is a most appropriate time for the discussion to take place. In remarks made by the chairman of Hydro in the last few weks we have been told that the costs of Hydro are going up, and this, of course, by government policy is associated directly with the costs of generation and the provision of these services. This is the cornerstone of Hydro policy that the rates charged are directly connected to the costs of production. It is about these costs that I want to have some views from the Minister and from the vice-chairman, if possible, this afternoon.

In the predictions made by the chairman, we look forward to a doubling of our electrical capacity in the province in the next eight years and rough calculation would indicate that this will take $1 billion of new capital. I presume that almost all of this would have to be raised with the interest rates that have been referred to in the discussions already, so we can see that this is a new and serious debt, a burden for the people of Ontario to carry, and particularly the users of Hydro.

Mr. Chairman, we know that in the last year Hydro was able to manage itself through a serious power shortage. We were warned by the chairman just before the end of the year that it might be possible for regulations to control the use of Hydro over the peak periods to be imposed. Fortunately for all concerned this was not necessary and only those power users with interruptible contracts found that the machines slowed down and stopped at a certain period every day, on regular occasions through December and on into January. While this is regrettable, those industries have to accept the responsibility for that particular misfortune since they have a contract that gives them the power under normal circumstances at a very competitive rate indeed.

Nevertheless we in Ontario have been very proud of the fact that we have been able to provide, even on interruptible contracts, unlimited power for the expansion of our industry, and down through the last 25 years this has been one of the great attractions that Ontario has been able to offer in the expansion of our economy.

But Ontario Hydro has been entering in recent years into a new sort of expansion, based on power developed from atomic sources, and I want to say something specific about this.

It was in the Legislature on April 18, 1963, that the then Minister responsible for the Hydro, the hon. Mr. Macaulay, said on page 2556 of *Hansard* that the Douglas Point plant on Lake Huron "will cost an estimated $81.5 million, is on schedule and within cost estimates. It will go critical in late 1964, and will be commissioned in 1965." I and some of my colleagues visited Douglas Point in November, 1967. They were then trying to clear up the difficulties that had plagued this experimental plant for more than a year. They had not yet achieved full power; full power was achieved some six months later. The plant was not commissioned in 1967, and I have heard no public announcement of its commission yet.

We can only assume then that the plant is a full three years behind schedule even though the work on the plant had begun in 1959 or 1960. However, the Minister of the day, had great confidence in this experimental programme, and I well remember discussions in this House reaching a level of some enthusiasm as we looked forward to the day when we in Ontario, as one of the world's major producers of uranium, would team up with Atomic Energy of Canada in the research and development that would permit us, surely by 1968, to have a heavy water moderated source of atomic power for electrical purposes or other purposes on the market which would compete with other types of power sources around the world.

Not only has Douglas Point turned out to be a severe disappointment in some regards, being a full three years late in its commissioning, but Atomic Energy of Canada, as I understand it, has yet to sell on an open competitive basis a source of atomic power anywhere in the world, except Pakistan which was financed at, I believe, three quarters of 1 per cent interest for 40 years under the Colombo plan. This surely cannot be considered as acceptance of the heavy water programme on the competitive market anywhere in the world. Still we are proud of what Atomic Energy of Canada has been able to do in research and development, but they have done this with full support, both moral and economic, of the Ontario Hydro,

the users of Hydro, the people and the government of the province of Ontario.

The present Minister announced about a year and a half ago that even though Douglas Point has not proved out to our expectations, the government of Ontarfio had sufficient faith in the principle behind the source of energy to go ahead with the work that would develop one of the largest atomic power plants in tht world when it is completed, at Pickering. He used the phrase at that time that he had sufficient faith in the heavy water procedure, and the mechanism that had been developed by Atomic Energy of Canada and Ontario Hydro to make this commitment. This particular work was undertaken with great cost; the Minister knows that the completed plant will cost close to $600 million and that Ontario's share of this will be something like $365 million—a major undertaking by the province.

Even in the relatively short time following the Minister's announcement that Ontario Hydro was going to go ahead with this, it has since been announced that we are already a full year behind in the scheduled development of this particular plant. This is extraordinarily serious when we relate the growing need for power in this province to the difficulties that Ontario Hydro has experienced in the last year. Many of these difficulties, as the House well knows, Mr. Chairman, were associated with labour problems. Yet I want to bring to your attention, sir, the answer to a question in *Hansard*, just a few days ago, on May 28, 1968, reported on page 3504. This was in answer to a question that had been on the order paper in my name for some time, relating to the delays at Pickering which resulted finally in the postponement of the official schedule by a full year. The answer is as follows:

> With one important exception, delays in equipment deliveries to the project have been nominal and could have been accommodated within the original schedule. That exception is the reactor and shields. At present it cannot be determined whether end shield delivery or the construction strikes which have occurred will prove to be the controlling factor in the announced deferment of in-service date. Both are considered to be equally responsible at the present time.

There has been a tendency by Hydro officials and those who speak for Hydro in this House to blame the difficulties associated in this matter with the labour disputes that we were aware of in 1967. It has brought us to a point that if there is a continuation of this labour dispute at anything like the level that occurred last year, we are going to be in serious difficulties in meeting our power requirements.

Last year, Ontario Hydro had scheduled one million kilowatts of new power to be brought into service. Less than half of that was actually brought into service even though the demand grows at between 750,000 and one million kilowatts per year. So we are not gaining at all on the increased power requirements that are being made on Ontario Hydro and on this large public responsibility. As a matter of fact we are falling behind even in the decisions that are related to new atomic projects. We cannot maintain the schedule that in my view is imperative, if we are going to continue to keep industry supplied with power and our municipalities with the supplies that are needed for their natural growth rate.

Mr. Chairman, I have got some specific proposals to make that are related to the statements made by the chairman of Hydro. Just today, in the newspaper, the chairman is reported saying to the atomic energy conference that is being held in Toronto: that within the next few months, Ontario is prepared to commit itself to a further large expansion of our atomic energy resources for hydro. This I applaud wholeheartedly. We must move away dramatically from dependence on coal-fired energy in order to meet modern electrical requirements.

He said, and I paraphrase his comment: "We cannot put all of our kilowatts in one technological basket." I agree wholeheartedly with that as well, because Ontario Hydro has been committing itself exclusively to the heavy water design that has been brought into being by Atomic Energy of Canada. This has yet to be properly proved. In the announcement that the chairman of Hydro made just yesterday, he used the same phrase that the Minister used more than two years ago, when he said: "We have faith in the heavy water method."

Believe me, I hope that both these men are right, but Ontario Hydro is undertaking $1 billion in new development over the next eight years. We have supported and committed ourselves to the heavy water programme and Atomic Energy of Canada, without reserve. Since 1958, we have pumped tremendous sums of money into this development and I believe those decisions were right. But it has yet to be proved that Douglas Point can come up to commissioning procedures. We have shown our faith by extending our commitments into the Pickering

programme which is already a full year behind schedule. The time has surely come, Mr. Chairman, when we must realize that Ontario Hydro with its policy to provide power at cost, must lay down the specifications for the new contracts that are going to be offered during 1968. These contracts are just the beginning of a very big beginning on $1 billion worth of new expansion. These contracts should be put up for competitive tender by those industries around the world who have the ability to meet our high and stringent specifications.

I do not want to appear to be undercutting our home industry. Since 1958, we have committed ourselves to heavy water development, the kind of development that we trust and pray—and in the Minister's words—will pay off in the long run. But in the words of the chairman of Hydro, we should not be committing all of our kilowatt eggs to one technological basket. I believe he is correct in this. We should put it up for competitive tender so that Ontario Hydro—which has supported the heavy water programme of Atomic Energy of Canada and is intimately associated with that very development and has been from the first—is going to allow the citizens and taxpayers of Ontario to have the advantage of real competition in the provision of the expensive modern facilities.

We know that the heavy water programme has built-in advantages of long term costs and these can be built into the specification that we put out for general tendering. We know that the American facilities have expanded dramatically in the last five years. There are those—experts in the field—who are convinced that they have surpassed what we have been able to achieve here. Mr. Chairman, it is likwise true that the technology in the United Kingdom in consort with European technology is moving very rapidly. There are those experts who feel that they have surpassed us as well.

The proof is in this. The Atomic Energy of Canada—with all of the support of Ontario Hydro and the provinces across Canada —have tendered publicly on the international market and have not been successful in any significant case. We have put our plans and ability before the objective market in many areas such as Finland, South America, and parts of Europe. In no instance have we been able to come up to the specifications as far as technology and cost were concerned that would make us successful.

We in Ontario have the largest source of uranium for energy purposes in the world—and this means that we have a tremendous future—but we are committing $1 billion in new money in the next eight years. A commitment of probably half of that will be made before the end of this year. We have supported Atomic Energy of Canada and the heavy water principle, and we will continue to do so in Douglas Point and Pickering. Before Pickering is finished it is going to cost $600 million.

Surely the time has come to give the people and the taxpayers of Ontario the advantage of competitive bids. Now, I hope that the Minister is not going to try to say that I simply do not have enough faith in Canadian expertise and technology. I am simply going by the facts that are available. We have not been able to compete successfully on the world market. If we want to, in the competitive bids that we call for, we can give Atomic Energy of Canada a full 10 per cent advantage—which is not out of the way at all.

To commit ourselves without review of this matter is surely neither in the best interest of the economy of Ontario nor these tremendous funds that we are about to commit. There are many areas in this matter that are of some significance. We know that Canadian General Electric has given up their independent position in research and development in this regard by allowing that particular branch of the company to be absorbed by Atomic Energy of Canada which forms a consortium with Ontario Hydro. In a sense, we have a complete vested interest in the heavy water development.

This has yet to prove itself to the satisfaction of those who can judge it objectively. We have this full commitment amounting to close to $800 million now, in support of the heavy water programme. Surely if we are going to follow the advice of the chairman of Hydro himself applied in a similar sense, we cannot put all of our eggs in the one technological basket without at least reviewing what is available from competitive sources outside of Ontario and Canada. The Minister knows that we are committing ourselves heavily to the importation of American coal, both for the new plant in Sarnia and the one at Nanticoke. There is no doubt that this is going to be a continuing heavy import requirement. We do not for one moment see our commitment reverting in the same way as enriched uranium which is available at the present time to us at least from American sources.

On the other hand, we have to take a realistic view of the provision of Hydro at cost. We see our cost going up by 9

per cent to the consumer in the next year. Surely our subsidies—and this is what it amounts to—to the development of the Canadian industry have to be looked at in the very careful light of world competition.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, I find it a little bit hard to follow the leader of the Opposition. He says that before the Ontario Hydro builds any more heavy water plants, they should go to the world in open competition. I take it that he has not got much faith in AECL, which is a Canadian company, and has developed a heavy water plant as we know it today. I do not know whether—

Mr. Nixon: Why do you think that Douglas Point is three years behind and that Pickering is already one year behind? Our needs for Hydro are growing faster than we are moving to meet them.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I could answer that. I cannot answer about AECL. I think that it was an experimental plant and I understand that. I think if you had been here yesterday evening, had listened to the vice-chairman for Hydro and heard his speech, perhaps it would have answered some of the questions you are asking today.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, if I cannot go out of the House for five minutes without asking you, things are getting pretty bad. I would just like to quote one paragraph that was in that speech last night. This is regarding Douglas Point.

On March 8, Douglas Point, which had been operating at 75 per cent capacity since the middle of December reached its maximum output of 200,000 killowatts—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Where are you reading from?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: This is the speech that was put on the record last night by the vice-chairman of Hydro.

After a week of operation, at full capacity, it was, during the favourable power situation experienced at this time of the year, shut down for planned maintenance and modification. It was back on the line again in mid-April and commissioning tests at up to 100 per cent of rated capacity and more are continuing.

Mr. Nixon: But it is not commissioned, and you said that it was going to be commissioned in 1965.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I did not say that it was going to be commissioned in 1965. I do not recall this.

Mr. Nixon: Are you denying that your predecessor said such a thing?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, let me explain what AECL is. It does not belong to Hydro, as you know. It was built and produced and Hydro will buy the kilowatt hours produced when it is in production. As you know, too, it was an experimental plant and anything that I can find out from the engineers with AECL, and with Hydro—who are quite knowledgeable I would say—they feel that this is a good concept. It is a concept that is using Canadian material, and natural uranium—which we have plenty of in the province. Now, if one or the other makes a plant, I understand that the cost might be 10 or 15 per cent less, but then we would have to purchase enriched uranium from some other country, because there is no enriched uranium in Canada. So we still think—

Mr. Nixon: We can specify Canadian uranium for enrichment.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: So you believe in taking our money and buying enriched uranium from the United States when we have natural uranium that we can use in a heavy water plant?

Mr. Nixon: Canada should consider a uranium enrichment plant. You believe in buying American coal when you could be using our uranium.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: No, now you are confusing the issue. We still think—I mean Hydro and AECL, and of course I have never heard anything to the contrary—there has not been experience enough with any of these plants to say which is the better plant as yet.

We still think, and I am told that the heavy water plant is designed as a plant that we can build in Canada which will compete—they hope and think, and we have faith in their statements—with any plant built in the world. We can use our own materials, natural uranium, and I would think until there has been enough experience with this plant that we should not condemn it.

I might say that we are not into day-to-day operation with this plant or of Hydro. I think the vice-chairman would like to answer some of your questions after I am finished. But, when it was decided that Hydro would build a plant at Pickering, negotiations were carried out with the hon. Mr. Drury, who was your federal representative. This is where the cost sharing comes from, and I believe that

they think this is a good concept. I know they do because they are willing to go along and put so much money in a plant for Hydro. I would think that before we condemn this concept that we should give it a chance to prove itself.

Now, you spoke about an announcement that the Chairman had made last night saying that perhaps we should not put all our eggs in one basket. I do not know, I have not spoken to him, but I do not think he was talking about nuclear plants. I think he is sold on the heavy water plants.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, I agree.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There is another way we can produce power—we have for years—that is, hydraulically. Hydro is producing hydraulic plants at the present time—and then of course there is the thermal plant, and I think this is what he had reference to. There are three type of plants that we can produce electricity with in Ontario, but he was not talking about another concept of a nuclear plant. I think the vice-chairman will answer the rest of the questions.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I want to make it clear that I understood Mr. Gathercole's statement very clearly to mean that he did not want to move entirely into the atomic field and he was going to keep some of his eggs, so to speak, in the thermal or the coal fire thermal field. I was just extending his comments to apply to my argument. I do not want you to think I misunderstood his position.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Very good.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Mr. Chairman, I, too, am sorry that the hon. leader of the Opposition was obliged to leave the House last night because I endeavoured to answer last evening some of the questions that he has raised. It was like the question from the hon. member for Grey-Bruce that he asked yesterday which had been inadvertently answered one day previously.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Boyer: What I was endeavouring to say is that many of the questions that the hon. leader of the Opposition has raised today I did endeavour to answer last evening. As to the proposition for looking at other parts of the world and trying to adapt systems that have been built up there to our own country, we might very well ask what type of system is indeed being referred to.

Now we have a unique system in our country. It is a Canadian method and technique for producing electric power from nuclear energy and it uses natural uranium. Every other system uses enriched uranium. It would be necessary, therefore, if we had a plant of some other type in Ontario to buy enriched uranium from the United States and yet, in the United States, as I understand it, there is the great problem of sufficient supply of enriched uranium for stations already established in the varous utilities in the United States. They are already worrying about this. Enriched uranium is an expensive item; the fuelling costs in their plants are sending the costs of power up in the United States. We expect, from our system in this country, that we will be able to produce power at a lower rate than in the United States.

I want to say that other parts of the world have also examined the matter of enriched uranium. In France there has been an effort made to build up a plant which would supply that country's needs. Between $2 and $3 billion, I understand, has been expended already in an effort to get such a plant going but it is not yet functioning. All over the world there is a problem about the supply of enriched uranium.

We are in a very fortunate position in this country in the system that has been adopted, developed by Canadian genius, by our expert Canadian scientists. But I think this point should be made emphatically clear that there is a pool of technological information in the nuclear scientific field and that Canadian scientists are knowledgeable about developments in other parts of the world. Information comes to them; we supply information to other countries. Indeed, many of the developments achieved by Canadian scientists have been used in other countries including the United States, nevertheless every country must adapt the type of system that best fits the local circumstances.

In the United States at the end of the war when the question of using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes was first being studied, they had already, for military purposes, built up a system of enriching uranium and developing other requirements. It was based on what they had on hand—their resources—and they adapted the system that they have in the United States, which is the pressurized boiling water and light water system.

In Britain, of course, there were other considerations special to their circumstances. But here in Canada we had a great resource of natural uranium, we had a great deal of technological know-how; scientists, indeed, had been working on nuclear matters in Canada for over 60 years, and this was the unique Canadian system which was built up and which is attracting attention elsewhere in the world. The president of Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. when speaking in Toronto this very week told about the interest being taken in our system in the United States. He predicted that within three years there will be a start made in the United States on one such plant.

I understand this is considered, perhaps, to be just the first of commitments which future years will bring in our neighbouring country using this Canadian system. It is a good system and is already showing that it works well, and will be producing power at very low cost.

The hon. leader of the Opposition did refer to coal, Hydro's imports of coal, and yet, if he is pressing for the adoption in Canada of a system from some other country which would require enriched uranium, then I submit that we would be sending more of our Canadian dollars outside the country and further throwing off balance our international trade.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it very clear. My view is that we have been seriously supporting the Atomic Energy of Canada Ontario Hydro programme for more than 10 years to the exclusion of all others. If it had lived up to its basic requirements and had gone into service in 1965, there would have been no need to plan that Nanticoke programme to be a coal-burning one that will continue to pollute the air of southern Ontario with imported American coal. It would have been a nuclear programme entirely.

Now I admire you people over there for having the faith that you do, but the time has come when you must realize that your commitment on faith is insufficient. Now the programme of heavy water development has to stand on its merits in competition with other programmes that have been developed independently in other parts of the world. Our duty as Canadians has certainly been fulfilled in building the experimental plant at Douglas Point, and making the heavy joint commitment at Pickering and the commitment of Ontario alone which is going to amount to $365 million.

No one can say that we have not given the Atomic Energy - Ontario Hydro consortium the very best opportunity, and I believe, with you—surely there can be no mistake—that these plants will eventually come into full service. But I simply draw again to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that the commissioning date of 1965 has not yet been met and we are in June, 1968. The Minister has indicated that he is very satisfied with what Douglas Point has been able to do, but surely when we compare it with the predictions of just a few years ago, we can see that it must be seriously disappointing.

If it had, in fact, met its requirements, we would never have gone ahead with the Lambton and Nanticoke coal-fired installations. On the other hand, the faith of the government was not sufficient to go ahead with those as atomic installations. They had to, as we say, distribute their eggs in the baskets, by putting in these coal-fired installations which are going to be obsolete even before they are built.

I am saying that the atomic energy of Canada programme—the heavy water programme—is a good one, but it should now stand on its own feet in international competition, around the world and in Ontario.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the hon. leader of the Opposition is examining this whole matter very carefully. But there is one thing he has been saying with which I cannot quite agree. If he thinks of this, I believe he will realize that it was not a delay in bringing in Douglas Point that was a principal consideration of Ontario Hydro in the commitments some time ago for Lambton and for Nanticoke. It is quite right to say that we will have as much nuclear power in our system as possible. As a matter of fact Ontario is more committed to nuclear generation than any other jurisdiction that we know of. But you will never have a system which is completely and entirely nuclear. This is not practical, not possible, not operative.

Mr. Nixon: It is elementary, too—

Mr. Boyer: Nuclear is a base load system; it operates best when it is going 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Of course, the power demand varies, therefore you have to have other plants which will meet the daily peaks and the weekly peaks. Consider therefore, that you have to have other types of plants. Already we have hydraulic plants for

peaking purposes but in addition to that we will have to have a coal burning plant and beyond that, as I mentioned last night, we expect in the future that we will have a further pumped storage plant. But nuclear can only form at any time a part of an electrical system for a province such as Ontario.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Chairman, if I might, I was interested in the comments of the vice-chairman of the commission. Towards the end of his statement, he spoke about the advantageous position, I take it, to the Dominion of Canada, in connection with out balance of payments position relative to the necessity of acquiring enriched uranium, and our present position in connection with the Sarnia and Nanticoke facilities with respect to the purchase of soft coal requirements, mainly I think from Pennsylvania. Since you are able to generalize would you give me your specific figures as to how much is going to be saved?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): One at a time fellows. Let us get an answer.

Mr. Boyer: I think perhaps we would need a period of research of some several days on that matter. I would not have—

Mr. Bullbrook: Am I correct in assuming then from your statement that you are able to tell this House that the position is this—that we are able to beneficially take a position, as far as Canada's balance of payments is concerned, that because of our position with respect to the heavy water project, we will not have to get into any enriched purchases? Are you saying in effect that this will beneficially reflect in the overall balance of payments position? Do you have any figures for us at all?

Mr. Boyer: I think Ontario Hydro has never considered buying enriched uranium, so I do not know that we can—certainly we cannot immediately submit an analysis of that matter.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is the very kernel, Mr. Chairman. How do you substantiate the generalization you just made? If you have not analyzed—

Mr. Boyer: Because there is not just a simple alternative between enriched uranium and coal. There is not that simple an alternative. We will be using both nuclear and coal always.

Mr. Bullbrook: The fact of the matter is, am I not correct in saying, that you have not analyzed what the cost picture will be. You cannot tell this House really, that you are benefiting our balance of payments position by adopting the atomic energy approach. You cannot say that for one moment.

Mr. Boyer: Of course we can, certainly—

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Chairman, may I have a word on this discussion? I am interested in this nuclear field because under my department we sent a nuclear mission to Japan in 1965 and since that time we sold something over $300 million worth of uranium. I do not think it is recognized that in many of these countries they have a nuclear programme such as we have. For instance, France is building its own stations using heavy water; Japan is building a heavy water plant right now of its own design; the United Kingdom uses a graphite system, which it is trying to sell to the world, and the United States is using the enriched system.

We estimate that between now and 1985 there will be something like $3.5 billion worth of heavy water, sir, required for nuclear plants around the world using a heavy water system. That is why we are interested in developing heavy water in this country. What I think is not recognized is that you do not sell nuclear plants like you sell washing machines. Many of these countries either have sufficient water power or have their own natural resource in coal, and so they do not need, at the moment, a nuclear energy plant for power. Japan, of course, is entirely different; they have to import most of their fuel, whether it be oil or whether it be coal, and they are looking to Canada and other sources for nuclear energy. But I also remind you that every time a nuclear submarine goes to Japan, there are riots, because they suffered from nuclear power development many years ago, as you recognize, and they are being very cautious and very careful as to what kind of a plant they put in.

One of the things about the nuclear field that I understand worries most people using enriched uranium, is that afterwards it has to come back to be re-activated and how do you carry it from one continent to another without providing an opportunity for perhaps an accident, which would cause great difficulties? The Japanese are very interested in our heavy water system because they do not have that problem when you have to re-activate the uranium.

So I think there are many things here that should be considered. First of all, Canada in my estimation is doing the right thing in developing its own heavy water system regardless of the length of time we take.

Mr. Nixon: We are talking about Ontario Hydro.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am talking about Ontario too. They are building a plant down in Quebec. Quebec is building a $100 million plant down there for the use of heavy water also. I am just suggesting that we should do everything we can, and I think the hon. leader of the Opposition agrees with that. We should do everything we can to nurture our own atomic energy programme here and sell this heavy water system around the world. Many of these systems are going to be sold only when foreign aid funds are available to put these in as a foreign aid project in many of these underdeveloped countries where they do not have fuel, or they do not have the natural resources to develop their own power. Until they do, they are always going to be underdeveloped in more ways than one, so I would hope that out of this discussion we do not get discouraged about heavy water plants, because I think it is going to be one of our greatest exporting areas in the next few years.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this is so. The Minister knows that when he told the House of our sales of uranium, these were sales of the mineral and not of any package—he says I should not call it a power package. But he is also aware of the fact that there are a good many nations who are not developing on their own and who do not see fit to adopt the procedures or the programme that we in Canada have tried to convince them would be in their best interests. I hope in the future, with the Minister, that we are able to do this.

But we are not talking about our national efforts, important though they are. We are talking about the responsibility of Ontario Hydro to provide power at cost. As the cost goes up and we see the consumer faced with a 7 to 10 per cent increase in the immediate future, we can see that the costs of power in this jurisdiction are going to be much more significant than they have in the past. I would agree, Mr. Chairman, with the comment that has been made by the chairman, that we in Ontario have been in a very competitive position, but now we find ourselves not being able to supply this energy or being in danger of not being able to supply this energy.

There is no thought that we are advocating the importation of enriched uranium unless it can be shown by specifications and competition that this would be in our best interest. A part of those specifications would surely be the use of our own uranium. The Minister surely knows that enriched uranium is used in the control rods of even the plants we are building in Ontario now. We cannot get along with it; we do not use it as a basic fuel, but we cannot control the apparatus without it. As a matter of fact, we had a little trouble with one of those enriched uranium control rods at Douglas Point. The thing is now lying in the bottom of a huge swimming pool up there and it will probably be there long after we and our children and our children's children are dead because nobody knows yet how to get the thing out of the way. It is going to be there, shielded by the water in the swimming-pool-type storage that they have under those circumstances.

I am just saying, Mr. Chairman, under these circumstances where we are asked to vote $9 million, which is an insignificant amount of money compared to the amount that Ontario has invested in this programme and is asked to invest in the immediate future, that we see to it that the best interests of the taxpayers and power consumers are brought to the fore, and I say there is some question that Ontario Hydro policy has these best interests at heart.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I would think, sir, that until somebody could prove differently, we should not be condemning a system which, from any information I can get, is, perhaps, one of the best developed. Providing it has the life—and I think that the only doubt they have in mind now is what the life of the plant will be, whether it will be 20, 25, 30 years, if that is the life built into it—it will produce electricity much cheaper than any source, outside of hydraulics, that has been developed as of to date.

Mr. Nixon: This might not be a fair question, but I wonder if the Minister or the vice-chairman can tell the House if the Douglas Point plant is presently operating at or near the capacity of 200,000?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I just said that.

Mr. Nixon: You said it was run up to that point for commissioning exercises, and then shut down for a modification.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: But it was started again, and is up to 100 per cent.

Mr. Nixon: Is there any further information on that?

Mr. Boyer: During the commissioning period, Mr. Chairman, it will be necessary, occasionally, to shut down the plant for adjustments or modifications, that sort of thing. But, as the Minister has said, the plant had been operating at full capacity. I think it operated at something over capacity for a time. Within a week or two, it will again be run up. The commissioning period of any plant—

Mr. Nixon: It got up to full power?

Mr. Boyer: Oh, yes. Well, it has been up to more than full power, more than the rated capacity. Within a couple of weeks, I expect the plant will be fully operative again. The commissioning period of any plant quite often takes about a year; but it is hoped that the plant can be fully commissioned this autumn.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, I was one of those who did hear the remark of the hon. member for Muskoka. I have gone through his speech fairly thoroughly, and noticed that he mentions that Hydro's basic responsibility is that of producing a reliable supply of electricity, at the lowest possible cost. I think, from his speech, that there is a great deal of defensiveness on the part of Hydro, as they seem to be not nearly as sure of themselves as they have been, perhaps, in the past.

Now, we have seen a residential flat rate increase which adds 72 cents a month to the average householder's bill or $8.64 a year. This increase was postponed for a few months, and because of the delay in raising these rates, Hydro lost about $2 million. They will end the year with a surplus of slightly less than $3 million, and they had counted on $5 million to offset their future increases. The general manager of Toronto Hydro expects Toronto to be in a difficult position again, in 1971, because rates were not raised on February 1.

We have listened to a debate, here this afternoon, showing that they are having problems with the system that they have planned and are trying to get operating efficiently. We note that they just scraped through at the Christmas time period. We also note that those who are interruptable users are being cut at certain particular points.

There are a few other aspects that I would like to discuss today. Particularly, I would like to ask the hon. Minister or the hon. member for Muskoka, where the heavy water comes from and the approximate cost of it in the nuclear plants? I would like to have some comment about the safety procedures that are being followed, with these radioactive materials, at the Douglas Point plant, and I would like to have further comment about the laser approach to transmitting power, whether very much research is being done in this field, at this particular time. I understand it is being used in medicine, and I would like to know, perhaps, at what time we might expect this to be used to transmit power in our part of the province?

There are two or three other things, in regard to safety, that I am concerned about, and since Hydro has the responsibility of inspection for safety in this province, I think some things need to be read into the record; and I think that Hydro needs to be a little more safety-conscious than it has been.

I refer, first of all, to an article in the Toronto *Telegram* of April 11, 1968, when a seven-year old boy, Gary Watkins, was out playing. A Hydro crew was replacing lines on towers between Finch Avenue and the Macdonald-Cartier Freeway, parallel to Highway 400. About 25 youngsters, in a field behind Driftwood public school, were playing with the wire, as it hung slack between two towers.

As the winch pulled it taut, Gary and another boy hung on. The other boy dropped off, when 10 feet in the air, and was not hurt, but Gary did not let go until he was nearly at the top of the tower. Gary, who is in the hospital for sick children, has a broken leg and internal injuries.

"I just pray he regains consciousness", Mrs. Watkins said tearfully last night. Mr. Watkins blamed Ontario Hydro for not having men watching the cable as it was hoisted. I understand that the closest man was about a mile away.

So it seems to me, that when this kind of operation is being carried out, there should be somebody, at periodic intervals, who can see what is going on and, if necessary, help the operation; and not allow this kind of thing to happen.

Another thing of concern, concerns the death of a young man delivering papers for

the Toronto *Star*, last March 12. He had slipped on some ice, grabbed the door, and as he grabbed the door, he was electrocuted—

—this is in the Toronto *Star*, of April 12, 1968—

> The inquest, under Coroner Gerald Cranston, adjourned April 11, resumed today. At the earlier hearing, N. F. Polloch, supervising electrical inspector for Ontario Hydro, testified there was no ground attached when he inspected the sign's wiring set-up an hour after Pinch died. He said he found 375 volts of electricity in the door, enough to result in a very severe shock to Pinch, who was wearing damp felt shoes. Polloch said the sign was not set up to 1968 electrical standards.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, is it fair to say that this is really in order, when you read the description of the vote that is under discussion here now? I recognize it is a matter of extreme concern, but is it totally in order, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: "Well, vote 609—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not think it is.

Mr. Ferrier: I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Muskoka, in his address last night, ranged pretty far afield—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That does not mean you have to replicate the same mistake today.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ferrier: Well, if it is in order for him to wander, I think it is—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I wonder if it is the practice of the House, for the House leader, who is present, to consult the chair before he rises on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well then, I will try to be in order.

On a point of order. As I read the description of vote 609, it simply asks the House to vote the sum of $9,650,000, to provide for the province's share of the cost of construction and installation of plant equipment and expenses, relating to the 1,000 megewatt nuclear power generating station, as directed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council.

Now I ask you, sir, to rule as to whether this type of debate is in order.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. Vote 609 certainly does cover only the generating station—the $9,650,000—and the debate so far today has ranged around that particular topic. However, I must agree that the vice-chairman's statement last night ranged around many other things and the Chairman cannot find a basis for ruling the member out of order.

Mr. Ferrier: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The problem in this situation is that at the coroner's hearing, Ron Pogue, a technician with the Canadian standards association, said he found a cracked insulator that leaked current to the door when he inspected the sign, after the boy's death. If the sign had been properly grounded, Pogue said, there would have been no harm done and the youth would not have been electrocuted. Now—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask a question. Was this a sign on someone's building?

Mr. Ferrier: It is a sign on someone's building. A complaint was made. The Hydro inspector came and found current was leaking from the sign into the door and he turned off the power. A person—Hydro repair—electrical repairman came to repair the sign and he did not properly ground it. No Hydro inspector came back afterwards to see if the job was properly done and—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Was it a qualified electrician who repaired it?

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, it was. A fellow by the name of Belak.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: They do not always have an inspection after they—

Mr. Ferrier: I think in instances like this, where we are dealing with human lives, that we need to be a little more stringent about our safety procedures in our inspection.

Another thing that causes concern was the death, last Sunday, of a man at a pool in Centre Island. The thought is that there was current leaking into that pool. John Forbes of North York was electrocuted. This is form the *Globe and Mail* of June 11, 1968.

> J. R. Simonett, Minister of Energy and Resources Management said yesterday ornamental illuminated fountains and pools are not covered by new provincial regulations governing electrical installations in swimming pools. The regulations followed the

death by electrocution last year of a boy in a high school swimming pool.

Now I think that whether we like it or not, these pools are not for wading in and I think that children are often impulsive and jump in this kind of pool. Most of the time there is no problem. But I think that the Minister should give serious consideration to making the regulations that apply to swimming pools also apply to this type of pool so that we are not faced with the same kind of situation where human life is in danger.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I forget now the first question by the hon. member—it was not on safety, it was on rate. I think he would agree, that on one likes to see our energy rates go up. But at the present time, as you know, with the cost of construction, cost of labour—and I do not mean labour to construct, we have a lot of line men out there and their salaries are going up—with the cost of borrowing money today, I think he would agree with me that perhaps electrical energy is one of the cheaper things that we can buy.

As to the safety end of it, we are all concerned about this one. When you deal with electricity you are dealing with something that is very hot and an accident can happen at any time; many foolish accidents happen right within homes. If people knew just more about it, it would not happen but I do not think that you can have an inspector or an inspection every time something happens, an electric current within a home or within a building. It would be nice if you could but it does not happen in many cases.

This accident last Sunday at the Island, I would agree with him—perhaps it would be better if we were to outlaw lights in wading pools and in swimming pools. I do not think that would hurt anyone's feelings because there is always the danger that something could go wrong, no matter how well they are installed nor how well they are insulated.

The other accident, where the young chap caught the line as it was being pulled up, I suppose that is the first time an accident like that has ever happened in Canada and boys will be boys. I expect he thought this was a good opportunity to go for a ride and see how far he could get off the ground. But he got too high and when he fell, of course, there was serious injury.

I doubt if you would expect any line crew to watch this procedure all the time to see that some young fellow did not grab the line as it was being pulled up. It would be nice if we could do it but as you know, when they are stretching line—I think they stretch a mile at a time or somewhere around a mile at a time—it is pretty difficult to hire men at the salaries they are receiving today to cover the whole mile of that process and do nothing else but watch some young fellow so that he will not get on to hitch a ride up in the air.

Mr. Ferrier: Perhaps barbed wire could be put over some of the fences that are around Hydro lines to keep these children out. But I wonder—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, this was right out on the line, where they were stretching a line. You cannot put a fence around that—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Ferrier: I will leave that, but would you comment on the laser programme; whether there is research and on where you get the heavy water?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I will not comment on laser. I think you should get this answer from some of the technical people from Hydro and if you would like to arrange to go down there, I think they had better answer that question.

But I understand the heavy water we are are borrowing from the United States at the present time. It will be replaced as soon as the plant is in operation in Canada.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I want to draw attention to a set of facts concerning the labour relations of Ontario Hydro that, I will allege to you, mark Hydro as being somewhat less than an enlightened employer and, indeed, engaging in practices that are not similar to those found in industry itself. But I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that I am drawing attention to a set of facts. I am not asking any questions. I am not going to be put in the position, by the Premier of this province, that I have to be subservient to this Minister in asking him to respond to any enquiries. But I lay these facts before the Legislature.

John Maxwell is employed by Ontario Hydro at Sudbury. He is engaged in what, I believe, is called the construction side of their operation. At Sudbury, Ontario Hydro have a rather large work force and apparently, one observes, they service many of the installations of the commission in the surrounding area. Indeed, one gets the impression that the workers of Sudbury travel many

hundreds of miles in the maintenance and construction work involved in the enterprise of this commission.

John Maxwell has been employed by Hydro continuously—that word is continuously—for a period of some 20 years. My friend from Parkdale will appreciate this when I tell him that after 20 years of continuous employment with Hydro, John Maxwell is called a temporary employee, they may even use the word casual. But for 20 continuous years, Maxwell has served Ontario Hydro. Recently he was directed by his superiors to engage in work on the behalf of Hydro at White River. Now maybe somebody will inform me how far White River is from Sudbury, but I would think it must be something of the order of 400 miles. He was engaged by that commission in work that was taking place over a period of time in White River.

His home is in Sudbury and, as might naturally be expected, Maxwell journeyed on weekends from his work in White River to his family in Sudbury. On one of the weekends when he was returning from Sudbury to his place of work for Hydro at White River, he was involved in a motor vehicle accident. He was completely without fault.

Another car carrying a group of teenagers, boys, came across the centre of Island Road and collided with his car, head on. Now under that part of the inhuman laws of this province, Maxwell could not, of course, contend that he was engaged in the course of his employment because he was taking himself from his home to the place of employment. The workmen's compensation legislation holds that he is not actually in the course of his employment until he gets to White River and presents himself at the job. So Maxwell was left to his own resources.

Having some familiarity with some of the aspects of Hydro's operations it occurred to me, when I heard that Maxwell was in the hospital at Sault Ste. Marie, very seriously injured with several fractures that he sustained from this traumatic experience, that I contacted the regional manager of Hydro. He was a very pleasant fellow, and I forget his name but he recently replaced Mr. MacAdam. I said to him, rather optimistically, that of course Maxwell would have the benefit of an income protection plan which I happened to know that Hydro has. The regional manager told me no, Maxwell is not covered with income protection because he is temporary.

I said his wife had informed me that he had worked for more than 20 years continuously for the commission and I suppose that I cannot hope to attract the interest of the vice-chairman in this matter, but he can read it in *Hansard*, I suppose.

Mr. Boyer: I am listening.

Mr. Sopha: So I said: "He will be covered by your income protection plan?" The regional manager said no, that he had no income protection because he was only a temporary employee. I, of course, asked how one could call a man who worked continuously for you for 20 years, a temporary employee? He said: "Well those are the orders from head office. These people on the construction side of our operation very rarely are put in the permanent category." I said: "Well, pretty soon this man will be ready for his pension. In five or ten years, he will be ready to be pensioned. Has he any hope of ever becoming permanent with you?" The answer was no, they are always kept temporary. Of course, the whole point is that if you search your mind, you cannot think of any other industry, and probably there is no other industry in the whole of the province, where they would employ people for two decades and still call them temporary.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): The Niagara parks commission!

Mr. Sopha: Yes, well, I am going to say to my friends from Niagara Falls and Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) that this queer practice of calling people casual or temporary workmen is unique to the government, and you do not get it in any other sector of the industrial community.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed, my friend from Parkdale is correct; it is a complete disgrace.

So here we have a man who is truly victimized by a truly technical system that is superimposed upon him, and of course he is powerless as an individual to exert any influence on the commissioners of the Hydro Electric Power Commission in any way. He has to accept what their beneficence will devolve upon him and what the fates will decree, and how could you condemn him? Here is the man. How could you condemn any working man in this modern day and age who had no resources put aside? He has nothing in the bank to meet this emergency, and is looking to his employer to shroud him with protection against the emergency which he and his family have encountered. Of course he is found to be in a state of want.

There are two things that ought to be pointed out about this. One would think that

in the first place, a government commission such as this, which after all is representative of us, would follow the most enlightened practices, they would be the leaders.

They should be ashamed, and they should be shamed into a state where they would not perpetuate these technical labels that they put upon those who serve the people. That is one aspect of it. The other is that on the basis of pure common sense and ordinary humanity, they might expect that those who work for them, in the course of their lifetime, are going to encounter some emergency situation such as this man encountered. In that case, of course, whichever way you look at it, if Hydro in their labour practices operated the way that we 117 would like to see them operate, one would not have to stand in his place in the Legislature and draw attention to a tragic set of circumstances such as this —to be in a position, as this man was, so that he could not have the ordinary form of income protection paid for partly by himself.

I have not asked Maxwell, but I would assume that if Hydro approached him and said, "Would you like to contribute to some form of income protection?" I would expect that the ordinary person of ordinary reason and common sense would with alacrity accept.

But really it is credit neither to this commission nor to us as the supreme governors of this commission that this situation exists, and has been shown by my friend from Parkdale to exist in The Department of Highways, and by my friend from Niagara Falls in the Niagara parks commission, and I would not doubt, in other sectors of the government. One must wonder aloud just why the government of Ontario is unique in imposing this artificiality on its work force? Is it not simply justice that this man, after 20 years of continuous and faithful service, should be protected? I would like to say that on asking the employers in Sudbury what kind of man Maxwell was, and what his record was, without reservation they gave the man a very high recommendation, as having been—for two decades, mind—a faithful servant of this commission.

When all was said and done, you see, what happened to Maxwell was he had a label. He suffered from a label. He was called temporary, and because the label had been put on him by Hydro, which must have reasons —and I will not repeat my mistake of last night by asking what they were—of course all the tragedy of the situation has to descend upon him and his family until he recovers and is able to go back to work for Hydro again.

I do not want to leave any discredit on Maxwell at all, but I expect that before he does recover—and the doctors tell me it will be six or eight months until he is able to present himself—he will be on welfare. He and his family will go to the resources of the state and ask for charity or a handout to keep him until he is able to go back to work. This is the legacy of 20 years of work for the Hydro commission. Finally I must say that these facts having been revealed, that commission ought to be thoroughly ashamed of itself, that such labour-management relations are permitted to exist within its doors.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, may I say that Ontario Hydro endeavours to be among the leaders in the community with respect to labour relations. In the case of Mr. Maxwell, who has been employed in the construction force of Ontario Hydro for 19 years, he is one of a class of employee known as casual. There are two types of employees—the regular, not permanent but regular; and the casual, not temporary, but casual—and the casual employees are those who are engaged in construction.

In keeping with the general practice of pay in the construction industry, Mr. Maxwell has received a high rate of pay versus an extensive benefits package. At the present time his rate of pay is $4.75 per hour with double time for all hours in excess of 40 per week, and in addition he was receiving free board in camp. We all regret, of course, the circumstances under which he is off work at the present time, but he is covered by subsidized Ontario hospital services commission insurance, upon which the Hydro pays 75 per cent of the premium. He is also a member of the pension and insurance plan of Ontario Hydro.

Mr. H. MacKenzie (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Chairman, last night in the *Globe and Mail* was a report about a talk at the Royal York on nuclear plants and this sort of thing. I am not sure whether the chairman of Hydro was misquoted or not, but it was indicated at one point that he thought that the interest in our type of heavy water plant would grow as uranium became scarcer. Later on he was quoted as saying that with our type of heavy water plant, with the cheap fuel required that you can literally—I think his words were—run the hell out of them.

The question arises, of course, Mr. Chairman, that uranium I do not think comes in

unlimited quantities. I am wondering with regard to the rate at which the usage is increasing and with regard to the efficiency of uranium and everything else, could you tell us, sir, how many years the known deposits of uranium will last?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I would doubt if anyone could answer that question and give you a definite answer, but as I understand, as fas as we know in the foreseeable future, what is being used in the province of Ontario at the present time, is unlimited.

Mr. MacKenzie: In other words, Mr. Chairman, are you saying that the known reserves in Ontario today are unlimited, the rate at which we are using them, and the rate of growth which is taking place. Is there no end to the supply of them?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, again I do not think anybody could prove that, but that is what I understand from those in the mining who should be in the know.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some comments in connection with this vote. In my first remarks, I would like to stay with 609. I hope you will afford me the same privilege as you have others to veer away from that to discuss matters a little closer to home.

I would like to read some facts as I know them into the record.

> On must appreciate that the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission's prime responsibility of providing electrical power at the cheapest possible rate may not always be entirely compatible with the general economic, social and environmental benefits of the province as a whole.
>
> On the one hand, therefore, they must be held to their prime objective. On the other hand they must be persuaded to adopt an appropriate socio-economic attitude to the welfare of Ontario and Canada.
>
> Several issues of importance now arise:
>
> One, for source for future generating coal, oil, or nuclear; two, siting of power stations to minimize pollution effects; three, beneficial location of power stations to aid other elements of the province's economic picture; four, participation in water diversion; five, highest and best use of land. The following statements attempt to present the position in each of these five areas in layman's language and may, therefore, suffer from a lack of professional precision.
>
> 1. The Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission has reached a point where its major future developments may be fuel-consuming plants as opposed to generating stations utilizing natural water resources. Development of the remaining reserves of hydro electric energy has progressed during the past ten years, particularly in the northwestern parts of the province and the OHEPC engineering forces have been maintained at work in this area. There is some question as to whether the initiation of new projects and the rate of development are not linked to the steady capability of the specialist engineering department retrained by the commission. It would be well to consider whether more rapid development of these distinct provincial resources would be to the benefit of Ontario, even though it would require the help of private consulting organizations such as is the case at the Lower Notch project.

I understand you use private consultant firms there.

> The major capital investments in the near future will, no doubt, be in the conventional and nuclear power. The OHEPC is probably the target at which Atomic Energy of Canada Limited are aiming their 720 megawatt Candu type reactor, which, they claim will give 3 mill energy levels. Were this to become reality, nuclear power plants could soon outnumber conventionally fuelled stations.
>
> There should be a continuing watch on the use by the OHEPC of all modern technological advances to achieve minimum generating costs. Some concern could be expressed that the commission and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited might become "inbred" with respect to their engineering and development.

This is what my leader was saying, by the way:

> Adding some independent consulting engineering skill may be of great benefit.

I understand at the last meeting of the Hydro commission with the committee, the chairman did say then that they are using some private concerns for some work in the province to get caught up in the backlog of work. I understood the chairman to say that at our last meeting.

Mr. Boyer: As at Lower Notch.

Mr. Bukator: As at Lower Notch. They are also doing some engineering consulting for you in other areas.

Mr. Boyer: Oh yes.

Mr. Bukator: Now if this method is being applied, even in part, it is a step in the right direction as I see it.

> 2. The adverse environmental facts of conventional power stations and perhaps, to a lesser extent, nuclear power stations, will become a growing concern.

This bears repeating. I mentioned it the other day but I would like to get it on the record again.

> It is significant that the smoke plumes from the Lakeview power station are often the most distinct signs of air pollution on Lake Ontario. There is some evidence that anti-pollution measures taken since the inception of the commission's thermal generation programme in the early 1950s have been inadequate. Power generation economics may be more and more influenced by the need to consider environmental factors in the future.

> 3. The HEPC is fortunate in being able to locate its major thermal generating plants on the large bodies of inland water available in the province. The heat losses, which become very substantial in large power stations, are usually safety dissipated in large bodies of water. Occasionally situations do arise where cooling water discharge does upset the ecology balance of the lake areas with adverse effects.

Now I am going to speak a little about home if you do not mind.

> Attention will probably become focussed on the possibility of using thermal power station discharge to offset the effects of our severe winter. One distinct opportunity arises in the area of inland waterways. Power stations sited on the Welland canal could be of great benefit in keeping the seaway open for winter navigation.

I understand that these waters are quite warm. If that were possible it could be used along the Welland canal to keep that body of water open, because they are going to discharge water somewhere anyhow. I think it makes good sense.

What is 4; let me see: "Participation in water diversion."

> The Hydro Electric Power Commission may become involved in the issue of a diversion of northern waters to assist in the dilution of streams and lakes in the industrial regions of the province, or alternatively to deliver adequate supplies of clean water to polluted areas. Certainly any plans for major diversion of pumping with power recovery from hydro electrical generation would involve the commission. While it would not appear to be in the general interest to encourage it to formulate yet more plans for northern water usage, they should be induced to adopt co-operative attitudes for the provincial and Canadian good.

> 5. The HEPC occupancy of high value land is greater in those areas of our urban communities where their transmission lines run. Wide swaths of good, usable land are reserved for transmission line right-of-ways. Increased demands for power are going to involve extension for upgrading our transmission lines. It appears to be to the general benefit of all who seek some means of releasing transmission line right-of-ways property for better economic use.

I could mention many areas where you do have valuable land occupied by transmission lines, that I think in this day and age could be put underground, and I do not say it to take the whole package into that, but there are areas where you could progressively do this—near cities especially:

> To achieve this, the HEPC may have to sacrifice some advantages of lower transmission lines and maintenance conveniences in adopting high voltage, underground cable transmission.

> In view of the interest of the provincial Department of Municipal Affairs and the Ontario housing corporation, steps should be taken to induce the commission to participate in a broad, interdepartmental study of a type most conveniently undertaken by professional consultants and planning organizations.

And why I say that, too, is because when I was involved in municipal affairs back in 1955 and 1956, we talked about putting all wiring in subdivisions underground, and I think the wires leading up to that particular municipality could also be put underground. I know of some areas where the Hydro did drop their lines underground, and have sold their valuable lands for, at a guess, close to $90,000 per acre in the Niagara Falls area. Previous to that there were transmission lines

across properties that took up this valuable land and made it of no good to anyone.

> To all appearances, the HEPC is performing its function satisfactorily. We should not lose sight, however, of the fact that the commission was most fortunate in that weather and load conditions during the past winter saved them from serious system overload. It is, perhaps, a reflection on their planning that the winter reserve of generating capacity for 1967-1968 will have come from south of the border over limited interconnections.

I understand that you do not have too adequate connections between the United States and Canada and possibly Quebec and the province of Ontario. This I am guessing at, the latter.

Mr. Boyer: It has been much improved in recent times.

Mr. Bukator: It has been much improved? I quote:

> The Hydro Electric Power Commission will have to become deeply involved in any further development of the northeastern power network. It should be encouraged to adopt an attitude which would consider the Canadian economy in addition to its own system's convenience.

I think this was not taken into consideration too often. But I think now we should look at it from every branch of our economy, to co-operate with municipalities, where Hydro may put power in to the detriment of these particular communities because of the valuable land that they could take up, if nothing else.

I would like to touch on the pension plan, and I know that this is not the place for it. But may I make this point, Mr. Chairman, through you. I would like to see the budget of the Hydro considered in the same way as departments of government are being considered in this House when their estimates come before us. It could come up as individual votes where we could take our problems up in each particular bracket, to discuss them openly and thoroughly. As the vice-chairman of Hydro said last night, they are spending this year $281 million. We know nothing about it until we read it in the papers. I think we are legislators ought to know what is taking place.

You had a capital in your assets alone of something like $3.2 billion in the last year. We do not have the 1967 report before us, and it would appear to me that if we are going to spend billions, it would be a much better way to get our information here, with your experts before you such as you have here with all departemnts of government, rather than meeting in committee for just one hour a year, you just cannot even scratch the surface.

Having said that, I would like to tell you something of a letter I received from a person who apparently reads the papers also. She said: "As you are the provincial parliamentary representative for the county of Welland"—She has broadened my scope; I represent Niagara Falls and not the whole county, "—and the Hydro critic in the assembly, I would like to supply you with some critical material. I would, however, like this to be kept strictly confidential as regards the sender, but it is, however, authentic material." I have the address of the party—she is a widow apparently, who feels that she is not being treated properly. I think maybe when you hear her letter you will agree with her and me that there ought to be some consideration given to widows.

> First let me explain the system that the Hydro have in regards to allocating of pensions to their employees retiring on pensions:
>
> 1. The employee, when retiring on pension, may take his pension under two headings, which I will explain. A contingent annuitant—

And I think she meant an annuity:

> —this means that he can take his pension and leave 20, 30, 40 or 50 per cent of his pension so that on his death his widow is not left to be destitute. This in my opinion is a despicable way to issue a pension after a person has given his lifetime skill to the Hydro. Again it means that only the employee with a big pension can afford to do this, and a man retiring on a pension anywhere under $150 to $200 per month could not readily afford to retire on the scheme.
>
> 2. There is what they call five-year guaranteed pension, which is, when an employee retires, his pension is guaranteed for five years, but if he dies only one day after the five years has lapsed, his widow is left without any pension whatsoever, not even any medical benefits. If he dies within the five years, then the widow draws pension up to the end of the five years, and the same thing happens, she is left absolutely destitute.

Apparently there is that type of plan:

> The most disgusting part about this is that in December, 1965, an agreement was

signed by the Hydro, that every employee who retired after January 1, 1966, at his death, his widow would receive 50 per cent of his pension, but no provisions were made for the widow of the pensioner prior to that date, and as you are aware, being a local, these men who retire prior to January 1, 1966, are actually the pioneers of the Hydro, employees who put the Hydro in the position that they are in today. We pensioners, as a body, through what is called the provincial council—

This is a council made up of the pensioners:

—have been fighting for an improvement in pensions to the widows for over three years. In October, 1967, the Hydro did give us a little break, after a three-year struggle, which was and I quote: "Every widow of a deceased pensioner, who was married to the employee at his retirement, and who has not remarried after his death, will receive 25 per cent of his pension, plus PSI and OHSC of which the Hydro will pay 75 per cent and the widow 25 per cent to be retroactive to October 1, 1967."

Mr. Boyer: I trust you agree with that?

Mr. Bukator: Yes, we have often argued about certain bills here that we did not think were adequate. We voted for it because a little is better than nothing. So this applies in that category very well.

Mr. Boyer: There was nothing before, but now there is this improvement.

Mr. Bukator: That is right and it took 60 some odd years to bring about the little bit. Quoting again: "This is an insult to all." She had the answer for you, I am glad you interjected. This is the widow's argument.

> This is an insult to all the old pensioners to give those at present employed with them their retiring 50 per cent and those who have retired before December 31, 1965, only 25 per cent of the pension. When one comes to pursue the balance sheet of the pension fund you will see that the Hydro are none too generous in their allocation of pension.

I might at this point say that there was a time not too long ago that the workmen's compensation board treated a similar problem the same way. Certain widows were getting $50 plus 12.5 per cent per month, as I recall, and the widows of a later date got $75 plus 25 per cent for each child. But now it has been increased in the last few days. It did not take too long in the time of the former Minister of Labour, Tod Daley. He did bring in an Act that gave all of the widows the same amount.

If Hydro did not have the money I would say that this would be the proper thing to do, to continue to pay them according to the amount they paid in. But according to this information that I have, if it is so and I imagine it is, then I do not think the condition should exist today.

The balance sheet for the year ending December, 1966, showed that the assets were $201 million. They are growing at the rate of nearly $2 million a year. They are talking about the pension plan. So if that kind of money is there I do not think that they are being treated properly, because they must pay the same amount for that loaf of bread as the one that gets the greater amount.

This is, you will agree, a fabulous amount. In Ontario there are approximately 800 widows being left destitute—I did not believe that figure would be that great—800 widows or should I say there were. I have here a list of the total of names thereon in Niagara district alone; there are over 200. Of course, out of these, 79 are deceased, which leaves approximately 120. Out of these there are 2 per cent who are contingent annuitants leaving 98 per cent destitute widows.

But why should the Hydro agree to give all employees who retired on or after January 1, 1966, 50 per cent and their pension, plus medical benefits and for those who retired before that date on 25 per cent plus medical benefits on this, only from October 1, 1967. That means some of those widows, and I have interviewed some of them, had been living without one cent from the Hydro for years, some for as long as 15 years. This is the state of affairs which needs exposing and as of this year we are attempting to get the Ontario Hydro electrical union to bargain for us in their agreement and to bring previous widows on an even keel with future widows. A little assistance would help to rectify this matter. My correspondent wrote:

> We, the present-day widows, want 50 per cent of our deceased husband's pension, the same as those who are retiring today with, of course, the same medical benefits. I hope you understand this letter and should you require any more information I could either phone or write.

I wanted that on the record because if this condition exists other departments of government have cleared up the situation. I am talking now again about the workmen's compensation board, and I think Hydro could

well afford to do that if that money is there for them.

I would come short of the mark if I did not talk about taxes this time. I will use that up in my Budget debate.

Mr. Boyer: But we can count on you talking about taxes.

Mr. Bukator: "Local boy drowns after tumbling into Hydro canal." This was an eight-year-old boy. I have his picture here and I have one of the spot where he fell off the wall down the bank on April 20. I imagine this will develop into a court case so I do not want to say too much about it, but let me read the heading of the local paper, April 20—"Ontario Hydro negligent in death of the boy."

In a casual, off-the-record moment with the chairman after the last meeting, as I walked by him, I spoke with him; I would not want the chairman of Hydro to get the impression that I am picking on him. He has taken on this job with its multitude of sins, if there are any previously and with his compliments. He has taken on this job at a time when many things have happened in the past that we cannot blame him for.

But he did say this, "I have talked about capping the canal." We talked about many millions of dollars so the Hydro does not want to spend that kind of money. I can readily understand it. It is the taxpayers' money of this province. But he did say to me that a chain link fence would be erected along it. He thought that would suffice. I say in this House and for the benefit of the people in that area I would be very happy to see chain link fences if they are properly maintained because children can get under and over very easily.

I would like to see that happen and it should have happened many years ago because the old, deterioriated fence that is there now certainly does not keep anything out. On many occasions you have cattle and deer in that canal.

I think on behalf of the family of this boy, it is a terrible thing to lose your children in that way. I realize that there are times they do get by and no one wants this to happen, but anything the Hydro would do to assist under these circumstances would be a step in the right direction. I wanted to get that on the record.

I read with interest, and I would be remiss in my duties, if I did not read to you a paragraph of what happened at one of the conventions here in the city of Toronto, as reported in the morning paper, the *Globe and Mail*—and they may be right about Hydro I do not know—but I think if the press thought enough about this account to publish it maybe this is constructive criticism and I would like to read into the record, from the *Globe and Mail* of April 17, a small portion of it, that is; I will not read the whole account:

> MAJOR OVERHAUL OF HYDRO PLAN IS TERMED VITAL
>
> A major overhaul of all research and development programmes being carried on in the field of electric power in Canada was urged yesterday by a member of the science secretariate of the Privy Council. Rapid developments are posing problems of scale that are being met by extending current design rather than by introducing new technology, D. N. Cass-Beggs told the annual meeting of the Canadian electrical association of engineering and operating division. While many regional and national research establishments are involved there is little co-ordination of planning. An intensive study should be undertaken to define the research needs to assess the facilities available and to propose the best means to develop the research offered both on the regional and national basis.

I suppose the chairman or vice-chairman would readily agree with me that nothing is perfect and we always strive for something better.

But these are professional men who know their business and they say that this should be looked at. It makes sense that every department of government and every business in our country that we just cannot hold the status quo and say "this is it, we are doing the best and we do not have to do any more".

I put to you two points—if I have not made them to you—that private enterprise, such as my leader has said to you, would help fill up the backlog of work if need be with engineers who can stay in this country. Not only engineers, but professional men have left Canada for fields farther away because they feel there is more money there for them. I speak of our neighbours to the south. An engineer there will get himself $5,000 or $6,000 a year more than he will get here, after we educate them they leave the country.

I think, sir, that this is an area in which we can develop our resources with what we have. We have the uranium; we are developing now, as the Minister of Energy and Resources Management said, the heavy water method and we no doubt will have that one day.

I think we should set the pattern because we are capable of doing that. Hydro has taken a back seat from no one but I do believe our engineers ought not to leave this country to get jobs when they could fill many positions here to do a job for us because you have now started to allow private consulting firms to do something for you. The chairman has said, and I think, this should be further developed.

If we do that, we are on the right track. If we continue to labour for one purpose and one purpose only to keep our rates down; I do not like that 9 per cent increase of rate naturally. It is a good argument for the vice-chairman to say that percentage-wise everything has increased, but Hydro increased not so much. Other things have gone up 50 per cent or 100 per cent, Hydro only 12.

You must remember one very important thing, whether you want to face the fact or not—and I am sure Hydro does because they are capable men—Quebec is our competitor for industry. Quebec at this moment is developing—and I guess some are in use now—power projects with no equal in the world; they are backing the waters up for some seven miles into a lake that will take I do not know how many years to fill.

They will be competing for the customers, for the industries, that we are striving for also. Hydro is a major factor with many of these industries, especially the heavy industries such as the abrasives industries in the Niagara peninsula. We are in competition with Quebec then whether we like it or not and I think our people are capable of keeping abreast and, I hope, a little ahead of them when the time comes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I think all of us in the House would agree with the hon. member's remarks regarding the use of our engineers. If we can build up industry in Ontario—and I mean Ontario, we talk about Ontario, not Canada—the more we can get here the better we would like it.

I would just like to say one word regarding Hydro's estimate or Hydro's expenditures for the year. I think the hon. member said it would be nice if it could be brought here and dealt with by this body. As you know, there are no public moneys in Ontario Hydro, only moneys that the government feel should be spent for special projects. We do vote some money to subsidize rural lines in northern Ontario. The government subsidizes 50 per cent of all rural lines in northern Ontario. That one vote is there. This other vote now is for the nuclear plant at Pickering and those the only public moneys that are spent with Ontario Hydro. I would doubt very much if we could demand that they bring all their estimates here to be dealt with by this body. It would be a terrific job, anyway, because of the moneys they spend and the things they have to deal with.

But there is one thing about it, if, as the member says, the members find they are not getting enough information in the one hour in the committee on commissions, I think Hydro is ready at any time, and was ready this year to spend two or three days, if necessary, if there were more questions to be asked.

The other thing that the member mentioned was getting rid of some of these power lines that are around our cities where there are valuable lands. I think we would all agree with the member on that. At the present time—I am told this by Hydro officials—it is very expensive to put high-tension wires underground. I think it is a feasible thing to do when and if they get money, and I think they are doing it in some places where the land is very valuable.

The other thing—on the letter from the widow—I do not think we will discuss that here. I notice it was confidential and the member did not mention any names. But if the member would like to discuss that with some of the pension people at Hydro or with the vice-chairman, I am sure that they might look into that matter.

Mr. Bukator: Anything I have said about the pension plan applies across the board. Some are getting 25 per cent, some are getting 50, and I think they all should get the 50 per cent. The money is there and can handle that.

Concerning transmission lines underground in the city itself, where you see a multiplicity of wires running through the city and transformers and these ugly old poles that have been stubbed—I guess they call it—this is a thing of the past, this is a modern city. Surely we could progressively do this. Hydro does a good job because the vice-chairman said—and I would like to pursue this a bit

further, too—that you charge on a 20-minute peak. This I have known since my years with the utilities commission.

I wish I were involved in that type of business because you also have a 13th bill at the end of the year. If they did not pay enough money during the year you collect that also. So you want to fill the valley with an off-peak industry that will develop in that particular town because the power is there and they have paid for it. Now, I think many municipalities have this kind of cushion with which they can work and Hydro should encourage it so wires could go underground.

I feel, too, that we have to work together. I know the chairman did say to me—and I say George Gathercole, in my opinion, is one of the smartest men in the business—"Our office is open, come and see us." But, I would rather discuss the individual expenditures. You say this is not public money? I say to you whether we pay it through a light bill or through taxes, it is still public money and I think we have a right to take a look.

I think we have a right to see where the money goes. No one here is condemning anyone with improper expenditures, but we would like very much to know how this money is administered and spent in projecting their thinking such as The Department of Education with the large budget. The Department of Highways do it, why can we not scrutinize the accounts of Hydro in the same way?

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Regarding linesmen working for PUCs and Hydro, Hydro is one of the largest employers of linesmen and it has been brought to my attention by them that they are seeking to be accredited as a certified trade. I have been told because Ontario Hydro is opposed to this move, it has not met favourable recognition from The Department of Labour. Could someone in Hydro, the vice-chairman or someone, tell me what the reasoning is behind the fact that Hydro is opposed to the accrediting as a certified trade of linesmen?

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, the subject is much more complicated than the hon. member would indicate in his question. It is not a matter of Hydro being opposed to certifying or accrediting or in some way indicating success of a lineman in his training. However, this is a matter on which there have been good meetings between municipal utilities and the Department of Labour. I think that the whole matter will be worked out.

Hydro has a very fine training programme in the township of Mono at the new training centre, and we expect that the requirements of municipalities and of Ontario Hydro as to the training of linemen will be fully carried out.

Mr. Good: Can I follow through on this area?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wellington South was on his feet and said "Mr. Chairman" first.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, further to what the hon. member for Waterloo North asked regarding these tradesmen, The Department of Labour went into all the other departments—plumbers, watchmakers, mechanics—what is the holdup on this? This has been going on for four or five years now.

Mr. Boyer: I am not aware of any holdup.

Mr. Worton: No, but they have petitioned us for a number of years now to be qualified as tradesmen.

Mr. Boyer: Well, they will be qualified as tradesmen, of course. They will be qualified.

Mr. Worton: No, not as a certified trade. I think that this is a very good industry and I feel that they should have some status attached to their position.

Mr. Boyer: If it is a matter of certifying as a trade, I think that is a matter which has been dealt with by the federal department of labour. This is a question I would think more properly might be put to our own Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales) in this House.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 609, the member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question on the same point? The organization that is representing the Ontario Hydro employees in this regard that linesmen be certified as journeymen—as I understand this is what they are requesting—has the Ontario Hydro made any reply to the organization that is representing in this regard, whether they are giving a positive or negative answer in this request that they have made?

Mr. Boyer: I believe this is up to The Department of Labour, not to ourselves. I know that there were conversations between representatives of municipal utilities and The Department of Labour. I know that there were meetings, I am afraid that I am not as fully informed as the member might like me to be on this matter, but I think it is more of a Department of Labour matter.

Mr. Pilkey: Obviously, Mr. Chairman, if the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission was in favour of linemen being given the status of certified journeymen, I am sure that The Department of Labour would work in co-operation with the commission in this regard. And that is the point that really I am trying to make. Has there been any dialogue with the association and The Department of Labour in regard to certifying these linemen? Or does the commission take the position that they do not warrant the status of journeymen? I think that this is the point that we are trying to get at. Is it the commission's outlook that they do not warrant journeymen status?

Mr. Boyer: I am quite sure that the Hydro commission would take no such attitude, but I will be very glad to endeavour to produce an answer to this question later.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make the point clear that I have checked with The Department of Labour. Hydro—being one of the largest or the largest employer of linesmen—has clearly stated that as far as it is concerned, it requires a mutual understanding between employer and employees, who are the linesmen, before this status can be reached. Ontario Hydro is opposed to this, according to The Department of Labour, and I would ask why.

Mr. Chairman: I think that the vice-chairman and the Minister have covered the various aspects of Hydro which are not in this vote. It has been suggested that perhaps it could be pursued through The Department of Labour. Again, it was suggested earlier that the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario can come before the standing committee, and I would think that this would also be an opportunity to discuss this particular aspect.

Vote 609 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates for The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

Clerk of the House: The estimates of The Department of Trade and Development.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Chairman, in presenting my department's estimates to the Legislature, I am pleased to report to the hon. members that the past year was one of steady growth in investment, profits, opportunities, and employment across the province. In 1967, Ontario gained 132 new plants. To be included on this list, the new Ontario company must either employ ten persons, occupy 5,000 square feet of manufacturing or assembly space, or have annual sales exceeding $100,000. And also in 1967, Ontario had at least 262 industry expansions, 14 joint ventures, and 125 licensing agreements.

My department's trade expansion programme last year helped ring up some $40 million in sales of Ontario products to many parts of the world. The government's new equalization of industrial opportunity programme, administered by the Ontario development corporation, was firmly launched in its drive to bring industry to the slower growth areas of the province.

Departmental estimates for the 1968-69 fiscal year will ensure that our trade and industrial development programme continues at its present fruitful pace, and in some areas will provide for an accelerated programme. We will continue to encourage new investment into our province to provide new job opportunities. To expand exports in 1968-69, we will organize and send to foreign markets 22 trade missions, representing more than 200 Ontario companies. Eleven trade missions will be sent to the United States, three to the United Kingdom, two to Germany, and one each to Italy, Scandinavia, Czechoslovakia-Yugoslavia, Australia-Japan, West Indies, and Libya.

In the new fiscal year, we will bring to Ontario nearly 150 buyers and agents to introduce them to our latest products. Many of these buyers will take part in our special design awards programmes for the garment and home furniture industries. As part of our overseas trade thrust, we will participate in 15 international trade shows, and at six of these shows—in the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, Germany, and Libya—we will sponsor some 60 Ontario manufacturers to display their products. At the other nine international fairs, the depart-

ment will operate an information booth only. We will also continue to hold export forums for Ontario manufacturers to show them the advantages of selling abroad.

Our engineering services programmes is being expanded as an incentive to consulting engineering firms, contracting companies, and capital equipment manufacturers seeking opportunities in foreign countries.

In 1967, our engineering services programme aided three Ontario firms in obtaining contracts valued at over $2 million in the Bahamas, Dahomey, and West Pakistan. My department will hold a manufacturing opportunities show in February, 1969, in an effort to broaden our industrial productive base. Also, foreign companies will be invited to display products they would like to have manufactured under licence in Ontario.

An innovation to our manufacturing opportunities show this year will be an inventors' exhibition, where Ontario manufacturers can view new inventions and discuss the feasibility of future manufacturing arrangements or joint ventures, and our "Shop Canadian" promotions will be continued this year, with the support of local manufacturers and retailers.

In the trade development field, Ontario added to its commercial intelligence by locating representatives in Boston, Cleveland and Atlanta; Kingston, Jamaica; and Stockholm, Sweden. We also opened a major office in Los Angeles. Planned for this year are task force posts in Tokyo, Japan, and one more in Europe. And we are looking into the feasibility of establishing commercial representation in Belgrade, Yugoslavia; and Beirut, Lebanon.

In covering their assigned territories, each of our task force officers seeks out potential investors for Ontario; looks for products for manufacture under licence in Ontario; and helps find reliable agents to sell Ontario goods abroad.

Our business opportunity missions will again be carried on, as teams of Ontario trade and industry officers will continue to promote our province as a place for profit opportunities, concentrating mainly on the United States—our largest customer and best investor. These teams will hold missions this year in Boston, Bridgeport, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Atlanta and Dallas.

Earlier this year, my department held Ontario Unlimited weeks in Los Angeles and New York, which placed under one umbrella, the complete spectrum of my department's efforts to attract industry to our province and promote two-way trade. During these special weeks, we combine a number of programmes that would normally take place individually, to add weight, prestige, and efficiency to our operations. We plan to hold similar promotions in Chicago and Philadelphia.

This year, my department will enlarge its research facilities, particularly in the field of foreign trade. This expanded programme will include studies into foreign capital investment sources and potential markets; development of industrial product indexes and export directories; and special long-term studies into the automotive, machinery, electronics, and chemical industries. Industrial research and technical innovation are of vital importance to the economic well-being of any industrialized nation. Our efforts in this direction are now being enlarged.

The Ontario research foundation has moved to its new location at Sheridan Park. Final cost of the new building was well within the budget set in mid-1965 before construction started. The new building, with its added conveniences and more modern facilities, will enable the foundation to expand its activities in serving the applied research needs of industry and of government departments. It will also help the foundation in maintaining a first-class research staff.

This year, the province will provide a grant of $1,135,000 to the ORF for research. The amount of this grant is in direct proportion to the amount paid by industry for research done by the ORF. It will be used mainly for essential backup research and for investigating new ideas and developing new technologies of potential interest to industry. A further grant of $200,000 will be provided to the ORF for the purchase of scientific equipment.

The advanced concept embodied in the establishment of the Sheridan Park research community is receiving international attention. Top science administrators for Russia, Czechoslovakia, Britain, and other countries have already visited Sheridan Park to see the development first-hand.

The Ontario economic council continued to hold monthly meetings throughout the past year, with its research and reporting activities concentrated in the fields of human resource development, including manpower training and upgrading, education and immigration; natural resource development with particular emphasis on northern Ontario; agricultural policy with special reference to ARDA; taxation, economic policy and the public services; and tourism, particularly in relationship

to the development of new recreational resources.

1967 was a year of major developments, both in our provincial immigration programme and in federal immigration policies and procedures. Our immigration office in Ontario House, London, continues to be the centre of direct overseas recruiting by Ontario employers. In 1967, a total of 9,458 enquiries were handled by the London office, which also took care of 295 Ontario employers' recruiting projects. Over 25,000 pieces of mail were handled and employers' funds totalling $96,000 were spent on personnel advertising in Britain.

Our much smaller Glasgow office had 7,707 enquiries in 1967, over 15,000 pieces of mail, and looked after 41 Ontario employers on recruiting trips. And last year, the Toronto office dealt with personnel requests received from 447 Ontario employers. Altogether, 2,035 employment offers were made to intending or newly-arrived immigrants by Ontario employers working with the branch. The largest single occupational category was school teachers, who accounted for about 600 of the total, followed by nurses and other trained hospital personnel.

In 1967, a total of 222,876 immigrants came to Canada, representing an increase of 14 per cent over 1966. Of this total, 116,850 came to Ontario, making our share of all immigrants 52.5 per cent.

During the past year, the Ontario development corporation embarked upon a number of new programmes designed to develop the industrial growth and economic well-being of the province.

In September 1967, the Prime Minister announced the establishment of the equalization of industrial opportunity programme, which helps our smaller, less affluent municipalities to compete for industry on more equal terms with the larger centres. In our first review of municipalities that have applied, we have designated those which appear to be at a disadvantage compared with other municipalities in the province, having regard to such factors as unemployment, loss or gain of industry, imbalance of tax structure, and all other factors that relate to a factual assessment of the situation.

This review is not final, and if circumstances warrant it, such as substantial loss of industry, growth in unemployment, or the development of better techniques of evaluation, then the situation can be reviewed again, and either complete or limited designation can be granted.

We have avoided the use of rigid criteria in determining eligibility. There are a great number of municipalities in the province of Ontario, each having different problems. A yardstick or criterion applying in one municipality may be completely inapplicable in another. As the Minister of Trade and Development, I would not wish to deny benefits of the programme to a municipality simply because a fixed formula or criterion suggested that it was one yard outside some imaginary boundary line or that it was some tiny percentage point below some arbitrary criteria.

We do not claim that the system used is perfect, and we will look for ways and means of improving it. We have learned, however, from the mistakes of other jurisdictions which have applied rigid criteria, and do not intend to repeat these errors, if they can be avoided.

To date, 308 municipalities have applied for designation under the programme. Of this number, 236 have been approved. Since the programme was announced in the fall of 1967, 31 loans under this incentive programme have been granted amounting to $4,986,000. A further 22 are under serious review at the present time.

This new loan programme will have an important impact on the economy of the province. The loans approved to date will create 1,198 new jobs, of which 452 will be in eastern Ontario, 181 in northern Ontario, and 565 in the rest of the province.

Many of these companies which are proceeding with plant expansions would not have done so at this time if the EIO grants had not been made available. In the case of new plants, many have chosen locations outside of Metropolitan areas because of the availability of the grant. In general, it can be said that so far the programme is achieving its objectives of stimulating economic growth and employment within Ontario, and enabling a larger number of smaller municipalities to participate in this development.

In co-operation with the trade and industry division of The Department of Trade and Development, the corporation has been assisting overseas companies to settle in the province. Leads supplied by the overseas offices of the trade and industry division are evaluated by the corporation's officials. Where a foreign company can add a new technique or skill, and a sufficient market exists for the product without jeopardizing existing Canadian industry, then financial assistance is provided.

The corporation's conventional loan programme has also been moving ahead. To date, 24 loans have been granted in the amount of $4.7 million. These loans are maintaining or creating 1,128 jobs over and above those maintained by the EIO programme. And ODC's guaranteed loan programme to date has resulted in 53 loans from regular lending institutions, backed by provincial guarantees, for a total of $5.1 million.

The corporation has also continued to provide advisory services to companies and individuals both in Toronto and all across the province. During the year, more than 1,650 companies and individuals received advisory services, bringing the total provided since the inception of ODC to 8,900.

In addition, tourist workshops in which the fundamentals of accounting and management are discussed with tourist operators were held in three municipalities. Altogether, about 200 tourist operators availed themselves of these facilities. These tourist workshops were sponsored jointly with The Department of Tourism and Information. Also, 140 inventors were counselled and assisted during the year.

I would like at this time, Mr. Chairman, to deal with the activities of Ontario housing corporation and Ontario student housing corporation.

So often when we talk of housing, we must, of necessity, deal with figures on starts, completions and units under management. Unless they are related to something, from our own experience, they are hard to fully appreciate.

There is one comparison which I feel best indicates the dramatic record of OHC which was organized less than four years ago. That is, by the end of this current year the corporation will have provided housing for 100,000 persons—the equivalent of almost the entire population of Prince Edward Island.

As of December, 1967, the OHC had under management 13,931 rental units in 64 municipalities, housing 70,000 persons, comprising approximately 23,000 adults and 47,000 children. Completions anticipated during the calendar year of 1968 will provide accommodation for another 30,000.

Since its creation in the fall of 1964, OHC has not only created records in the construction of family and senior citizens housing, but has also introduced development techniques which have created an entirely new relationship between private and government enterprise.

I would point out that as of the end of 1967, OHC had under management, construction or development some 29,519 housing units. The ratio of family housing units to senior citizens units was roughly nine to one. This does not include family housing for students, such as our Charles Street development, which is exclusively for married students. The Ontario student housing corporation was created in the fall of 1967 and already has under construction or development over 12,000 units for 12 universities and post-secondary educational institutions. The launching of a programme of this magnitude in such a short space of time is indicative of the way in which Ontario housing corporation works with the building industry and has thus been able to produce these most significant results.

From just under 1,200 starts in 1965, OHC's programme climbed to more than 7,000 starts last year. As indicated in the central mortgage and housing corporation annual report for 1967, this represented 81.9 per cent of all public housing starts in Canada and utilized 96.3 per cent of all federal money available for these purposes. In addition, 4,000 starts were undertaken for universities by the Ontario student housing corporation for a grand total of 11,000 starts in 1967.

Now let me again, Mr. Chairman, put these large figures into their proper perspective, and I do this by using the United States housing programmes as an example. When we relate the United States' 1966 population of 194,800,000 people, to Ontario's population of 6,960,000 and compare our respective public housing programmes, we find that on a per capita basis Ontario housing corporation, in 1966, started twice as much public housing, and using the same yardstick for 1967, Ontario started four times as much per capita, as did the United States.

President Johnson recently announced a crash public housing programme, now before Congress—as reported in *Business Week* magazine of March 2, 1968—aimed at meeting some of his nation's critical accommodation needs. If this programme is approved, and with it some of the suggested techniques which, interestingly, OHC has been using since its inception, then the United States will, this year, produce some 75,000 public housing starts. On a per capita basis, the 7,500 starts OHC plans for the year commencing January 1, 1968, in family and senior citizens housing, and exclusive of student housing or the HOME programme, will be nearly three times the accelerated United States' programme.

Mr. Chairman, in using these factors for comparative purposes, I do so, not with any sense of complacency of what has been achieved to date, but simply to emphasize the magnitude of the housing programme underway in this province.

I would now like to turn to our land development programme which is just one facet of the overall HOME plan, inaugurated last year.

During 1967 the corporation made serviced lots available to prospective homeowners in ten municipalities, and it is currently active in land development in more than 40 municipalities. In some of these, large areas of land have been purchased or secured under option—the largest to date in any one area being more than 2,000 acres. By the end of last year, the corporation had placed on the market, sufficient land to permit the building of 1,182 dwellings. The 1968-69 programme will produce enough serviced land to permit development of approximately 9,000 dwellings. The total amount of land currently under development is approximately 7,500 acres, and we contemplate the acquisition and servicing of land will continue unabated.

It has been suggested the corporation has inflated land prices by selling its lots at current market value. I would like, at this moment, to set the records straight. To date, over 86 per cent of all lots disposed of by OHC were on a leasehold basis, at a monthly rental based on the net cost to the corporation, at an interest rate of 7.25 per cent. I would like to re-emphasize that the land programme is not oriented to cash sales. It is wholly oriented to leasehold or agreement of sale, with an option to purchase when the homeowner's economic circumstances permit, after the first five years. At that time, the market price prevailing when the lot was leased is the selling price. If land values continue to rise, as I am certain they will, then the lessee enjoys the appreciated value when he exercises his option to purchase.

If one doubts the success of the HOME land development plan, I would welcome the opportunity of conducting a visit to many of the areas which OHC has made available to date. Here, we will see homes already occupied, or being built as fast as merchant builders are able to construct them, and also meet many families who have finally achieved their goal of home ownership at costs within reach of their present income.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Does that include Malvern?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will get to Malvern in a minute. Do not run away—stay. You will not leave, will you?

Mr. Trotter: Wait another 15 years.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You will be here all week.

Mr. Trotter: Another 15 years will not change a bit.

Hon. Mr. Randall: This government has recognized that the dynamic economy of our province has in turn created housing problems. More important, however, the government is doing something about it through the HOME plan which represents a concerted and many-pronged attack on the housing shortage. The introduction of condominium legislation, last year, was just one link in the chain required to provide a climate in which private enterprise and government could collectively work toward meeting our housing needs. We must face the fact that if housing on an ownership basis is to be made available to modest income families, then they must be prepared to accept individual ownership in multiple developments. We are confident this can be achieved, particularly in our heavily populated urban areas, and other centres where more modest cost housing must be constructed in line with local income levels, through building condominium developments.

Ontario housing corporation has invited proposals from major residential developers for the construction of 295 town house units at Thistletown, in Etobicoke. This will be the first condominium development sponsored by OHC. These will not be confined to our major urban centres only, but will also provide accommodation within the means of potential homeowners in towns such as Arnprior, where a 20-unit multiple housing development will shortly be undertaken through the sponsorship of OHC.

Mr. Chairman, another vital link in the HOME plan has been the availability of mortgage money for the development of dwellings on HOME land. Having initiated a programme to ensure that the cost and availability of serviced lots would not impede home ownership, the government could not allow lack of mortgage financing to hinder the programme. Consequently, we have taken steps to ensure an adequate flow of mortgage money for all HOME developments, in order that merchant builders will be able to construct dwellings in sufficient

volume, so that savings in builder overheads and costs will be made for the benefit of the ultimate owner. They will then be able to maintain a steady production of homes under the $15,000 limit set by OHC.

Residential accommodation of all types, at various retail prices, must be provided by the housing industry in this province if we are to achieve Ontario's share of the 200,000 national starts per annum, projected to 1970 by the economic council of Canada in its fourth annual report. This would amount to approximately 80,000 units, per annum, for Ontario. We believe this can be accomplished only if mortgage financing is available on a continuous basis. It is the intention of this government, working with the mortgage investment industry, to make this possible, and assure that housing objectives are met.

A steady, and ever-increasing, demand for housing in the years ahead, to accommodate an expanding population in all our urban and rural areas, provides one of the most essential industries, that of construction, with a challenge to meet these insatiable demands for accommodation. To accomplish this, we are well aware that it will require a budgeted flow of funds annually, over a projected period of three to five years, unhampered by the inadequate financial policies of the past which, to the merchant builder, have proven virtually unworkable and very costly. To this end, we in this province have already moved to ensure the availability of financing for the HOME plan, as I advised the hon. members, a few weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman, I would not want to conclude these remarks without commenting on the support which our programme has received from central mortgage and housing corporation and from the Hon. John R. Nicholson, who was the Minister responsible for that agency. Mr. Nicholson was a great advocate of the HOME plan, and I believe it represented one of the major solutions to resolving our housing backlog. He was not always able to convince his colleagues in this regard. As a consequence, the programme has, from its inception, gone through periods when federal funds were not available, and the province had to accept full financial responsibility, or see the HOME plan bogged down. However, following the former Prime Minister's housing conference, in Ottawa, on December 11, 1967, we were assured of sufficient federal funds to permit a public housing programme for families, senior citizens and students, together with the land development operation, amounting to approximately $400 million.

Once the land is serviced, however, the central mortgage and housing corporation share of the land investment must be paid back by the province within 15 years. Thus, any lots still under a HOME lease at that period must be the financial responsibility of the province. There is no provision in federal funds for purchasing completely serviced lots, so these have been, and will continue to be, bought to provide immediate housing by Ontario housing corporation, wherever necessary to speed up housing production.

We recognize the financial problems of central mortgage and housing corporation, and the heavy demands made on this institution, and OHC has, at all times, endeavoured to co-operate to the fullest extent, in every way possible, in order to keep our housing programme on schedule.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to acquaint the hon. members with what I hope has been a concise, but informative report on my department's activities, and will welcome the opportunity to outline these in detail during discussion of the department's estimates.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, there are two basic policy questions that the official Opposition wants to focus on in the present Minister's estimates. The first is the housing crisis in Ontario and my colleague from Parkdale will be dealing with that issue when we get to votes 407 to 410. I would like to focus my opening remarks on the second basic policy question concerning the Minister's operations in his department.

I am concerned with those of his policies that are making the degree of foreign ownership and control of the Ontario economy, which is a very large segment of the Canadian economy, much greater than need be the case. We have here a Minister of a Canadian provincial government, whose avowed purpose is to sell us out to foreigners, especially United States investors and managers. Here is a Minister actively pursuing policies which intensify this threat to our international independence and identity. Mr. Chairman, this present Minister has said: "We would still be chasing Indians if it were not for foreign investment". His Deputy Minister, a civil servant, bluntly states: "Let there be no doubt about it, Ontario welcomes American capital investment".

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the member for just a moment. I have His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor waiting to give Royal assent to the bills. I do not wish to interrupt but I have really no choice but to move that the committee rise and report.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with your permission I will ask His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, to join us and give assent to certain bills.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario has, at its present sittings thereof, passed certain bills to which, in the name and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles to the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed.

Bill 50, An Act to amend The Securities Act, 1966.

Bill 59, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Bill 60, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

Bill 91, An Act to provide for the reduction of municipal taxes on residential property.

Bill 107, An Act to amend The Corporations Act.

Bill 112, An Act to establish the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

Bill 120, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Bill 121, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Bill 122, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Bill 123, An Act to amend The Medical Act.

Bill 127, An Act to amend The Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation Act, 1964.

Bill 128, An Act to amend The Training Schools Act, 1965.

Bill 129, The Department of Correctional Services Act, 1968.

Bill 130, The Employment Standards Act, 1968.

Bill 131, An Act to amend The Wages Act.

Bill 132, An Act to amend The Industrial Safety Act, 1964.

Bill 133, An Act to amend the Ontario human rights code, 1961-1962.

Bill 134, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Bill 136, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Bill 137, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act.

Bill 138, An Act to establish The Department of Revenue.

Bill 139, An Act to amend The Public Service Act, 1961-1962.

Bill 142, The Ontario Labour-Management Arbitration Commission Act, 1968.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

The 24th order; House in committee of supply, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

(Continued)

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, if I may continue where I left off.

The Minister said to New York businessmen last May 22 that new United States investors in Ontario could count on the vari-

ous programmes of his department to increase their profits if they come to locate in Ontario. He said to his United States audience, "When you locate in Ontario and wish to export, all our programmes work for you". To paraphrase the Minister, what he was getting at runs like this: Come to Ontario and jump aboard our trade crusade. We will take you on a sales mission abroad. Choose any one of 66 countries. If your American government will not take you on a foreign sales mission, forget it, do not worry. Come to Ontario and the government of Ontario will take you on a junket abroad. And if you do not like flying to foreign countries come to Ontario, stay in Ontario and grow while the government of Ontario exhibits your products abroad for you in international fairs and brings other foreigners to Ontario to see you.

Mr. United States investor, the Minister claims, "When you locate in Ontario, all our programmes work for you."

We have got our own international task force—one-man task force posts in Milan, Dusseldorf, Stockholm, and Kingston, Jamaica. And soon we will be spending taxpayers' dollars to send men to Zurich, Tokyo, Belgrade and Beirut.

And do not forget we have got a larger office in London for you, too. And then this provincial Minister from Canada says: "Again these posts can work for you".

And as if this is not enough, he goes on in the following vein.

Come to Canada, the Minister says, and get a "Canadian image" which is the greatest asset going for overseas sales. You nice, harmless Americans buy a "Canadian image"—the price is dirt cheap and your profits high. No one will know you are not really Canadian, and always remember the great profit it makes for your New York City parent company and its stockholders.

Now, he says, how can we help to get you to come to Ontario? He says:

> The Ontario development corporation recently launched a new programme of equalized industrial opportunity in the province with grants up to $500,000 to industry in slow-growth areas . . . The ODC and my division of trade and industry encourage a greater movement of foreign companies into Ontario by offering financial help if necessary. Our new programme is helping them to locate in the province."

And if that is not enough to get you interested in coming to Ontario to own and control even more of the key manufacturing sector of the Ontario economy, we will reserve a place for you as well in the multi-million dollar Sheridan Park research community. He adds: "And there is still some room left in which you can locate."

The Minister concluded this specific oration by saying: "I warmly welcome you to Ontario—it is truly a place to stand and a place to grow."

He forgot to add that the result of selling out Ontario would mean very little place for Canadians to stand, let alone grow as Canadians in an independent Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to the government's economic thinking. The Minister's view on what makes for continuous economic growth in Ontario is a very simplistic one. He says: "We have the resources, the manpower, and a growing market. But we need vast quantities of business capital to finance expansion." Then he says: "But if Ontario is to realize our growth potential, more capital is needed—capital beyond the capacity of only 7 million in Ontario or 20 million Canadians."

His conclusion: Get American parent companies to invest and locate subsidiaries or branch plants in Ontario.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that later on in the same speech the Minister contradicts himself. He talks about how wonderful the Ontario market is for domestic sales by referring to "over seven million affluent Ontarians." Well, those seven million affluent Ontarians just happen to save a lot more of their affluent incomes each year than almost any other seven million people in the world. With such a high propensity to save, there is a large part of funds available for investment in this province. That is a flat contradiction to his statement that Ontario needs capital—United States capital—because the capital capacity of only seven million affluent Ontarians is so limited. Logically, the Minister cannot have it both ways. In fact, too, his analysis is erroneous. I would like now, Mr. Chairman, to turn to the argument of the Minister that foreign-controlled or direct investment has no economic costs to Ontario or Canada.

The Minister has said that "we'd still be chasing Indians if it were not for foreign investment." And he makes it clear that he is talking about direct investment, that is, foreign investment that results in foreign investors controlling the operation of subsidiaries or branch plants in Ontario for he says, specifically, "our rates of economic

growth and technological advance would have been a lot slower without access to the capital and technology of many parent companies in the United States."

His concern is not with foreign investment, for example, in the bonds of Canadian companies, investment does not carry decision-making control with it. His top civil servant in a political speech, his Deputy Minister, underlines his policy. Mr. Clarkson stated last January 23, "I must . . . nod in the direction of foreign ownership," He continues:

> In recent years it has become fashionable in some circles to deplore the extent of foreign ownership, chiefly American, in Canadian industry. The charge has never been proven that this ownership has hurt the Canadian economy. No doubt the full grounds of criticism are political rather than economic. Because so much foreign investment in Canada has taken the form of direct equity holdings, foreign investment is for many people virtually synonymous with foreign ownership and control.

Then he concludes, "Let there be no doubt about it—Ontario welcomes American capital investment." And he meant subsidiaries and branch plants of "parent companies in the United States".

Turning to the future, Mr. Clarkson states: "Canada will continue to need substantial amounts of foreign investment . . . to maintain our rate of growth". And again he meant subsidiaries and branch plants of "parent companies in the United States".

Mr. Chairman, I would like for the moment to leave the political implications of increasing United States ownership and control of many key sectors of the Ontario economy, particularly in the manufacturing sector.

I want to address my remarks to the economic generalization made by the Minister and his spokesman, the Deputy Minister.

I would like, first, to put against their economic arguments the views of the chief economist of this province, Mr. H. I. Macdonald. This is the senior government economist, a man who is a professional economist with outstanding qualifications for advising this government on the economic costs and benefits to Ontario of various government policies. After reading some of his views on this question to the members of this House, it will not come as a surprise to learn that last November the chief economist was transferred out of the Minister of Trade and Development's office to The Treasury Department.

Here is what the chief economist of Ontario has to say about the adverse economic impact and implications of the increasing degree of United States ownership and control of strategic sectors of the Canadian economy of which Ontario is so large a part.

Mr. Chairman, this is an extensive quotation; I shall read it directly without any interruptions.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the member would permit the Chairman just a very brief interruption in his comments.

Mr. T. Reid: Another interruption after the Prime Minister's?

Mr. Chairman: I will extend my apology to him, but I am sure the committee would like to note that the hon. Senator, Allan MacNaughton, former Speaker of the House of Commons, is with us this moment, sitting to the left of the Speaker's chair. I am sure they would like to extend a welcome to him.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, unlike the first interruption yours is quite in order.

Mr. Chairman, the quotation is as follows:

> The degree of concentration of foreign capital in certain areas may give the foreign owners a degree of influence over the economy far beyond their relative size. Concentration of foreign ownership in the manufacturing sector could lead to the exercise of considerable influence over commercial policy through pressures for tariffs and protection or on other governmental policies such as those affecting the location of industry. In a more subtle way it may influence the future course of capital investment of both foreign and domestic origin.
>
> The real concern should be that foreign investment has made it difficult for us to construct an economy appropriate to our needs and our own best interest. The problem may have two aspects: The first is an economic distortion of the industrial structure resulting from the monopolistic character of direct foreign investment; the second is the derivative nature of the actual industries which are established in the branch-plant sector of the economy.
>
> The result of foreign investment in Canada has been a tendency to establish not only a greater number of producers in Canadian industries than the market would economically allow, but also firms and industries which are duplicates of the American parent, although producing on a

far less efficient scale. External financial resources, so readily available to Canadian branch plants, have provided a deterrent to the competitive rationalization which economical production would demand.

The existence of American firms as the principal component of Canadian secondary manufacturing has resulted in products similar to those of the parent firms and this, in turn, has retarded the development of a specialized, indigenous Canadian industrial structure. The victim has been the national economic identity that might otherwise have developed.

Mr. Chairman, the chief economist of this province says there are adverse economic costs of the present degree of foreign ownership and control of key sectors of our economy. The Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) is on record as saying that that is a lot of nonsense. Mr. Chairman, if asked to make a judgment, I would say that the chief economist of this government should be believed. He is qualified, informed and has studied this particular problem for a number of years.

In spite of this expert advice, this Minister continues with policies, very actively, I might add for he is an active Minister, to push economic-decision making in Ontario and Canada further and further into the hands of American parent companies.

I can only repeat what the chief economist of the government says should be the Minister's real concern. The chief economist states that:

The real concern should be that foreign investment has made it difficult for us to construct an economy appropriate to our needs and best interest.

The Minister of Trade and Development is pursuing policies to get more American parent companies to locate subsidiaries and branch plants in Ontario which judged, in terms of the chief economist's analysis and judgment, is making it more and more difficult for us to construct an economy appropriate to our needs and best interest.

Mr. Chairman, let me now offer additional evidence on the economic costs of the Minister's policy thrust to increase the extent of American ownership and control of the Ontario economy.

I would like to refer the members to an article by S. Hymer entitled "Direct Foreign Investment and the National Economic Interest." Mr. Hymer states:

The proper place to begin any discussion of direct investment in Canada is to put the question: What motivates foreign firms to own branch plants and subsidiaries in Canada?

He adds that the motivation is simply to maximize the profits of the parent. He continues:

The issue for Canadians, however, is whether [this] is also in the best interest of Canada.

Is it to our advantage to have Canadian enterprise directly affiliated to foreign firms, or would we be better off if the Canadian firm was independent? Which form of business organization results in more Canadian production, lower prices for Canadian consumers, and higher prices for Canadian exports? We cannot be sure until we know what it is that the parent firm is trying to achieve through control of its Canadian subsidiary.

Direct investments to achieve international integration of firms, can be a means of reducing competition. Since competition tends to lower price and reduce profits, restraint of international competition via direct investment is profitable.

Direct investment can give a firm in one country control over price and output decisions of an enterprise in another country.

It is a form of legal international collusion.

The operation of foreign ownership decreases the number of firms in the world, and tends to encourage imperfect competitive behaviour. In general, imperfect competition reduces economic welfare because it decreases the efficiency with which resources—such as scarcer labour and capital—are allocated. Prices, facing consumers, tend to be higher than they would otherwise be and consumers tend to be made worse off.

This type of market structure has costs to the Canadian consumer and gains to the foreign parent company. The excess profits accrue to foreigners and reduce Canada's national income. Mr. Hymer states:

Some portion of the foreigners' gains may be paid for the disservice of restraining competition and reducing the efficiency of resource allocation.

Let us turn to a second situation which Mr. Hymer discusses. He says:

The large volume of foreign investment in Canada seems to suggest a shortage of Canadian entrepreneurs or businessmen.

> But which is the cause and which is the effect? We usually think of foreign investment as a consequence of a shortage of domestic entrepreneurs, but perhaps the former has helped create the latter.

If foreign investment were reduced in Canada and Ontario, Mr. Hymer argues, might there not be a growth of Canadian entrepreneurship? Mr. Hymer says:

> Once over their initial learning period, might not Canadian entrepreneurs be able to stand on their own feet? The shortage of entrepreneurs in Canada might just disappear and with it the need for so much foreign investment.

Mr. Hymer concludes:

> Just as there is an infant industry argument for a tariff, there may be an infant entrepreneurship argument for restricting foreign ownership.

One further economic argument, Mr. Chairman, from Mr. Hymer. He says this:

> The foreign firm's preference for full control of its Canadian subsidiary has meant the exclusion of Canadians from participation in equity securities, except to the extent that they have been willing to buy shares of the foreign parents. The result may have been to deflect Canadian saving into other investments with lower rates of return. This, in turn, may have reduced total Canadian savings.

This statement is a double rebuke to the Minister's generalization that there is not enough capital investment and saving from Ontario's 7 million affluent people. The first rebuke to the Minister, from Mr. Hymer's remarks is this: his policy and active endeavours to increase foreign ownership and control of key sectors of the Ontario economy, which shuts out, increasingly, equity participation in Ontario by Ontario investors, may directly reduce the propensity to save by Ontarians. The second rebuke to the Minister from Mr. Hymer's statement is this: his policy may be accentuating the leakage of Ontario savings and investment to the United States for investment inequity abroad, instead of in Ontario.

The Minister's analysis, therefore, Mr. Chairman, of cause and effect, may very well be upside-down. And, as a result, the consequences may very well be perverse.

Mr. Chairman, I would like next to turn to another side of the issue and it is this: Direct investment, that is investment by foreigners in Canadian branch plants and subsidiaries, is not the only way of getting foreign capital, nor is it the only way of importing foreign technology.

The Minister's Deputy Minister, in a political speech, made it quite clear that one of the department's operating premises is that the only way to get up-to-date technology from abroad into Ontario, is by getting foreign parent companies to establish subsidiaries and branch-plants in Ontario. The department's view is that Ontario can only get modern United States technological innovation via the direct link between the branch-plant in Ontario and the parent company in New York state, for example. The Deputy Minister said:

> The rates of over-all economic growth and technological advances would have been a lot slower without access to the capital and technology of a host of parent companies in the United States.

That is, Ontario gets a package deal.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that foreign direct investment capital in branch plants has brought with it up-to-date technology. But, in some cases, they may charge too high a price. By different policies on the part of this Minister, we might be able to lower the price that we pay, and obtain a higher provincial income.

The Watkins report puts this view forward in the following way (p. 235):

"The transfer of knowledge," that is the transfer of up-to-date technology from the United States to Canada, "that accompanies the transfer of capital in direct investment operations, provides benefits to recipient countries." Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe, and the official Oppositoin believes, that such economic advantages can be obtained through other means which would be much more acceptable to Ontarians and Canadians.

"Two specific means which are alternatives to direct investment," says the Watkins report, "are extensive licensing agreements and joint ventures." When a foreign firm decides to produce in Canada, it can choose to establish a Canadian subsidiary or branch plant, or to licence an independent Canadian firm to manufacture its products, or enter into a joint equity venture with an independent Canadian firm.

From the licensee's point of view, say a Canadian owned and controlled manufacturer with a licence arrangement with an American company:

> The benefit is the gaining of access to superior technology while remaining free to choose the products or methods they want.

The Watkins report continues:

> Insofar as licensing of an independent domestic firm is a substitute for a foreign subsidiary, Canadian ownership is more than it would otherwise be.

The Watkins report concludes that:

> Licensing agreements can be presumed to be a useful alternative for Canada in some cases, provided that the Canadian firm has freedom to export; [and that] means should be found to exercise surveillance with respect to—this freedom to export—both by collecting information from firms on a compulsory basis and policing restrictive practices.

With regard to joint-ventures as a substitute for foreign wholly-owned subsidiaries and branch plants, in Ontario and in Canada, the Watkins report says that joint ventures are probably in the national interest of Canada and, of course, that includes Ontario.

> Participation by a domestic firm with dividend control can be preferable at times—to the wholly-owned subsidiary with no resident control—while the small number of major joint ventures in Canada suggest that they are not an important alternative to foreign ownership—there is almost certain scope for their increasing use.

There are, in short, viable alternative ways for Ontario to get advanced foreign technical know-how without increasing United States domination of the Ontario economy. As Mr. Hymer says:

> A foreign firm wishing to use its superior technology or its brand name in Canada does not have to invest in a subsidiary in order to do so; it could rent, licence or otherwise sell its advantage to an independent Canadian firm.

Surely these are the areas for a policy thrust on the part of the Minister of Trade and Development of this province. Properly formulated policies could increase the economic benefits of foreign technology and decrease the economic costs of foreign subsidiaries and branch plants to Ontario.

There are ways of encouraging the inflow of foreign technology into Ontario without its hand-maiden, foreign ownership and decision-making control.

I would like next, Mr. Chairman, to turn to the question that direct investment—that is investment in subsidiaries and branch plants by foreigners—is only one form of foreign investment.

Mr. Chairman, direct investment, which is the foreign ownership and control of subsidiaries and branch plants, is only one form of foreign capital investment in Ontario.

Concern about foreign investment centres on the issue of foreign ownership and control.

> Not all foreign investment, or inflow of capital from abroad, is accompanied by foreign control; foreign purchases of bonds and of non-controlling equities are cases in point. Direct investment, on the other hand, refers to those cases where the foreigner, by exporting capital, does acquire control and retains the locus of decision-making.

The point is that I am not discussing the amount of capital that Ontario should borrow from abroad; but, rather, the form that borrowing should take as Mr. Hymer says:

> If we restrict direct investment, we are still free to borrow as much as is desired in the market for bonds and non-controlling equities.

I would like next, Mr. Chairman, to turn to the question of what makes for economic growth. The Minister's view is that capital investment is the most important or strategic ingredient of economic growth in Ontario. That is why he keeps saying we need so much of it; that is why he goes down to New York to get United States investors to come to Ontario to set up their subsidiaries and branch plants.

The interesting argument on this is that recent studies in the United States and by the economic council of Canada, and by the task force on the structure of Canadian industry, conclude that additions to the capital stock of an economy, provincial or national, has not, I repeat, has not in the past and will not in the future be the most important determinant of long-run economic growth.

Professor Harry Johnson, a Canadian who is one of the leading economists in the world, stated in 1963:

> The results of the research on the sources of economic growth that has been steadily accumulating over the past decade, strongly indicate that investment, that is the accumulation of capital, is not a major source of economic growth.

He adds that:

> The results of this research have invariably assigned a very small part of growth to capital accumulation and a very large part to technical change.

In January, 1962, Mr. E. F. Dennison published his exhaustive econometric analysis on the sources of economic growth in the United States for the period 1928 to 1957. Mr. Dennison's analysis concluded that less than 15 per cent of the total increase in real net national income was attributable to capital accumulation. The main sources of economic growth were (a) improving the quality of the labour force, a contribution of 25 per cent, and (b) the improvement in technological know-how knowledge, 20 per cent contribution.

Mr. Chairman, the Watkins report states:

> These findings, which downgrade the relative contribution of capital investment in the growth process, by implication reduce the importance of foreign investment in explaining economic growth in Canada.

The report notes that:

> A major source of economic growth is the increased productivity of the factors of production arising from improvements in their quality, and in the inefficiency of their use. Improvements in the quality of resources include more education and skill of the labour force, improved capital equipment, and improved attitudes and enterprise of the work force. Improvements in the efficiency of use of resources stem from more efficient organization of the production process, economies of scale, and shifting resources from low-productivity to high-productivity activities.

The importance of the improved quality of the labour force in Ontario for rapid economic growth in the future was underlined by the economic council of Canada. The council came to the conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that one third of the productivity gap between Canada and the United States was directly accounted for by the lower quality, education and skill of the Canadian labour force.

Mr. Chairman, what the Minister of Trade and Development will have to face up to is this: First, as the chief economist of the government has stated, the monopolistic character of foreign investment in branch plants leads to an economic distortion of our industrial structure, and inefficiency due to the derivative nature of that investment. This works against other policies designed to improve the efficiency of use of scarce resources by a more efficient organization of the productive process, economies of scale, and the shifting of resources from low-productivity to high-productivity activities.

Second, the public funds spent by this Minister to get more foreign branch plants to locate in Ontario would have a much higher rate of return to Ontario if these funds were reallocated to The Department of Education or to apprenticeship programmes in an effort to improve the quality of the labour force. In short, $1 million reallocated from this department towards labour force education and retraining could well have a rate of return of 15 to 20 per cent, to quote the economic council of Canada, instead of a questionable return, if any, in its present use to get Americans to locate more branch plants in Ontario.

Third, the Minister will have to face up to this:

There are alternative ways of getting continuous infusions of more innovations and technical "know-how." There are alternatives to the getting of the package deal of foreign branch plants tied to foreign parents' research results. We do not need to pay the economic costs of even greater United States ownership and control of key sectors of our economy to get the economic benefits of up-to-date technology. Sheridan Park is a good first step, and we do not have to sell it to the Americans to get results. We can also buy more research directly from the United States, with no foreign ownership and control strings attached.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like to underline a central point. The Minister of Trade and Development and his Deputy Minister have a very limited view of what makes for economic growth in Ontario.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I think the Minister had better toss those speeches into the waste basket—both of them.

Mr. T. Reid: I think also that they have reacted emotionally rather than rationally to recent research concerning the sources of economic growth in a mature economy. They have also, perhaps, been unable to sort out the political argument and the economic argument about foreign ownership and control in Ontario's economy. There are clear economic costs to policies that are designed to encourage even greater foreign ownership and control of our provincial economy. In the years ahead, we can gain the benefits of the improved technology that have been in

the past, associated with this foreign ownership and control without paying the economic cost by pursuing alternative policies.

I would request the Minister and his deputy to have a tough look at the present policy in the light of recent research that has accumulated in this area over the past decade. There should be a hard-headed, rational evaluation. I know the Minister has a soft heart but in economic matters he cannot also have a soft head. To ensure prosperity in Ontario and to maintain control over our economic affairs in this province, he must have a soft heart and a hard head.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, on the political side of the present degree of foreign ownership and control of our economy, a quote from the chief economist of the government of Ontario. The chief economist of this provincial government states this:

> We can never ignore the real possibility that Canadian nationhood may be stifled in spite of our [American] neighbours' good intentions.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the applause from the members of my group for a presentation of one minute's duration. I hope it will be renewed this evening at 8 o'clock when we commence. At that time I propose to deliver the burden of my remarks on the Minister's estimates so that with your indulgence I would like to call it 6 o'clock.

It being 6 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 119



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, June 13, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 13, 1968

Estimates, Department of Trade and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 4437

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 4469

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT
(Continued)

On vote 401:

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, I did want to make a few brief comments on the speech by my friend from Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid), in reply to the Minister's speech on his estimates. He dwelt at considerable length on the problem in the Ontario economy of foreign ownership and foreign control. His remarks impressed me in this manner.

Until I had looked at the *Telegram* of today, and the column by Harry Crowe and Doug Fisher, I had thought that the differences between the federal Liberal Party and the provincial Liberal Party of Quebec over constitutional matters were as wide and divergent as the difference is between any political groupings in this country. It was not until this afternoon, listening to the speech from the member for Scarborough East, that I realized that the differences between the Quebec Liberal Party and the federal Liberal Party were only exceeded by the differences on continentalism and control of our own economic affairs between the Ontario Liberal Party and its federal counterpart.

I am not going to spend any more time on that subject tonight, Mr. Chairman. I think that the time available to us on this estimate is much better spent on a priority issue in this province, an issue of considerably greater priority than that dealt with by the member for Scarborough East. Like him, I am going to spend all of the time which I will take this evening dealing with the one issue, and that is the issue of housing in this province.

I recall a story from the days of the John F. Kennedy administration and the period of social grace and political wit that was in flower at that time. It was one of the famous White House dinners, called by the President, to which he invited a number of notable figures in American culture. Oddly enough, along with them he had some guests from the Pentagon, and he placed Carl Sandberg, the famous American poet, alongside one of the army chiefs of staff from the Pentagon.

He had, as the guest speaker following the dinner, Mr. Sandberg, and the guest who introduced Mr. Sandberg was the general from the Pentagon. After citing Mr. Sandberg's achievements as a writer and a preserver of American folklore, he said: "Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I now introduce to you Mr. Carl Sandberg. He will now make up a poem for us". Mr. Sandberg stood up and said: "Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. President, I yield to the general. He will now fire off a cannon for us". And that story, Mr. Chairman, I think points out the manner in which the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) in this province deals with our housing crisis.

He thinks that the solution to our crisis can be as instantaneous as the manner in which the general believed poets write their poetry. Following along in the same analogy, Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of talk about the credibility gap that has developed between the United States administration and the United States public over the war in Viet Nam. I think that the Minister of Trade and Development, in handling the housing crisis in this province, has himself developed a credibility gap—one that is as wide and empty as the 1,662 acres in the land assembly project known as Malvern.

This evening, I want to discuss with the Minister the dimensions of that credibility gap, the gulf between promise and performance, and the awesome differences between the headlines and the housing that has been imposed on the people of Ontario, who are anxious to see the housing crisis solved.

Let me start with an example from the recent provincial election campaign. The announcement of the Flemingdon Park housing project, last October, was one of the greatest examples of barefaced pre-election hocus-pocus in this country.

The Minister unveiled plans for a $60 million development in his own riding, to

provide 3,500 condominium units just four days before the voters went to the polls. He indicated to the press that it could begin in two months' time. Well, Mr. Chairman, now eight months later it is revealed that absolutely nothing has happened.

In the Toronto *Daily Star* of March 6, 1968, we read that: "The Minister said yesterday"—the day before this article was written—"he meant that project planning would begin within that period. This has begun, but construction will not start for quite some time".

The Minister promised the Legislature a full report on the project, including the construction timetable. He said he could not comment until the report is completed. Not even the servicing, Mr. Chairman, has commenced, and an Ontario housing corporation official was quoted in the same article as saying that the project will be in the planning stage for at least another year.

To the thousands of people in the Metro Toronto area caught in the housing squeeze, this pre-election announcement was a cruel hoax. But it is typical. It is typical of the way the Minister of Trade and Development, responsible for the Ontario housing corporation, discharges his housing responsibility throughout the province.

Let me deal, though, with another example in the Metropolitan Toronto area—this, too, was trotted out in the last provincial campaign—the Malvern project. We first heard about it in 1953, and 14 years later there is still not a house on it. But the follow-up to that announcement—prior to the provincial election—came only at the end of 1967. In his December 28, 1967, press release, announcing the selection of the development team to prepare land-use plans and engineering designs in Malvern, the Minister rejected "uninformed criticisms and comment levelled at the proposed community". That release went on:

> Mr. Randall pointed out some critics have said the entire area will be used for public housing and others have said disagreement and procrastination between the various levels of government have held Malvern back for years. "These assumptions are entirely incorrect," Mr. Randall stated. The Minister stated that Malvern will be a wholly integrated community, combining residential, commercial, institutional, industrial and public uses.

Let us deal with two aspects of that release, Mr. Chairman, before going on. In a *Globe and Mail* story on May 14, 1968, the mayor of the borough of Scarborough, Mr. Campbell, was quoted as saying that the first houses in the Ontario government's Malvern development in Scarborough are not likely to be built before 1970. The four planning companies, those that the Minister had announced in his December 28 press release, had been expected to produce the first plans for the development by early April of this year. So far, Mayor Campbell said "OHC officials have only introduced the planners to some municipal department heads in Scarborough and that was last week. So they are just beginning planning," the mayor went on, "and now I have to say they will be fortunate to have first homes built by 1970." We have headlines of 1967, Mr. Chairman, maybe we will have the housing in 1970 or 1971, and perhaps even 1975.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I think before 1971.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, before I was elected a member of this Legislature, many, many years ago, when I sat in the galleries of the House listening to the proceedings, I would hear members from the back benches on the opposite side stand up to read editorials from the Toronto *Globe and Mail* in praise of the administration. I never thought there was any other use for *Globe and Mail* editorials; I had a very low opinion of them. But there is one which I cannot avoid reading, Mr. Chairman, in relation to this Malvern project, and that is one which appeared the day after the article to which I have just referred, in the *Globe and Mail* of May 15, entitled "The Joy of Not Giving," and it reads:

> When a political carrot is dangled before an electoral donkey, the position of the carrot is of the utmost importance. It must be close enough to interest the donkey, but not so close that he can actually sink his teeth into it.
>
> The Ontario government has little to learn about these techniques. It has had us trotting hungrily toward the Malvern carrot for more than 14 years, salivating like mad over the thought of about 10,000 housing units for 25,000 persons. The land was assembled long ago by the provincial and federal governments and the first houses were promised for 1954, but these things cannot be rushed.
>
> A powerful whiff of carrot wafted over Metropolitan Toronto last October at about the time of the provincial election, when

Economics Minister Stanley Randall let it be known that the start on the project was imminent.

After the stimulant, however, comes the depressant. In the beginning servicing worries, and then the suggestion this week that the first houses may not be built before 1970. We feel sure that between now and 1970 a number of unforeseen difficulties will present themselves.

With any luck a start on Malvern will be just around the corner by the time the next provincial election is upon us.

Mr. Chairman, that is an editorial from the *Globe and Mail* which I enjoy quoting and I think that the ridicule which it heaps upon this government for the delays in developing the Malvern land assembly are well deserved indeed.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to have this housing in 1970 or 1971 in the Malvern area, what kind of housing is it going to be? A hint, I think the first real hint, as to the type of housing to go up on Malvern land, came in the same release that I referred to earlier—the Minister's release on Malvern, December 28, 1968, in which the Minister said:

The development of Malvern will be a major step toward facilitating home ownership in Toronto.

That hint, Mr. Chairman, was confirmed in the *Globe and Mail* story of May 14, 1968:

Patrick Brady, deputy director of the Ontario housing corporation, said yesterday that the government's emphasis on home ownership and Scarborough's already heavy share of the Ontario housing, could prompt Malvern planners to recommend no permanent public housing in the development.

Later in that story:

"The OHC has set no guidlines for public housing in the development," Mr. Brady said, "and the planners could recommend that there be no housing units in it. Scarborough has about 20 per cent of Metro's public housing and other boroughs may be in line for more new units," he said.

That, Mr. Chairman, in an incredible forecast—that after 14 years of delay, after 14 years in which this land in the Malvern area has been isolated from the surrounding speculation and inflation of land costs, after 14 years of paying a total of $3.5 million for the cost of acquisition, maintenance and interest charges—after 14 years of pent-up expectation, we are not going to have public housing on Malvern land. That is an incredible statement by the Ontario housing corporation, Mr. Chairman, and I hope it is one that the Minister can correct tonight.

If public housing is not going to be placed on Malvern, who is going to be housed on the Malvern land, Mr. Chairman? That is another question that has to be answered. Well, let me return again to the *Globe and Mail*, this time for January 6, 1968, in which statements are made by officials of the Ontario housing corporation about the corporation's policy in regard to land value appreciation. The article quotes Mr. Suters, the managing director of OHC:

While defending the government policy of selling at market value, Mr. Suters said he could not comment on it. "The corporation is not out to make a profit from people, it is out to get people into proper housing."

Mr. Chairman, when we look at the appreciation of values in the Malvern area, I think that we have to question this statement. A headline over that story in the *Globe and Mail* of January 6, reads "$15 million Malvern profit likely for Ontario and Ottawa—land value soars." At the time, a piece of speculative writing perhaps, an article that was regarded by many as quite far-fetched suggesting that the federal-provincial partnership could come into a bonanza of this size. "Federal and provincial agencies would have a potential profit of about $15 million if the Malvern project were ready to be started today," the article said, "Depending on how much of the land went to high-rise apartment use, the figure could be higher. But for every acre of single-family residences the profit would be about $18,000."

Mr. Chairman, if home ownership is to be the form of land use for those areas set aside for housing, then we have to think in terms of single-family residence lots. These, according to this article in the Toronto *Globe and Mail*, could currently sell at $10,000 to $10,500 each, with about four on each acre. Theoretically, if the entire area was covered by single-family housing, the profit would be more than $30 million. Calculating what the appreciation on a per-lot basis would be, Mr. Chairman, the land has cost the Crown—Ontario and Canada—slightly more than $2,000 an acre to date to acquire, maintain and pay interest. Using the cost of $6 million for servicing, which was one figure that appeared and was attributed to Scarborough, the cost of servicing and acquisition could be approximately $3,600 an acre. I find that figure much too low.

I think that a much more appropriate figure in estimating the book value—the cost of acquisition and the cost of servicing together—would be more in the order of $5,500 per lot, on the basis of four lots to the acre for single-family dwellings. At the current appraised market valuation of $10,000 to $10,500, that represents an appreciation of double the book value of those lots, double what the provincial and federal governments paid for them and what the cost of servicing would probably be.

In his estimates speech this afternoon, the Minister said that it has been suggested that the corporation has inflated land prices by selling its lots at current market value.

"I would like to set the record straight," the Minister said. "To date, over 86 per cent of all lots disposed of by the Ontario housing corporation were on a leasehold basis, or a monthly rental based on the net cost to the corporation, and an interest rate of 7.25 per cent." But we are not quarreling with that, Mr. Chairman. What the Minister did not deal with in his defence of the charge that the corporation has inflated land values, is the manner in which ground rents or leasing rents are set for HOME lots as they were in Bramalea—where the corporation acquired land and serviced it at one cost, and, because of the time delay, in putting those lots on the market, the current market evaluation was considerably above book value. He did not defend himself against the charge that in Malvern, the same kind of process is going to be followed when housing is put on that land for the HOME programme.

In the article on January 6, Mr. Chairman, it reaffirmed that the provincial government's policy is to sell land at market value. The government is certainly not going to take into account, once lots do go on sale, the tremendous appreciation that has accrued to it in this 14- or 17- or 18-year period, or whatever it turns out to be, from the time of acquisition to the time that lots and houses are first offered.

If these lands in Malvern are subdivided into lots for leasing under HOME, and the lease rent is based on the market value at the time that the lease is drawn, then the province will be, despite Mr. Suter's statement, "making a profit from people," and the government will share in that profit. The speculation will not be found in the *Globe and Mail* story, Mr. Chairman. It will be found in the land development policies of the Ontario housing corporation.

Let me turn to another example of this gap between promise and performance, Mr. Chairman. Early in 1967, the Minister announced that 20,000 lots would be provided through lease under the HOME plan, including over 4,000 in Metropolitan Toronto. And that, I believe, was just following the Throne Speech early in 1967. Now it is revealed that only approximately 1,100 lots were made available and none of them within the actual boundaries of the Metro area by year's end, 1967. Only 658 were actually taken up by prospective home owners in 1967, as some lots were in remote areas where there was no demand or the price or size was unsuitable.

Mr. Chairman, that is a tremendous shortfall in performance—from 20,000 lots promised at the beginning of 1967 to only approximately 1,100 actually offered and 658 disposed of at the end of the calendar year. But let us take it up to a later date, the latest which I have been able to obtain—for the ten months since the first HOME lots were offered to the public. I believe the Minister himself has said that a total of 1,365 lots were disposed of in that ten-month period—nothing approaching the dimensions of the HOME programme that the Minister forecast at the time of the Throne Speech in 1967.

Let us extend the period of grace somewhat for the Minister to fulfil his projection. What is forecast for 1968-69? In his speech this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, the Minister pointed out that the 1968-69 programme will produce enough serviced land to permit development of approximately 9,000 dwellings. That is the only indication we have of the number of lots to be made available and, of course, that figure is meaningless if we try to extract from it the number of lots that will actually be offered for home ownership under the HOME plan.

Adding that number—the 9,000—to the number of lots that the Minister said would be available under the HOME programme—the 20,000—we come up with a total of barely half of what was promised.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out another contradiction between what the housing corporation and the Minister told the public of this province is going to be achieved in housing and what is actually performed. It is a statement by Mr. H. Peter Langer, a member of the board of directors of the Ontario housing corporation, in the Windsor *Star*, May 1, 1968, in which he said:

> Ontario housing corporation hopes to makes 6,000 new building lots available in 30 municipalities this year.

That figure may be the one. That figure may be the target that the Minister is shooting for under the HOME programme in 1968-69.

But earlier, Mr. Chairman, in a report in the Toronto *Daily Star* dated April 2, 1968, the Minister said:

> Ontario's home ownership made easy programme will expand to provide many thousands of lots this year—

that is in 1968, or 1968-69:

> —but he refused to elaborate on how many lots would be provided, or where they would be located, until detailed plans are presented in the Legislature.

Yet we have this later story dated May 1, in which one of the directors of Ontario housing corporation speaks of 6,000 HOME lots being made available and the Minister saying that he cannot say and will not elaborate, on April 4, as to the number of HOME lots to be offered in 1968.

In the public housing field, Mr. Chairman, this record of contradiction is equally shocking. On July 31, 1967, the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) said that Ontario housing corporation expected to start 12,000 units last year. He failed to mention that over 4,000 of these were student housing units. For families and senior citizens the province only started a total of 7,100 units in 1967.

On the basis of that kind of calculation, Mr. Chairman, the Minister claimed, in his speech to the Beaches-Woodbine Progressive Conservative association, reported in the Toronto *Star* on April 2, that Ontario housing corporation had produced 20 per cent of the province's new housing last year and will raise the figure to 25 per cent in 1968. That is a very commendable level by the way, Mr. Chairman, and I want to speak of it a little later.

But the credit for achieving 20 per cent of the housing starts in the province last year was based on the inclusion of almost 4,000 bedrooms, Mr. Chairman—not homes—for students at universities.

But the contradictions keep turning up. In his speech in Barrie on Thursday, May 23, the Minister said, according to his release:

> One out of every ten housing starts in Ontario last year was made by Ontario housing corporation.

Suddenly the claim is cut in half, from 20 to 10 per cent.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): That is a credibility gap.

Mr. Peacock: And while there were, I think, approximately 62,000 housing starts in the province last year, I do not see how the Minister—even acknowledging the 7,100 starts on family and senior citizens' units—can come up with either the 10 per cent or the 20 per cent figure, if he adds in the 4,000 student housing unit starts.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that Ontario housing corporation did not even come close to building the number of family and senior citizens' and student housing units that the Prime Minister forecast over the summer.

A total of 6,400 starts in family housing were forecast or promised; 5,700 were actually undertaken, for a shortfall of 700. A total of 1,700 senior citizens' housing units were forecast for starts in 1967; only 1,400 were actually gotten under way, for a shortfall of 300. In all 4,400 student units were supposed to be started in 1967; just under 4,000 were actually commenced, for a shortfall of 400.

So that between promise and performance for starts in 1967, Mr. Chairman, we have a shortfall of 1,400 units, or a gap of better than 10 per cent. The number that the Minister did manage to commence—the 7,100 senior citizens' and family housing units—fell far short of the need.

The Canadian welfare council, which is launching the Canadian conference on housing, has undertaken a major research project in the housing field and estimates that Ontario will need about 75,000 units a year until 1971, and nearly 89,000 annually in the following five years.

I believe that at least 25 per cent of these should be public housing, if we are to meet the needs of the thousands who have been priced out of the private market by the economic policies of the Liberal administration at Ottawa.

On this basis, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Peacock: I will take a little more time later in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, to deal with the coalition between Ottawa and Toronto to defeat the expansion of our housing policies in this province.

But on the basis of what the Canadian conference on housing has estimated to be the need in Ontario until 1971, we need 19,000 public housing units of senior citizens'

and family unit types at present—that is, at the end of 1967—and not the 7,100 that were actually commenced by Ontario housing corporation.

And what do we have forecast for the coming year? The Minister in his speech this afternoon, on the estimates, pointed out with pride the contrast between what was happening in the public housing field in the United States, and what he has been achieving, in his view, in Ontario. He told us this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, that on a per capita basis—and I just want to say in parenthesis here, that he did not take the trouble to tell us directly and straightforwardly and in a separate, specific way what the plans for senior citizens' and family housing starts in Ontario would be in 1968. He put it in a reference to what was happening in the United States. He said, on a per capita basis, the 7,500 starts Ontario housing corporation plans for the year commencing January 1, 1968, in family and senior citizens' housing and exclusive of student housing, or the HOME programme, will be nearly three times the accelerated United States programme.

It is only in these references to what is happening in the United States—in these illustrations of how well he is doing, in his lights—do we get any information at all about what Ontario housing corporation plans to do to meet the housing crisis in Ontario.

I suggest that the increase in starts of 400 between 1967 and 1968 is absolutely pathetic; absolutely unrealistic; nowhere conceivably close to what the demand in this province is, even granting the Canadian conference on housing's estimate of total demand which I think is conservative.

So far, Mr. Chairman, into 1968, the Minister appears to have announced starts for about 3,100 units, some senior citizen and some family units, from what I can gather from Ontario housing corporation press releases. I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that, of these starts, a very large proportion will not be scheduled for completion until well into 1969. When we are talking about starts, Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the possibilities, indeed the probabilities, of getting into the same kind of hang-ups that the Malvern project has gotten itself into, and starts in this light, therefore, are not a very meaningful measure of the activity that the Ontario housing corporation is carrying on when we look at the need that now exists in 1968.

We should be talking about completions that have taken place in 1967, and that are guaranteed to take place in 1968, if we are going to talk realistically about meeting the present demand, and not allow the backlog of housing to grow any larger than it already is.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to further introduce the element of confusion into the publicity and the information that the Minister for the Ontario housing corporation provides to the public of this province. In his Budget address on March 12, the Treasurer of the province (Mr. MacNaughton) said that, "In this Budget we have recognized that housing merits a top priority claim in Ontario's finances. To meet our goal of good housing for every citizen, Ontario needs an average of 90,000 new units each year from now until 1970"—90,000, Mr. Chairman, not 75,000 according to the estimate of the Provincial Treasurer, but 90,000 units.

How much more abysmally short are we going to find ourselves on the basis of the Minister's forecasted starts of 7,500 units in 1968? How much more short we are going to find ourselves on the Provincial Treasurer's estimate of demand compared with the Canadian conference on housing's estimate of demand is about 3.3 times, Mr. Chairman. The number of units that the Ontario housing corporation should be building under the Ontario Treasurer's estimate of demand is about 25,000 if we are going to meet the 25 per cent proportion of public housing to total housing for the province. So we are even further behind than the estimates of the Canadian conference on housing would suggest.

But in his speech this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, let me remind you that the Minister said, in talking about the economic council of Canada's forecast of 200,000 national starts per annum needed up to 1970, that this would amount to approximately 80,000 units per annum for Ontario. Why the two figures of 80,000 in one document—the Minister's estimates—and 90,000 in the Provincial Treasurer's Budget, Mr. Chairman? This has not been explained. It is not a very wide gap, that 10,000 difference in number, but it is illustrative of the confusion that exists in the housing field in which the statistics keep changing, the forecasts keep changing, and the promises get ever further and further ahead of the performance.

The Minister's assertions that we were doing more than has ever been done before in the past, or more than other provinces, do not gainsay these shocking shortfalls. The gap between promise and performance means that the pressure on rents and home prices for everyone will continue to grow.

Just a few words, Mr. Chairman, about what is happening in the housing market currently. According to central mortgage and housing corporation, the number of housing starts on a seasonaly adjusted basis in Ontario in April, 1968, was 69,200 expressed as an annual rate, down almost 10,000 compared to the 79,400 units the month before, again expressed in an annual rate. One indicator of what is going to happen later this year in the housing field is the change in the number of NHA loan approvals. In April, these dropped by 56 per cent to only loan approvals covering 2,500 dwelling units from 4,000 in April last year. In the January to April period of 1968, the loan approvals in terms of dwelling units fell by 19 per cent compared with the same period a year before.

Under the policies, Mr. Chairman, of the high-interest NHA mortgages set by Ottawa we are squeezing more and more families out of the private housing market in this province. In 1963, according to central mortgage and housing corporation, families with incomes under $7,000 per year represented almost three quarters of all National Housing Act borrowers, but in 1967, Mr. Chairman, they represented just over one quarter. I use that period of time, 1963 to 1967, because in 1963, Mr. Chairman, we were well into a period of expansion, and incomes were rising and home activity was picking up.

Families with incomes of less than $5,000 per year dropped out of the picture completely in that period, Mr. Chairman, because of the shortages in housing and the steadily rising interest rates. The average family income for an NHA borrower in 1967 was $8,300 and I suspect that in the province of Ontario it was somewhat higher. Dr. Albert Rose, who is himself a member of the board of Ontario housing corporation, says that it is fair to argue that the housing crisis has spread as far up the income distribution as the 75 per cent mark if not higher on the scale.

Mr. Chairman, many members of the Legislature are familiar with what has been happening in the private housing market as a result of the scarcity and the high interest rates and the high down payments and the higher monthly carrying charges. They have instance after instance of hardship and deprivation in the private market. Looking at the Metropolitan Toronto housing registry figures, Mr. Chairman, we can see the extent to which families are shut out of the housing market by the policies carried on by Ottawa and Toronto. At the end of 1967 the registry had 10,000 applications on file for family units, 4,800 for senior citizens units, for a total number of applications of 14,800. Between the end of the year and the end of March, 1968, the registry received an additional 3,200 applications for family housing and 875 for senior citizens, for a total of additional applications of 4,000. But in the meantime, in that period, Mr. Chairman, one has to deduct from that total of applications on hand at the end of March, those who were housed by the registry, or found housing on their own, or those who were found to be not interested. As a result of the survey of need or demand that OHC carried out for Metropolitan housing registry, 5,400 applications were wiped off the active file.

I think that it is important to point out, Mr. Chairman, that at the same time as OHC was weeding out inactive applications, another 3,200 had come in for family units. For senior citizens' units there were 460 applications called out as inactive, not interested or who found their own housing; almost double the number were filed in the three-month period as were culled out. The difference at the end of March compared to the end of December is fractional. The total number of applications on hand as of March 31 stood at 13,100, down from 14,800 at the end of 1967.

Mr. Chairman, in my own community of Windsor, the extent of the plight is illustrated by the number of applications that were on file at the Windsor housing authority in April. These totalled 1,500, of which 1,000 were for family units and 500 for senior citizens' units. I might say that of the 1,000 applications for family units, about 350 were applications from families headed by women.

What is the Minister's answer, Mr. Chairman, to the housing crisis? In the Budget speech and in his own estimates he talks about adding to the OHC advances, which will mean spending $400 million in all on housing in Ontario in 1968 and 1969, equalling all that the housing corporation has spent since it was set up in 1964.

Let us take a look at the figures that the Minister and the Provincial Treasurer have offered to us as their recognition of the extent of the problem in Ontario. The Provincial Treasurer said in his Budget speech: "We

have provided the funds to carry out the greatly expanded and accelerated public programme which is required. Our total capital advances to the Ontario housing corporation, and to the Ontario student housing corporation have been increased more than 30 per cent to over $62 million for 1968 and 1969. This level of spending by our agencies will bring in over $300 million of CMHC capital financing. Thus, the total housing programme for next year will amount to almost $400 million".

But, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to spending on housing for families and senior citizens, what are we talking about, assuming that the Minister is successful in getting all the money which he says Ottawa has promised him? We are talking about an expenditure of just over half of the $400 million, an expenditure of $215 million on housing for those who are in the greatest need of it, Mr. Chairman—families and senior citizens.

Another $100 million is going into student residences and community housing projects. Land assembly—which is to increase the supply of serviced land and stabilize housing costs, as Malvern was presumably designed to do over the last 14 years—will take up a further $73 million. That is quite an inflation in itself. Mr. Chairman, with the extent of this province's housing programme for 1968, I fail to see how the province's plans for land assembly are going to generate spending of $73 million. During 1967, according to CMHC again, the federal contribution to land assembly under section 35(a), in the province, amounted to only $1.8 million, providing 505 lots, and the actual outlay reached $3 million for land assembly. This provided a total of 22.98 acres of land in 1967. How, in 1968-69 does the Minister propose to escalate spending to $73 million from approximately $3 million in the previous year?

I would also like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the increase in advances to OHC and the Ontario student housing corporation are not really as great as the Minister would have us believe. In 1966-67, OHC received an advance of $12.2 million, in 1967-68, $41.5 million, and in 1968-69, it is estimated that the corporation will receive an advance of $49.8 million. But the Minister fails to point out that while the capital advances will rise by $8.3 million for OHC, the percentage increase is not 30 per cent but 20 per cent in fiscal 1968-69, compared to the previous year. The increase in advances in 1967-68 were three and one-half times as great in dollar terms as the increases proposed in the current fiscal year, so that the Minister, in terms of what he did in 1967-68, is doing less in 1968-69 by approximately $21 million—the difference in the size of the increases between these two years.

The Premier of this province, Mr. Chairman, said that he had postponed Ontario's entry into medicare because housing took higher priority. It has taken the higher priority, to the extent of $8.3 million more in spending by OHC this year compared with last.

This is just another miscellaneous instance of the manner in which the housing statistics of the province are handled by the Minister. On January 30, 1967, in the *Northern Daily News*, he stated that he was considering removal of the 5 per cent sales tax on building materials. On April 13, 1967, Mr. Chairman, the Minister was quoted as telling the Legislature that he will not recommend the removal of the 5 per cent sales tax on building materials, because other industries would ask for the same relief. In *Hansard*, when asked if it was advisable to remove the sales tax on building materials, he replied that it was a matter of opinion.

> I suppose that in my position, on housing materials I would say yes. But, on the other hand, the minute we say yes, somebody says: "Well, we are entitled to have it removed also." So where do you go from there?

Well, Mr. Chairman, we have not gone very far from there because the Minister has left us once again with a promise to consider—early in 1967, and then later in the year. His performance shows that he has reversed himself.

What became of the proposals to develop satellite cities? I have already touched on that with respect of Malvern. In December, 1967, Mr. Brady of OHC was quoted as saying that four satellite communities with total populations of 100,000, are planned to be situated from 50 to 100 miles from Toronto. In September, 1967, the Prime Minister in a campaign speech said that within five years the provincial government will be developing satellite cities, and this would short circuit land speculation and red tape. "The provincial government will buy parcels of marginal farm land and plan the satellite cities. This is under study by Ontario housing corporation," he said.

On May 24, 1968, the Toronto *Daily Star*, reporting the Minister's speech in Barrie, said that the Minister last night distributed the text of a speech promising that the province will soon start developing large new satellite cities—but he left the promise out of his speech when he delivered it. He did say

in his speech: "We do not propose to let the housing crisis of the moment push us into a programme where prudence would be sacrificed in the interests of expediency. "The rapid growth of urban population will make the satellite cities necessary," he said, "but we cannot permit urban sprawl, its ugliness and disadvantages, to mar our cities." I wonder, Mr. Chairman, in the light of that, if the Minister is really thinking of green-belt instead of housing for the Malvern project?

Mr. Chairman, I believe, and the members of the New Democratic Party group believe that the only answer to the housing crisis in Ontario is for the Prime Minister to relieve his Minister of Trade and Development of his responsibility for the Ontario housing corporation immediately, and to set up a full-fledged department of housing and urban development, with a Minister who is prepared to tackle the problems of land costs, mortgage costs, municipal service costs, low-rent housing, tenants' rights, and the whole ball of red tape which has caused interminable delays in putting roofs over our people's heads.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Chairman, in order of delivery—I would not say importance—of the rebuttal this afternoon, perhaps I could be permitted to make a few comments. I would like to deal with the quotations from many of the speeches that my hon. friend from Scarborough East read this afternoon. I sense that in the delivery and with the interjections from the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), there was an attempt to drive a wedge between our department and the new Department of Treasury and Economics, and I want to assure you that this cannot happen. I want to assure you that we are in complete co-operation at all times. Perhaps the member did not know this, but he quoted from my Deputy Minister's speech in New York or New Jersey. I will just start it, because I think we have the article—I will not go all through it. He said: "The national policy fostered the establishment of industrial plants in Canada to supply a Canadian market which in the absence of tariffs will probably have been regarded as just one more American market area to be served from home base," and so forth and so on.

Mr. Chairman, that was not my Deputy Minister. That article was written by Mr. Ian MacDonald in our *Ontario '67*. That was taken from Mr. MacDonald's comments. I think also the article that the hon. member is quoting from was—and he can correct me if I am wrong—a magazine article written by Mr. MacDonald called: "Foreign Ownership —Villain or Scapegoat?" He gave both the cons and the pros and the negatives and the affirmatives. And if you had read all the way through, here is what Mr. MacDonald said in one paragraph:

> Turning to foreign investment, however, we find two significant differences. First, Canadians themselves pursuing a higher rate of growth for their own country, have catered to American business instincts, and facilitated American ownership. And second, it is well within our power to change the degree of foreign investment. At the same time, there is one very good reason why even the most anxious have hesitated before attempting to change the foreign investment position. We have not succeeded in discovering how to have our cake and eat it too, along with the added guarantee the supply of cake will be adequate to satisfy our expanding appetites.

I have another one here that I think is very interesting—so that we make sure that Mr. MacDonald and I are on the same wavelength. I am not suggesting that these are unworthy objectives, but I am pointing to the confusion which arises when they are all lumped together. It is clear that these objectives are not necessarily mutually dependent; a nation can be sovereign without being independent; it can formulate distinctive policies without producing a national identity; it can have a national identity without being sovereign, and it can do all these things or not do them, without necessarily damaging the nation's economic interests.

It is of primary importance to examine each of these causes of concern with a view to seeing which of them—economic interest, national sovereignty, independence, distinctive policy, and national economic identity—have a bearing on the foreign investment issue. Only in this way can we determine what, if anything, foreign investment offends against and, more important, what policies, if any, we should adopt.

Later on in the hon. member's speech he touched on a comment made by Professor Harry Johnson, and I think we should see here what Harry Johnson had to say on the other side. But before we get to Harry Johnson, Mr. MacDonald again said:

> The suggestion then is that we have put our boring to good use by increasing our capacity to produce, as well as our economic wealth. And, even if the benefits cannot be precisely measured, they are real.

The story was reported recently of a highly successful Canadian computing firm that was unable to find capital in Canada. It is now 70 per cent owned in the United States. Would it really have been better for Canada if that firm had failed—better dead than American? Whatever the origins of capital, such firms provide employment and income for Canadians in the same way as any other businesses. And C. D. Howe is reported to have remarked that he never examined the nationality of a dollar bill—and he was a pretty good Liberal, I think.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Yes, but he could be wrong!

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think you would acknowledge he was a pretty good Liberal.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: All this may have betrayed the absence of reasonable prudence. His policy was perfectly sound as far as economic growth, employment and income creation in Canada is concerned. Now, moreover, as Professor Harry Johnson has argued, Canada receives the additional benefit of taxes paid to the Canadian Exchequer.

Private investment can contribute to economic welfare in two ways. It yields an income to the investor—a private benefit; and a tax revenue to government—a social benefit. If investors invest at home, the country gets both benefits. If they invest abroad, the host country, rather than the investing country, collects the social benefit and I think this is where Canada fits in.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and read a few other comments from Harry Johnson and a few others. But I just want to clear the point with my hon. friend here from Scarborough East that I do not like to read from articles—I would sooner be original, but I am just saying—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Next time you get up, if you go to read—

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): What happened to the original housing programme?

Hon. Mr. Randall: If you are going to read, take both sides of the book and then we will get the proper story. Now, I just wanted to clear that point because I did not want anybody to get the impression that there was a difference between the young man who came from the university into government life, and decided that he could not get along with the economics Minister. In fact, I learned a great deal from him and I think he learned a great deal from me. And we consult with each other almost on a daily or a weekly basis at least, and I can assure you that we will continue to do so.

Mr. T. Reid: What did he learn from you?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now, we are going to let you make a speech in a few minutes if you will just let me finish. I respect the opinions of my friend from Scarborough East, but to be honest with you I have lived too long with reality to accept theory in this hard, cold world we are in today.

Because there is not a province, there is not a nation I know of that is not advertising morning, noon and night and trying to do what we are doing to make sure that we get our share of the world markets, and create our share of the jobs. And just as long as I have this job—I think I am like Mr. Howe—I am not interested in where the dollar is coming from. I am interested if the dollars are interfering with our sovereignty, at this level as well as the federal level. If we do not like what is happening, we should sit down and prepare some guidelines.

I think before Mr. Winters went out of office, he sent out 6,000 letters to manufacturers and asked them a number of questions. One, of course, was: "What is bothering you when you ship your goods to other countries? What are the hidden, non-tariff items?" And I think, perhaps, we have got some of those difficulties right here for foreigners doing business with Canada. So it is a two-way street.

Canadian investment in 1965 and 1967 is an interesting figure that I think I should point out to you because I hear this story that Canadians are timid—they will not invest a dime in their own country. Do not believe it. I will give you some figures.

Here is 1965-67, combined new manufacturing establishments, plus expansions. In 1965-67 Canadians invested $828,795,872 out of their own bank accounts which we talked about this afternoon. Foreigners at the same time invested $800,407,600. That figure is very close to a figure I quoted last year in this House—about $690 million in 1964 and 1965 was Canadian and $692 million was American or foreign. But the foreign investment at that time accounted for roughly two-thirds of the jobs created. Of this figure I gave you here for 1965 and 1967, the Canadian

investment created 82,242 jobs; the Americans, 115,362. So I do not think we can tell them to take home their money and take home their plants, that we do not want to play ball any more.

Mr. Nixon: How much did we invest out of the province?

Mr. T. Reid: Have you studied the Mexican system?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I know all about it, I have been down there several times. I would not trade it for ours for free.

Mr. T. Reid: Does not the Mexican government have some control over their companies?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, but look where they are. They do not have an economy like we have. Mr. Chairman, I might say that I was not a disciple of Walter Gordon, but I have known the gentleman for 30 years. In fact, he was my auditor for a number of years, so I know him very well. But I did not share his political religion, or his political philosophies, and I think when he got together with the eight leading economists across the country, they disappointed Mr. Gordon. I think when they were finished, he was rather disappointed because they came up with some interesting facts.

They say that the Watkins report realizes our dependence upon foreign capital; they acknowledge this in no uncertain terms. They have not said what we can do about it, but they acknowledge that we have to have it. And Watkins says also this: It is not too much foreign capital that is worrying the Watkins people, but how we want them to operate in Canada.

So far, even Ottawa cannot tell our foreign investors how they want them to operate and I can understand the problem. I sympathize with the people up in Ottawa that have to make this decision, because if they make the wrong one and we do not get any investment in this country and have to depend on ourselves, then I think we are going to have much slower growth.

I think Mr. Pearson, the former Prime Minister, a year or so ago said we could settle for a 30 per cent lower standard of living. He may have been exaggerating a little, but I do not think he was too far off the mark.

I would also suggest that if I am in the wrong league, I am in a good league, because every Premier of every province in Canada has been abroad and has been in the United States looking for foreign capital. Mr. Winters, time after time, has made statements that they welcome foreign capital. Maybe that is why he decided to get out of politics, I do not know. I have not heard Bud Drury, the Minister of Industries, say he did not welcome foreign capital.

One of the things that I believe we should look at and be very conscious of when we analyze the Watkins report—and I have not read it thoroughly, but I am going through it—is that he is more interested in what is happening with multinational companies, what kind of an influence they have on our economy or anybody else's.

I just suggest to you—and I guess you are an advocate of Marshall McLuhan's; I assume you would be—Marshall McLuhan says that this is a global village and this is where I agree with Marshall. I do not understand him, but I agree with him on this. I agree with him that the world is getting smaller and, as the world gets smaller, we are not going to be as parochial as we were in the past. If we have multinational companies, we have to recognize they do have an influence in every country they operate in, including Canada. If we want them to operate here, then we should set up some guidelines, but it should be set up on an international basis, and this is not hard to do, in my estimation.

We have set up the international monetary fund—that is an international fund that is administered in all countries. You have the world bank. The United Nations has many agencies operating to make sure that they do not damage each other's economy. Surely, I would say to my hon. friend from Scarborough East, if we are worried about foreign investment, then let us sit down and figure out how we can do something about it.

I do not have any answers, to be honest with you. I do not see anything wrong with what we are doing, but I am trying to find an answer for my critics. I want these fellows to sleep at night. I know they are lying awake tossing and turning, worrying about sovereignty. I tell you, I like to sleep at night, so I do not worry unless I can do something about it. So I just want to leave that thought with my friend from Scarborough East. As I say, I respect his opinions—I cannot buy them, but I respect them.

Turning to my friend who went through a mathematical exercise today, it would be impossible for me to answer all the questions he posed, because it was sort of a buckshot approach to the facts and figures. I just say to him—do not believe everything you read

in the newspapers. If you do, if it criticizes you you will throw it in the wastebasket, and if is good, you will go out and buy 5,000 copies and make sure your friends all get it.

I just want to touch on a couple of things that the hon. member for Windsor West brought up. He talked about the 14 years' delay at Malvern.

I wish some day you would go out and talk to Mayor Albert Campbell. When that land was bought that was miles from the boundary lines of Scarborough proper. Nobody in his right mind would have run a trunk sewer out that far, leaving all the vacant land in between until the rest of the municipality was developed. Also, my friend, the Don Valley expressway was not built, so the people could not get in and out. It is bounded, I think, on the north by Sheppard Avenue, or by Finch, I forget which. None of those highways had any accessibility into that Malvern property. It took 11 years to develop Don Mills as it is today, so I can assure you that the land was not bought, as far as I know, in 1952 with the intention that they would build houses on it the day after.

Mr. Peacock: I never said that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, yes, you intimated all the way through, 14 years' delay.

I just want to clear up something else too. You said there was no mention made about public housing of senior citizens. Let me assure you that in any development that we have there will be an integrated community: senior citizens; public housing; the HOME programme; I hope some $35,000 or $40,000 houses; high-rise apartments; a golf course; plus commercial, industrial. All those things that we need to make up, what I call a satellite community, and not a satellite city.

I do not think we have got to satellite cities as yet, and I do not like to refer to Malvern or even Saltfleet over here as a satellite city.

As far as the $15 million profit is concerned, I have not sat down with a lead pencil to figure out whether we will make that kind of money or not. But let me assure you when we go in to develop the property, we are going to sell off the commercial. We are going to sell off the industrial. We are going to sell off the golf course. We are going to sell off some of the high-rise. We are going to sell off land for $35,000, and $40,000 homes.

With that profit, we are going to pour it back into the land, where we can build a community centre; where we can build the schools; the hospitals, if necessary, will come out of that profit. We can lower the cost of land to the people that will have HOME lots on there. So this is the reason for the big major development areas, with the government being the developer.

Mr. Peacock: For services too?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, all services. Yes, everything. So I just want to show you we are not trying to put ourselves in the position of a private entrepreneur making $15 million selling land. We are using that money to pour it back into the facilities that, perhaps, in the past, in many communities, have been neglected.

Mr. Peacock: Including public housing?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, including public housing. We have now sold the fact that public housing should be in any area we develop and this is what we are doing. Senior citizens' and public housing. So we will put public housing in any area that we develop.

Today a comment was made with reference to Bramalea's pricing on lots going so high because of the long wait. I think that is what was said. I want to assure the House that the day we bought those lots and paid for them was the day we decided what the selling price would be.

That price was already established. We did not price them nine or ten months later. We priced it the day we gave them the cheque for the 1,600-and-some-odd lots.

Mr. Trotter: Yet you paid $6,700 a lot.

Hon. Mr. Randall: $6,600 for the first 1,666 and we have an option on 5,000 more at $4,000, including services. This is a good deal in anybody's language. I would take that deal myself.

Mr. Peacock: Why do you not go out and—

Hon. Mr. Randall: That was the selling price on the land across the road from the lots that we bought. And we established that as the selling price, the market price.

An hon. member: So you made $2,000?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We got a good bargain. What is wrong with it? We put it back in the servicing. We are putting our money—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: There are other facilities to go in there and we have developed the rest of Bramalea.

Mr. Chairman, just to wind up some of these comments, I want to clear one thing that the—another thing that the hon. member brought up was Flemingdon Park. May I just clear up something on Flemingdon Park?

I will read you—I have two or three papers on Flemingdon Park. Perhaps I will get a chance to give you the rest as we go through the estimates, but here are the final two paragraphs:

> At the present time the installation of underground services in Flemingdon Park has been completed by Central Park estates on behalf of Ontario housing corporation. Work is now commencing on the construction of services above ground such as roads, curbs, and so forth. It is anticipated that servicing will be fully completed by August of this year—we are right on schedule. An application for rezoning of the lands has been made by Central Park estates and this is currently being processed. Immediately the necessary rezoning has been obtained, Ontario housing corporation will arrange for construction of the dwellings to commence on a condominium basis. In view of the magnitude of the development, construction will be undertaken on a phase basis with completion anticipated in two or three years. However, the first dwelling will be available in 1969.

Now I do not think we could have moved any sooner than that and we believe that the programme has moved along as rapidly as we can push it.

The property is divided by the Don Valley parkway as you know. Some are on one side of the highway and some are on the other side. We have to get a rezone by North York as soon as we have our plan of development. They do not know what we are going to put up there yet. If we are going to put up five high-rise buildings surrounded by town houses they want to have a look at our plans before they give us our complete rezoning.

Mr. Trotter: Will the government take long?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh no. We do not think it will take long. We are optimistic.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): You have an option on 5,000 lots in Bramalea.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are in power because we are doing the right things. We do not push the panic button.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): You should not ask that question.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now let me just finish to my friend from Windsor.

I want to show him that when he talks about the $400 million, that money is available as we want to draw on it and we are not drawing on it until we can use it. The money is there. We have been advised by central mortgage and housing this is the amount of money available. We are drawing on it as fast as we can get it. Now, if that $400 million could be spent immediately within this year, we say it is going to generate about $1.5 billion worth of construction in this province, or $1.5 billion in spending power in this province. If you doubt that figure, I am just adding four to a figure used by your national leader, Tommy Douglas, in the debate the other night.

He said spending power is $2 for every $1 in construction. I think he is a little conservative for a change. He is never that conservative as a rule. I think it would generate $5 or $6 per $1 in construction and so I tell you that the housing programme is moving along. The money is available. Central mortgage and housing, as I said this afternoon, made these funds available and we are using them just as quickly as we can put the housing into operation on the lots that are serviced from day to day.

We cannot do any more than we are doing. We are going as fast as we can go. I have no intention of pushing any panic buttons for anybody. The figure is as I quoted. We will live with that. As far as I am concerned, I have never made a promise to this House that I have not kept.

I have never gone to a municipality and said we will do something we have not done. Let me remind you once more, we respect the fact that municipalities elect their own officials. If the municipalities pass a resolution requesting housing, whether it be for senior citizens or whether it be for public housing, we are on schedule or ahead at every municipal request.

Now I do not think you can ask any more of any organization. It is all right to sit here and say we need 80,000 houses a year, or 200,000 houses a year. If you do not have to build them, that is fine. I just say to you, as I said to your leader last year, your type of government was in power in Saskatchewan for 17 years and you built

500 houses. If you look at what is happening in Great Britain today—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Randall: If you look at Great Britain today they have a greater housing problem—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: —they have a greater housing problem in Great Britain today than in the history of the country. I was in Sweden in October and I will tell you, there are 150,000 people in Stockholm waiting for housing and they are going to wait nine years. So do not tell me that you or Tommy Douglas have all the answers for housing. Believe me, it is not easy and I appreciate it is not easy.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister if he really means to say to the Legislature that he is going to generate $400 million of spending on housing in this province and on land assembly too and out of all of that, produce 7,500 family and senior citizens starts this coming year, for $400 million.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No. Again you have got your mathematics wrong. I simply suggested the $400 million is available for housing. If the lots were here now, if we could spend the whole $400 million in one year, this is what would happen. But we have to have continuity in this programme. We have to say to the federal government: "You cannot turn the tap on and off. If you are going to be our banker, how long is that 90 per cent going to be available."

If the 90 per cent is not there then we cannot go ahead and buy land, we cannot service. We do not know what we are going to do unless the money is there. The discussion we had in Ottawa was for a figure we could shoot at. And we are shooting for the $400 million. I do not think we can spend $400 million in one year. I do not think it is physically possible to put up that much construction.

Mr. Peacock: If the $400 million is assured, or could be assured, then how many starts could the Minister promise for family and senior citizens' units?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Exactly what I outlined today.

Mr. Peacock: Only 7,500.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The 7,500 starts—that is what we are talking about, plus what we already have underway.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I might start on vote 801 with the comment that I was delighted to hear the Minister's deep analysis of the question of foreign control of our economy and his very well-thought-out policies.

His analysis is that we would be still chasing Indians if it were not for foreign investment. His policy is, for example, for the Ontario development corporation "to encourage a greater movement of foreign companies into Ontario by offering financial help if necessary". He added, "Our new programme is helping these foreign companies to locate in the province."

I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that we have for the record exactly what the Minister's analysis is and where his policy stands on this point. I think it is a significant difference in policy between his party and my party and I look forward to continuing debates on it.

Turning to the first estimate, Mr. Chairman, I would like to commence my remarks by referring to the publication *Industry* which is published by the Canadian manufacturers association. It is number 241, November, 1967. It has a very interesting quote in here. The quote is:

> Ottawa, which spent $6.5 billion in 1964, will this year spend well over $9 billion, an increase of over 40 per cent. Likewise, the provincial government, which spent some $4 billion in 1964, will spend about $6.2 billion, a jump of more than 50 per cent.

Municipal level spending has also increased, Mr. Chairman. Turning to this fantastic increase in provincial government expenditure, I would like to refer the Minister to some of his own estimates in the main office.

For example, Mr. Chairman, if we take the maintenance estimates over the past five or six years, we find between 1966-67 and for the estimates next year, 1968-69, that the maintenance expenditures will double. I would like to ask the Minister how he can explain such a doubling of this one item in head office, of maintenance over a period of two years. I thought this government was trying to cut down on bureaucratic expansion. Instead when I look at the Minister's main office I find this fantastic increase. Doubling is a lot in two years. Is there any explanation for it in that particular sub-item?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The figure I have is $125,000 last year and $134,000 this year, a $9,000 difference. What figure are you referring to?

Mr. T. Reid: I was referring, Mr. Chairman, to the estimate for 1966-67 which was $64,000 and which has jumped to $134,000 for next year. That is a doubling.

Hon. Mr. Randall: There was a re-arrangement of departments in there. In that year, housing was with us up on 950 Yonge Street, and they are now down in their own office with the corporation on University Avenue. The only difference in the maintenance costs this year is a $9,000 increase. Some of that maintenance was due to a re-arranging of some of the departments such as housing. Some of the cost was printing. Some of their stationery was provided by us. It was a re-arrangement of departments that made the difference, according to the information I have here.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Minister's argument would support a conclusion that there should have been a halving of that particular estimate rather than a doubling. If you had added more functions to your main office, then I could expect a doubling. But what the Minister has just said, Mr. Chairman, is that he has pulled out functions from his department over that two-year period, and yet it doubles. I do not quite understand.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me see if I can explain myself again. We have added, but we moved the housing corporation out. We had to move them out to provide space for new departments that we set up. For instance, our Trade and Industry department expanded, our Ontario development corporation expanded, and when they came in separate corporations, we had to provide the necessary maintenance to operate these departments. Now, I think, primarily, there are increases in the cost of equipment, and the cost of printing and stationery. I think the cost of printing and stationery has gone up very considerably in the last two or three years. In fact, I think that every time we get a bill for stationery, it has increased. I can only comment on what we have this year for printing and stationery. All branches in the main office have $25,900. I would doubt that there would be half that in 1964. However, I will get some further information to see where the 64 and 125 are, or where the difference is. I do not have it here at the present time.

Mr. T. Reid: Sir, I think that would be helpful if what the Minister has said is correct. I find it difficult to understand, because in the trade and industry division in 1966-67 the estimate for maintenance was $84,000, and that increases by 50 per cent for next year to $126,000. So I do not see how he can argue that one reason for the maintenance estimates going up over a two-year period in his main office is because he was doing, in that two-year period, some of the maintenance functions for divisions such as the trade division.

Look at the trade and industry section, in vote 405. We find that the maintenance estimate has also increased by 50 per cent. So, I would like more detail on this at a later date.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will get it for you.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Under this vote, would you discuss housing in the towns and villages that have not got sewage?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No. We are discussing houses.

Mr. Spence: There is no possible chance of getting CMHC money to build houses in, say, villages or towns of 3,000?

Mr. Chairman: I think that would be proper under vote 407.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I can talk to you about it under vote 407. I think there is the possibility.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would also like to know under whate vote I could discuss the equalization of industrial opportunity.

Mr. Chairman: Trade ministry—possibly vote 405.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, on item 5, the grant to the Ontario research foundation is to be paid in amounts as authorized by the Minister. I would like to inquire from the Minister if this indicates that the Ontario research foundation does not have a specific grant to which it is entitled in full in this fiscal year. Does it, instead, depend on the dollar-for-dollar matching, or some such formula, that is required of firms establishing their research facilities in the Sheridan Park operation. Perhaps that comes up later on. I do not see a separate vote on Sheridan Park. I am wondering if it could be discussed under vote 401?

Two things: The first point is whether the research foundation can look forward to a

definite amount of money regardless of the participation of private firms in the research establishment at Sheridan Park. And the second thing, Mr. Chairman, is that I understand the Minister has been asked by the industrial research institute of the university at Windsor to have a representative of the province appointed to its board of directors. The industrial research institute at the university at Windsor has been carrying out, for the southwestern Ontario region, applied research contracts for private customers—again on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis. It would like very much indeed to have a link with the Ontario government, or through it to the Ontario research foundation. I believe that the Minister has declined the request of the IRI to appoint anyone from the provincial level to its board of directors.

Hon. Mr. Randall: At Waterloo or Windsor? I am informed that this is a federal Department of Industry programme with a number of universities, and in Windsor an ex-employee of ORF is the general manager. The reason we felt we should not participate, is that we have a liaison with them. We do not feel we need to have somebody stationed there to work with them, or, in similar circumstances would they have somebody stationed with us. We think that co-operation between these university programmes is very good. We recognize what is going on, and our general manager, Mr. Stadelman, and his staff, are in very close contact with the national research council in Ottawa, and any department in Ottawa that is operating these research facilities in the various universities. But I do not think that we would have enough people on the staff to put somebody into each one of those research centres. However, we will be in liaison with them at any time required.

Now, you ask about the amount of money they get. Prior to your coming into the House, of course—I do not even know the background of ORF—but great sums of money have been given to ORF. I think the last grant was about $3.5 million when the building was sold over here on University Avenue, and they moved out to the new research centre. It was felt by the directors of ORF as well as ourselves, perhaps in order to further the work of the institution out there, that we should help them by matching them dollar-for-dollar with their earned income. Now, I think there is an incentive here for them to go out and do something for themselves, because you know it is really not a government-owned enterprise. It is operated by a board of businessmen. They have their own investment fund, they have their own teams out looking for research work, and they do, as you know, a great deal of work for this government. But, we think the basis of giving them dollar-for-dollar is a fair way of granting, and, as you will notice, we also gave them $200,000 this year for special equipment. If they come back to the department, I would assume from here on in that we would also help them to get further equipment. I think that that is all I can tell you on that. I think that the grants are sufficient for the present time, and I might say that the Ontario foundation people were very happy with the way that we worked out the problems of their finances.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, on the second point. Do I take it that the foundation was assured only of the $200,000 for special equipment, and that out of the estimated grant of $1.5 million, they will receive only what they can raise to match contributions from the private firms making contracts with them?

Hon. Mr. Randall: They asked for the matching grants formula, and they are very happy with it. If there is extra equipment required, we are quite prepared to look at this. That is all they can spend. But if they come back next year and say that there is another piece of equipment, where do we sit? We are quite prepared to look at it.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I just want to explain to the Minister that the IRI in Windsor University did not ask for staff from the Minister's department, or that the ORF be made available to the institute. But they did ask for a representative of the province to sit on its board of directors so that the provincial interest could be heard in the field of applied research locally. And, while the federal government is putting up, I think, $10,000, the institute operates in a somewhat similar manner to the Ontario research foundation. It also is endeavouring to generate moneys on this dollar-for-dollar matching basis, so that it anticipates a budget of a considerably larger amount than the federal grant. It would be very much interested in having this kind of liaison through membership on the board of directors of someone at the provincial level.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, Windsor, McMaster and Waterloo have these facilities now. All I can say to the hon. member tonight is that we will

meet and are meeting with them and are working closely with them.

Whether we need to have representation on their staff, I do not know. I do not think that we do at the moment, but we are quite prepared to look at it and, if they need assistance, we will help, because I think research, regardless of where it comes from, is very necessary to this province. Certainly we cannot do it all out at ORF.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in this vote to spend $1.5 million towards the ORF.

The principle of making a levy of $1.5 million against the homeowners of this province towards one segment of this economy is wrong. This money should be taxed against the industry that benefits from this. This is a business expense. Those firms that are benefiting from the ORF could charge this as a business expense and it would cost them nothing. Here we are making a levy against the homeowners, who cannot pay the taxes that they have to pay now, and charging them for the $1.5 million grant to the industry.

Along the same line, a group of farmers come to the government for help and the government gives them the deaf ear, but we take $1.5 million and give it to industry on this vote. I am opposed to the principle of giving to a certain segment of our economy money for research from which they alone will benefit.

Under this next, advertising and films—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, are we through with Ontario research foundation?

Mr. Sargent: Are you going to take it section by section?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, just so we finish with one or the other.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister has to talk about number one, if he wants.

Hon. Mr. Randall: If you want to finish this, while we are on Ontario research foundation, it is okay with us.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I will wait.

Mr. T. Reid: Just returning to that specific vote that my colleague referred to—the ORF.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I cannot hear the hon. member.

Mr. T. Reid: Can you not hear?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): You just be patient and you will hear! It will be very intelligent, believe me.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to agree with the need for more research in our economy, and more technological innovation which the Minister has referred to. It is very important and we need it.

One question is: how should it be financed? I would like to ask the Minister if he could explain to me the difference between his statement in the House today and the grant listed for the estimate next year. In the estimate book, the grant for the ORF is $1,515,000 but in the Minister's statement on page 6, he says this: "This year the province will provide a grant of $1,135,000 to the ORF for research".

Does this mean the current year, or was the Minister referring to the next fiscal year, because there is a discrepancy there of $.5 million? I suppose he might say, "What is a half a million bucks?" But I am interested in that. Could the Minister answer that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, the $1,135,000 is the maximum grant, dollar-for-dollar, against their earnings. Then there is the $200,000 that we granted them for new equipment. And then there is $180,000 for industrial research which they do; our department pays to have it done. They have a staff that calls on small industry rendering those services for the trade and industry department, and we pay $180,000 for that service. In other words, we use the research foundation for some of the research service. That makes up the $1.5 million that you find there.

Mr. T. Reid: That means that when we get to vote 405, under the trade and industry division, in that particular vote there is not an amount for $180,000 paid directly from that division of the department, for the ORF. It comes in on the main vote, even though it is for that particular division of the department?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, in other words, that department contracts that work to be done, but it is in the same vote.

Mr. T. Reid: The second query I have, Mr. Chairman, is that when one looks over the research grant from the Minister's department to the ORF starting in 1959, and going on through for his estimate next year, one is struck by the lack of growth in this particular expenditure.

Let me give a particular example, Mr. Chairman. In 1962-63, which was six years ago, the grant to the ORF was $1.54 million. The estimate for next year is $1,515,000. It would seem to me that if the Minister

really did believe as he stated in the statement to us today on page 6, that, and I quote:

> Industrial research and technological innovation are of vital importance to the economic well-being of any industrialized nation. Our efforts in this direction are now being enlarged.

If the Minister really did believe in the importance of research in our economic development, as he professed this afternoon, then surely there should have been a much more rapid expansion of the grant to the ORF?

I mentioned before that one can spot, throughout his whole department, very large increases in what I call bureaucratic expenditures, such as postage, maintenance and so forth. Yet when we look at this estimate, an area in which the Minister says that he has a vital concern, we find that really over a seven-year period it is only increased by 50 per cent.

I am really saying, if you believe what you say in your statement, surely you should not be at the $1.5 million level, but at a higher level, or have established greater incentives for the private sector to do even more for the research on contract basis.

If that is a matching basis, that Sheridan Park in the ORF, what explains the very slow rate of growth in the contract research done for private industry, as my colleague from Grey-Bruce pointed out? And the slow rate of growth, tied to the slow rate of industrial growth by research—what explains that?

Surely it is not a fast enough rate of growth, in the Minister's opinion. What is the Minister going to do to stimulate this type of technological research?

Hon. Mr. Randall: First let me say that we, as I said a few minutes ago, have granted to the research foundation the money that they say they require.

Going back to the discrepancy in the figures. At one time—

Mr. Sargent: —that section of it—

Hon. Mr. Randall: When the government —just a minute—when the government made grants to universities for various research facilities, a grant was made to ORF.

Back in 1960 there was an amount of $205,491 included in the grants to universities; $205,315 in 1961; $278,363 in 1962; $307,500 in 1963; the same amount in 1964; and $300,000 in 1965. That money is distributed to the universities by The Department of University Affairs, so it no longer is in the figures that you are looking at here. Their grants have been improved more than the 50 per cent you are referring to and, as I said a minute ago, they are getting all the money they requested from the government for these research services.

Mr. T. Reid: I would follow up on two things, Mr. Chairman. That is very helpful.

Would it be possible to see what I call a consolidated sheet of the research grants?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. T. Reid: Both in your own department and in another department?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We will be bringing in —I hope within the next two weeks—the report of the research foundation, an up-to-date report. You will have a statement on your desk.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, it would be very helpful. The final question I have in this particular item is this. Do I understand correctly the government's grant to the Ontario research foundation is tied to a formula? In other words—

Hon. Mr. Randall: The only formula is: If they earn $1 million, we give them $1 million.

Mr. T. Reid: Okay.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Dollar for dollar.

Mr. T. Reid: I appreciate your reasons for this incentive approach. Let us just put the case bluntly.

There are a lot of American subsidiaries in Ontario. A lot of their research is done down in the United States, so they get it that way. This has advantages to Ontario, too. But if the Minister feels that the rate of research done in private sector in Ontario is not fast enough, as indicated by the fairly slow rate of growth in the contracts they make with the Ontario research foundation, then surely the formula limits him in the amount of expenditures he can put into that type of research. In other words, I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister might re-evaluate that formula so that he can, instead of reacting to external pressures on the amount of his grant, take the initiative and try to stimulate it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I can just say this—and I speak from my own experience in industry—at one time our research was a bent hairpin and a screwdriver. Then, as business got a little bigger, we had a little research centre of our own. I think this is the story of Canadian research. Some of the bigger companies came in and were able then to get their research done here.

On the other hand, there are many companies that, if they are subsidiaries of foreign parents, will have their research done by the foreign parent. These people will benefit from it. So, in effect, the Ontario research foundation was set up to go out and assist small industry to do the kind of research that they could not do themselves. Now, as industry grows, we have a lot more small industries coming in. ORF has been able to keep up its pace of looking after research requirements for small industries.

On the other hand, there is a competing force here and that is, as our own industries get larger and more sophisticated, they do not need ORF services. I think if you were to go out to the research foundation today and see the ten companies that are now located there, you would find the reason they have located there is they decided to do their own research in Canada.

Now there is co-operation between ORF and these people, but most of their money is spent on their own research laboratory. We have never stinted, insofar as Ontario research foundation is concerned, to assist small industry with sufficient funds and it is the wish of their board of governors that they be matched on this basis—for every dollar earned, we grant them a dollar.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell me this? Of the six or seven private companies using the facilities at Sheridan Park, how many of those companies have their equity more than 50 per cent owned by foreign parent companies?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not think I have that information here. I would be glad to get it for you, though.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, would—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few remarks on this vote having to do with the general policy of the department because, other than housing, it is difficult to assess how useful this department is to government and if we are getting the value for the time and money put into the department. We have discussed research. I for one think that this is one particular item that the government is justified in encouraging because it is only by research and industry in the modern-day complex society that we are going to get anywhere.

In fact, in Canada—I do not know about Ontario, I only have these figures as countries as a whole—but we in Canada only spend 1.1 per cent of our gross national product on research and how to develop our industry. In the United States they are very conscious of this and they spend about 3.4 per cent of the gross national product trying to find out how to improve their products and trying to get a better piece of the market.

In Great Britain, they spend twice the amount of gross national product that we do. So we have a long way to go in this field and I think that this is one point that this department should emphasize.

But what I highly question under this vote is the amount of money that is spent on item 6. If less money was spent on number 6 and more on number 5, I might feel that we are getting more value for our dollar.

The latest figures that I have on what this department has spent are two years old. I think two years ago this department spent almost $1.4 million on what we might call public relations—goodwill. That $1.4 million was for the entire department, but now we are getting almost that amount of money—$1,247,000—just under the main office.

I know that that is the main part of the public relations, but it is not all of it and I predict that they must be close to the figure of $2 million on public relations. This is just getting out of hand, because we have no way of knowing or analyzing what we are really getting for our money.

We know that we have our foreign offices abroad and I hope we are not overlapping with what the federal government does or tries to do. But I suspect there is an overlapping, both in trade and industry and in immigration, with the federal government. This I do not know and I do not think the officers of this department can really know. But when a new department is formed—and this is a relatively new department—they tend to grow like wildfire. There seems to be no control on their spending policies. For example, Mr. Chairman, this department spent $29,896 on banquets and entertaining alone two years ago—and it has increased since then. Again it is something that I think they simply have to tighten down on. I know

that the Minister of this department is probably the happiest Minister in the Cabinet. He always seems to have a pleasant smile and good salesman approach, but he has good—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): He smiles more than I do?

Mr. Trotter: Well he smiles more than the Minister of Reform Institutions smiles.

He has good reason to smile because he has got the best of fun to gain friends and goodwill for his department and, I hope, for the province of Ontario. But newspaper, radio and television advertising for Trade and Development two years ago cost $855,000. Also, Tourism and Information advertised to bring the tourists, and to some extent we can analyze by the number of tourists that come into the province. But it is highly questionable when we see government advertising. It can be justified, perhaps, in some places—in some of the advertising we do and I would like the Minister to give the House some idea of what advertising is actually attempted by this department and what benefit he hopes the province gets and if they have any way of knowing what we really get

For example, in exhibitions alone, nearly $128,000 was spent—and that amount has increased. That is not counting Expo. That is over and above anything that was spent on Expo. In passing, I compliment the department for their efforts on Expo. I thought our building there was good and I think, by the number of people that attended, it was worthwhile. It would seem that we, being the banner province of Canada, should make the effort that we did and I compliment the department for it, but I highly question some of the ads that I have seen that are being used in Europe.

I think the spending is getting out of hand. Pamphlets and publications—$126,000; conferences—this is over and above the banquets —over $41,000. This is running into a lot of money. It is continuing to increase and there is no way to analyze what we are actually getting for our money. I would like the Minister if he would—and I have remarks on something else on this vote, Mr. Chairman—but I would like to stop here and ask the Minister if he would care to comment and give the House any indication of what he feels we are getting for our money?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry we are both on our feet at the same time, but the member for Parkdale has hit a sore spot with us here. This department is the propaganda department for the government. You are asking us to spend $1,247,000 of the money of the taxpayers of the province of Ontario to promote the government in every area of public relations. They have done a complete saturation of the PR field in promotion. This money has been used to send the Minister and his cohorts and the hon. Prime Minister on junkets all over the world, with camera crews following them. We sit in our living rooms and watch them cavorting in Europe, smiling for the cameras, living in the lap of luxury—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Frustrating, is it not?

Mr. Sargent: Very frustrating. And we have to sit and eat this propaganda selling the Robarts administration—nothing else but. They have run the whole gamut, Mr. Chairman. They have even got the women in the act—around the province they have organized the women. You have got so low you even have to organize the women. You go into each area and you organize the women, using the public funds to organize them as another Tory—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not easy. Jealousy will get you no place.

Mr. Sargent: But they are getting pretty hard to swallow, all these things. Talking about the great job you did at Expo last year, you did a great job down there all right for your buddy, the Ports of Call; they ended up with about $90,000 profit.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Look at this, this is amazing.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What is wrong with that? What is wrong with profit?

Mr. Sargent: This is the man who guides our finances. He is the pilot of the financial affairs of this province and he makes a deal through this Minister and gives the Ports of Call 6 per cent of the gross. And the Ports of Call did not put up one five cent piece. They furnished nothing, and you even put the money in the till. The more money they lost, the more money they made.

That is the deal you made for us. Now how smart can you be as the financial advisor of the province? Can you say that is good business?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am constrained to say the hon. member is misleading the House.

Mr. Sargent: All right. You tell us the facts then, will you please? I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that he is misleading the House if he says that is wrong, because those are the facts given to us in *Hansard*.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You have no affinity for facts.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I challenge him to tell me the facts then, if he knows the facts.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): What vote are we on now?

Mr. Sargent: We are on the propaganda end of this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: So we are talking about $1,247,000 to disseminate the good job that you fellows think you are doing, but propaganda is expensive machinery here. Everything—the whole bit. We have magazine advertising, pictures of the Prime Minister in everything you pick up, and billboards across the highways. In everything we do, we see this snow job you are doing, using public funds.

Out of this vote, Mr. Chairman, came $70,000 to build a display in front of this building which was there for a matter of weeks and then torn down—$70,000 to put up a scaffolding display out in front of the building. This is the kind of waste going on under this vote.

I, as a taxpayer, think it is a shocking thing that you can spend $1.2 million of money for nothing but promotion, for propaganda. That is all it is, because you could take that $1.2 million out and keep your camera crews back home here and stop the PM going across to Europe with the Minister and all these junkets going on at public expense.

This is wrong, it is public money. If you want to go across there pay your own way, but do not use public funds.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Do you not think Ontario is worth promoting? I do.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I will deal first with the question from the hon. member for Parkdale.

All I can say, with reference to advertising, is this. As long as I have been in the merchandising field I do not think there is anybody can say to you that they have spent X number of dollars and they have sold X number of goods.

If General Motors stopped advertising tomorrow, I do not think they would sell another automobile. They know they have to advertise. You have to advertise if you want to sell.

Mr. Sargent: They have a quality product to sell.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, but they have build it up by advertising and promotion. Do not ever kid yourself.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Have a little faith in good old Ontario, a quality product.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me get the decimal point straightened out—I am talking to my friend from High Park here; Parkdale, I am sorry, I apologize, Parkdale. In this province, gross provincial product last year was $24.9 billion.

Mr. Sargent: That was none of your doing was it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Wait a minute now, wait a minute—$24.9 billion. It is estimated at $27 billion this coming year.

Maybe I am wrong, but I look at the province as something that has to be sold—not only at home, but beyond this jurisdiction—if we want to sell the kind of products we produce. If we want to sell the way of life we have here; if we want to get our share of foreign markets, I think we have to promote the province.

When we talk about $1,247,000 for all of these things that is a very small budget for a $24.9 billion sale, believe me.

Mr. Trotter: Oh, that is silly.

Hon. Mr. Randall: All right. No, it is not.

Nova Scotia—little Nova Scotia—spends $600,000 to $700,000 a year. New Brunswick—the last figure I had was something around $300,000 a year, and they were told by experts if they did not advertise they would never get tourists down there, and they recognize that. They have an office now in New York, and they are talking about—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just a minute now, one at a time. I will answer all your questions, just give me time.

I am just suggesting that, on advertising, if this province stops advertising we would go out of business in more ways than one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Randall: For a man in the newspaper business you are leaving yourself right out on a limb tonight. A lot of your customers are going to pull the plug. No more advertising. The Owen Sound *Bugle* is going to go right down the drain.

Let me just suggest this. If you look at any of our national magazines, you will see ads running in these magazines from almost every state in the United States selling the various jurisdictions across the line. And this province has to do the same thing. We have been selling tourism for many years very successfully.

Mr. Trotter: You said that is not your department.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I know I said it is not my department. We have been selling tourism very successfully. You would not stop advertising for tourists, so why should you stop advertising to sell your merchandise?

Mr. T. Reid: That is under trade and industry.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, this is under trade and industry. This is a programme of selling the province of Ontario and its products.

Mr. T. Reid: There is no item for advertising—

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it is right in the main vote. right here. We are looking at it right now. That is what we are talking about. This is the vote for the advertising.

I suggest to you that the amount of money that we are spending is not out of line compared to what other jurisdictions are spending. This province has to compete if we want to sell our merchandise, if we want to sell our services.

I do not think anybody who has been in the merchandising field, or even in public office, would fail to recognize that this government could not go by, year in and year out, without spending something to promote its services, to promote its people, to promote its products.

Mr. Sargent: But you are selling Robarts, that is all you are selling.

An hon. member: It is a good product.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You show me an ad where either the Prime Minister or I have appeared—a national ad—bring it in. To my knowledge, there is no $70,000 display outside the main door here advertising the picture of the PM.

Mr. Nixon: No, that is The Department of Public Works that does that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: There is no picture out here, where is the picture?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I suggest, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: You mean you do not want my name on anything?

Mr. Nixon: Just the pay cheques.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, if there is any doubt we are getting value for our dollar, the Starch report, which is one of the analytical institutions on advertising, has said, the readership in our advertising runs 90 per cent and we are within the top 15 per cent of readership in all the magazines we have appeared in. The ads that appeared in the *New Yorker* were rated at 150, which is 50 per cent more than 100 per cent—which is where they averaged them.

So I say to you that any money we spend is spent to get the best results, the greatest coverage, for the least amount of dollars. And I would think that any government or any province that did not advertise had just better fold its tent.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I just want to dwell on this again. This has been no answer at all, because we are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars, nay, when you look at the government as a whole it goes into the millions, the money spent on public relations. For example, two years ago the travelling bill of this department alone was about $340,000—that is the travelling bill, over and above the items that I read having to do with public relations.

Incidentally, I must admit the Minister is a good talker, but they have one of the biggest telephone bills in the government. I think they spend on telephone calls $55,000

—that was two years ago, and it is higher now. When the Minister was giving me that line there I realized why the telephone bills were so high.

The unfortunate thing is that it seems to be government money on a policy that does not seem to have any definite goal. Sure we want to bring business in, but there is no question that the great volume of business that is generated in this province and on this province's behalf outside its own borders was in existence long before this department was ever born. Certainly you cannot take credit for what prosperity this province has had. I have been trying to get something definite, something specific that has happened.

I do know that one or two companies, for example, that went on the junket to Moscow —I think that cost around $23,000—did get contracts, not amounting to very much as far as I know, but how much they are going to be in the future we do not know. But there is really no analysis done of this department.

Hon. Mr. Randall: How would you know how much you were going to get if you did not go?

Mr. Trotter: Well, you see, it is where you put the limit on the amount of money that you spend and it is literally going away up. Now, we see the estimates increased here. Each year they get higher and higher. There seems to be no stopping it, and yet we cannot get a proper analysis of what this department really does for business.

As we come to other items in the estimates of this department, we will be asking what specifically is done. I have talked to numerous businessmen and to most of them this department is something of a joke. Many of them are furious at the amount of money that seems to be spent in a frivolous way, and I am certain that it is. I do not think that a modern government has any right to be spending taxpayers' money at the rate we are doing, around $1 million for one department for newspaper advertising. This banquet business and—

Hon. Mr. Randall: On a point of order, that is not just newspaper, that is all advertising.

Mr. Trotter: Newspaper, radio, TV advertising, that is right. And I say around $1 million; I think it is actually higher now. It was $855,000 two years ago. I do not have the exact figures for an analysis of the whole department for this year. I do not think they are available. But the general approach of government to this dealing with business is frightful, and it is completely wrong. There are so many things that money is needed for today that this business of high living and good-will has no place in government unless you can show specifically where you are getting some results.

Well now, Mr. Chairman, I had one other item I wanted to deal with that has been discussed under this vote, and under general policy. You would think the Provincial Treasurer would be glad we bring these things up. We do not like seeing our money wasted, and it is about time the Tories quit wasting money. There is no doubt in my mind that this money on advertising is often deliberately spent at election time. Time and time again—

Mr. Nixon: Right.

Mr. Trotter: Time and time again they have regurgitated this trade crusade, "Buy Ontario" and "Buy Canada," just before elections. They use the public moneys to perpetuate themselves in power. But over and above that, there is a continual waste of public money by foolish and wild spending.

Mr. Nixon: You drag out that old crusade.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, when they are dealing with research—

Mr. Nixon: You have not had a quarter-page ad since last September.

Mr. Trotter: I think this is one matter—I do not know if it would come under research, it certainly comes under the main office being discussed—and that is, I think, the concern of many of us about the foreign control of our industries. Ontario, being the main industrial centre of Canada, is involved more than any other part of Canada. Because of our split jurisdiction in many of these matters between the federal and provincial governments, it concerns the government of Ontario. There is no question that we need foreign capital and if it is properly handled it is a good thing. It is up to us to see how we can get the most benefit from foreign capital, and at the least cost. But no country in the western world, or probably any part of the world, that has used foreign capital has ever allowed any percentage close to what we have done in permitting our assets to be owned by foreigners.

Japan has had tremendous growth since World War II. It has used foreign capital, but it has very stringent controls on what money comes in and where it is used. It is the same with Great Britain. The Bank of England is very cautious on how money is invested within Great Britain, although they seek it. The same with France. France, the United Kingdom and Japan have gone out and they have sought foreign capital. But they have not been as stupid and as wasteful as we have in losing the control of our assets.

You know when you look at the sorry state of things—60 per cent of our manufacturing, 59 per cent of our mining foreign controlled. Petroleum and gas 74 per cent, automobiles 97 per cent, the rubber industry 97 per cent foreign controlled. Chemistry 78 per cent foreign controlled. I think it is important for every Canadian, and particularly for this government of the province of Ontario, to take a very hard look at how we encourage foreign control or foreign investments of our industry and our assets here in Canada.

I think that the Minister should be ashamed of himself for making that remark, "You cannot eat independence". It is not just a matter of waving the flag. We have to remember that a lot of people have given their lives as well as their time and their assets in building this country. And I do not see why we should sit back foolishly, virtually without any controls at all. The United States is literally the home of free enterprise. It will not tolerate the things that we tolerate. Here, we sat back and Labatt's could have been owned by Americans. But the American government said no. Here is a major industry that is still Canadian because the Americans stopped the takeover. We allow large American companies to come into Canada. They form private companies. As a result, because they are called private companies, we cannot ask what assets they have. The American government knows. They can ask. But we sit back stupidly and say: "No, it is a private company". You know, 743 of the largest private companies in Canada are 60 per cent foreign controlled. And yet, I emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that the American government enquires as to their assets, but we cannot.

Mr. Reilly: Are these national, or are these provincial charters?

Mr. Trotter: It does not matter. They are usually provincial charters, and the majority are in Ontario. I cannot tell which one, but I know from the way company charters are obtained in all of Canada that certainly Ontario does the land office business. That is why we should be concerned more than any other provincial government. We know that we in Ontario have lost business because the subsidiaries of American companies cannot sell to China or Cuba. Even today in Saskatchewan the potash industry is suffering. They cannot sell to Cuba, because the American executives would go to jail, if they allow, or let their Canadian subsidiary sell to Cuba. Well, when are we going to have the guts to stand up and run our own country and run our own affairs? The Americans are going to lay down their own guidelines to suit their own purposes.

It is not a question of being anti-foreign or of being anti-American. It is a question of being Canadian, and we are going to have little influence in the world, or be of little use to ourselves, unless we can control our own country and our own business future. Where the flag of trade—the flag of traders—goes, so the political flags of governments follow. This has been the history of the world and the present Minister's utter indifference to this major problem is a shocking situation. Unfortunately, it has been the fault of the business community, regardless of its politics, and it is time for us to waken up. I hope and pray that the younger generation growing up, the children that are now in high schools, will not be as stupid and foolish as their fathers and grandfathers were in letting the control of their industries get out of the hands of their own country. It is going to be an increasingly serious problem.

I do not think that punitive measures should be taken, but I think there are a number of things that a government can do—sometimes a provincial government on its own, and certainly, in many instances, in conjunction with the federal government, because it is a national problem. But the influence of The Ontario Department of Trade and Development can be very major, simply because of the amount of industry that is in this province and the influence that this province has on the government of Canada as a whole. That is, because of its numbers and because of its wealth.

And there is a particular responsibility on this Minister to be more Canadian, and not be so facetious about the whole matter. If it goes to the extreme, whereby we are completely at the mercy of the Americans, or anybody else, I am certain that the younger generation will rebel, and they will take far more extreme measures trying to solve the problem than we would want to see happen. These business firms, with their great mergers,

are literally doing away with the small entrepreneur, the small entrepreneur is really something left in the books. There are not too many of them left.

Business today is controlled by mergers, and when these large companies are foreign-controlled it means one of two things: Either Canadian capital goes in from individuals or the government goes in. This is what is going to happen sooner or later, and the thing for us to do is see to it that the best of enterprise is saved. It will only be done through government policies that strengthen and encourage the private enterprise to invest. But through our economic councils or whatever department or section of this department we use, we are going to have to ask what is going to be done with the mutual funds, and with the great funds insurance companies have. Even, as the Watkins report suggested, we should be in a position to set up a trade export board, as many other countries have done.

For example, suppose China wanted to buy automobiles from a plant in Ontario, and the Americans refused to let their subsidiaries sell. Our export board, itself, would buy the cars from General Motors, and then in turn sell them to China. This is one practical way that was suggested in the Watkins report, and I just use that as an example. But it means that government has to move in to help get around laws that the Americans are forcing on their own people. I believe it is called the United States trading with the enemy Act, that is giving so much trouble right now, and that was passed in 1917. The Americans are getting tougher and tougher all the time. We are going to have to worry not just about laws that were passed in 1917. There are certainly going to be the guidelines being laid down now, developed from the laws passed last year.

I think this is a highly important matter, and a heavy responsibility rests with government today. I urge it on the government because I do not like to see extremes of any kind in society. If we allow this serious situation to become a crisis, there is going to be a tremendous reaction from young people, who will soon take over this country. I do not blame them.

Our resources have not been husbanded as they should have been, and this Minister has no intention, as I see it, of changing the course that he is on. I believe that he is rushing headlong towards a disaster. I regret to hear the remarks that the Minister has made tonight.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister advise what foreign services or what offices we have? I mean like Dusseldorf or Milan. Where are the various offices across the whole bit here?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Can we finish vote 401? We will get into that in the trade ministry vote, 405.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about the advertising films and so on in vote 6 here. We have an item here last year—Inn on the Park, $17,000. That is one item for entertaining and dinners, and so on?

Hon. Mr. Randall: You mean in 1967?

Mr. Sargent: In the accounts, yes. In other words, we have an item of $17,000—that is $50 a day over the year in one hotel. I am objecting to the fact that here in this province, with the greatest boom time in the history of our country, the debt last year was $215 million. We went into debt $215 million last year—that is almost $1.5 million a day into debt. And here he has the nerve to spend, and in a supplementary vote. We are spending under the trade ministry $3 million, and $1 million for promotion. It is a shocking thing that the Minister says: "If we did not do these things, we would go out of business." What a ridiculous statement.

Under this vote, we are asked to spend $1.2 million for advertising. We have the greatest huckster in the history of the province in this Minister here. But the motivation is deceitful, because you are selling nothing but propaganda. We have these offices. I was in Los Angeles a few weeks ago and I went into the Ontario office there and asked—

Mr. Reilly: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. What vote are we on. Are we not on 401?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401.

Mr. Sargent: Item 6 is pretty wide in this vote! In the Ontario office in Los Angeles—

Mr. Chairman: Let us call it vote 405.

Mr. Sargent: The point is that we have this government which has increased the sales tax now to the limit. We have the hospital tax, OMSIP gone up, the gasoline tax gone up, everything is up and you have the nerve to spend $4 million or $5 million here on promotion! I think that you have gone the limit, and are spending another $125,000 in Japan

under this vote for the Expo there in 1970. You will be lost in the shuffle, but it is $125,000 a week.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add one comment to what my colleague from Parkdale stated. Last year at this time in this department, the Minister of Trade and Development made the statement that the survey he had done, or seen, showed that Americans do not buy Canadian goods because they are the same as their own and therefore, unless some different products are produced, we will have trouble selling on the American market.

I think that the remarks were made in the context of his explanation of why so much overseas development effort was made as opposed to United States promotion.

I would like to suggest to the Minister that one possibility explaining the results of this survey is the statement that the chief economist made about the United States firms coming up here and setting up firms and duplicating production from the United States. Well, of course! Since the Ontario manufacturing sector is so heavily owned and controlled by Americans, they are producing the type of goods that they produce in the United States. When they try to export to the States, the Americans do not want the goods because they are produced in the States. I suggest to the Minister, in looking over the remarks that he made in this House last year, that there might be some relevance in the remarks of the chief economist about the subsidiaries duplicating United States production items, rather than diversifying.

It raises very serious questions about advertising in the *New Yorker*, too, for example. I would like to turn to a different point here, a much more specific point.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I answer one question? You said that it should make a difference whether they should advertise in the *New Yorker*. We are not just trying to sell merchandise, we are trying to encourage the manufacturer to come here and set up plants here. I would also suggest to you that we have a number of cases where our manufacturers produce a different kind of design or product to the American. If it is different, they can sell it and that is where we have had our success in many parts of the United States selling a product that has different design and features.

In the article you are talking about there, that is an ordinary product—like a Westinghouse or General Electric toaster. They all look alike. Therefore they might have trouble. I myself sold a difference to the United States and many other parts of the world when I was in the industry. But that comment there was made with reference to products that look alike. I do not think that the Americans can tell the difference any more than the Canadians can whether the product is made over here or there. I am just suggesting that these ads that we run are not single purpose types of ads to sell a product. They are also to encourage investment here in Ontario.

Mr. T. Reid: I think that this reinforces the point that we should do all we can to encourage product differentiation in Ontario, particularly by firms that are owned and controlled by residents of this province and by Canadians.

The second point on this vote is this. On looking over the estimates and the actual amount expended over the last eight years in the department, one gets some very interesting results. My conclusion in looking over the main office estimate and the actual amount expended is that I do not think very much of the ability of this department to prepare budgets.

It looks like a rather sloppy type of presentation to me. The department just does not seem to be able to learn from past experience. It comes to this Legislature to get approval for the expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars and persistently does not come anywhere near spending what this Legislature approves.

Take for example the "salary" item for the main office. In 1965-66 the Minister asked this Legislature for, and got approval to spend, $361,000. And he went and spent $418,079, by getting a Treasury board order. Now what this means, Mr. Chairman, is that there is an error in budgeting and judgment of over 16 per cent in 1965-66.

If that was just the only slip, I would not criticize the Minister so sharply. But then again, in the following year, the same error in the same direction was made, and it seems to be a persistent error on the part of the Minister's department. Again in 1966-67, in the same persistent direction, the Minister spent 16 per cent more than he got approval for on the presentation of his estimate to this House.

Mr. Chairman, for next year, the Minister is asking us to approve $667,000 for main office salary. Is this a realistic figure or is it 16 per cent less, as the Minister is in the habit of allowing? Mr. Chairman, the same budgeting forecast mistake was made in 1965, 1966,

and in 1967 for main office "postage." In fact, the error was in the neighbourhood of 35 per cent. And, if that is not enough, again in the item entitled "Advertising, Films, Conferences," *et al*, a 20 per cent budgeting forecast error was made in both 1965-66 and 1966-67.

And now the Minister, in a sense, and I say this politely, has the gall to come to us this year and ask us to approve estimates for those items for next year. How can we believe him? It seems a useless exercise; the credibility gap of the Minister is so wide. Persistent errors, all in the same direction, in three separate items in one vote. Does not the Minister learn from experience? How can he explain persistent budgeting forecast errors? And how can he ask us to believe that this budget makes any sense at all? Does he have any explanation, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I certainly have an explanation for that one, my friend. I am glad you brought it up. Let me just suggest this: when I get any money from Treasury board, I do not pad my requirements; I say this is what I need. If I have any left over, I am going to turn it back and I have a record of turning back funds that I do not require, and will not spend unless I need them.

Mr. Trotter: That is just poor budgeting.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it is not poor budgeting—it is good budgeting. In my own business, if I gave my advertising manager $100,000, and he had $10,000 left on December 31, and he went out and spent it just to get rid of it, I would fire him. And that is what you should do.

Now you ask if we do not know what we are doing when we are budgeting. Let me tell you where the differences are. In the main office vote, salaries, $72,000, made up as follows: Arbitration award, in the year after the budget was all established. We do not have a crystal ball; we could not see what was going to happen on that. Overtime payments, $11,000—this is the one you referred to, 1966-1965.

Mr. T. Reid: I referred to 1965-1966.

Hon. Mr. Randall: 1966-1967.

Mr. T. Reid: How about 1965-1966?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will give you 1966-1967 first.

There is $72,000 there; there is additional postage required for most development facilities established by the department at Expo which we could not foresee. We did not know what was going to happen down there with people coming into Expo. As you know, there was twice as many people arrived. There is $12,000—

Mr. T. Reid: Was that not 1967-1968?

Hon. Mr. Randall: This is 1966-1967—$12,000 you asked me about, did you not? You said it was an amount of money there that we did not account for; we had to go back to Treasury board. These are Treasury board orders for 1966-67.

Then there was an amount of $250,000 to ORF—a grant to make available the additional funds required to complete the building in Sheridan Park.

Mr. T. Reid: But I did not talk about that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I know you did not but you asked about Treasury board orders. I am just telling you, these are Treasury board orders.

Mr. T. Reid: Answer my question.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Pardon?

Mr. T. Reid: Answer my question.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I answered your question.

Mr. T. Reid: I did not refer to that at all. I referred to salaries.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I answered salaries. There was an arbitration award in the amount of $72,000.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Did you anticipate any elevation of salaries?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, we provided for some but there is—

Mr. Bullbrook: What percentage?

Hon. Mr. Randall: —always arbitration going on—always changes made in salary adjustments, and they are postdated.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would you let me direct a question along these lines?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, go ahead.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would you give us the figures, Mr. Minister, as to what you anticipated the elevation was, and what the award of the board of arbitration was?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I might say, on a point of order, it is not customary to anticipate that. I suggest you can neither negotiate nor arbitrate for these situations if you disclose the position before you do it. It is not done.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is not a point of order. I arose and asked the Minister if I could direct a question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister is providing answers to the member for Scarborough East, and the member for Sarnia interjected. Is the Minister completed with his answers to the questions from the member for Scarborough East?

Hon. Mr. Randall: If I have not, I will get further information for the hon. member for Scarborough East.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401, the member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, on these first three items, or two items, in the main office vote.

I think we have been talking about peanuts when we were examining what this Minister has drawn from the consolidated revenue fund, in excess of what the Legislature voted. And, of course, a sizeable piece of that total for Treasury board orders which, in 1966-67, amounted to $4.9 million, was accounted for by expenditures for Expo. The fact still remains that almost half of what the Minister—or over half of what the Minister—spent in 1966-67 was not put before this Legislature for approval or consideration.

In item 7 we see an anticipated expenditure of $125,000 in preparing for Ontario's participation in the next Expo, due in 1970. I want to suggest to the Minister, that well before 1970, in fact, in his next estimates for 1969-70, he should put before the Legislature, in an accurate, budgeted manner, just what Ontario is going to be committed to in that 1970 exposition, and not treat the expenditures in the manner in which they have been treated for Expo at Montreal, where half of his main office vote and two-thirds or more of his Expo expenditures were not put before the Legislature for discussion.

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister have any comments?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The only comment I have at the moment, Mr. Chairman, is that we are just getting started with Expo '70; $125,000 is what we anticipate we will have to spend this year.

We are now preparing estimates for the building, for what is going to be in the building, what our operating expenses will be. That will be going before Cabinet I would think within the next few weeks, and then it will be brought to the House, if it is required.

We estimate that it is going to be $2 million outside for the Expo '70 pavilion. Now, we get advances on that, as required, from the Treasury board. We do not take the money until we require it. So, if it is not in this budget, we may have to go back this year—if we move ahead with our plan, we may have to go back to Treasury board for Treasury board order. Otherwise we have to wait until next year before we can do any work at Expo '70.

We do not draw the money in advance if we do not need it. And so, it is not sloppy bookkeeping to go back and get Treasury board orders. It is good bookkeeping not to take the money unless you can use it.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister draw out money under the voted expenditure before it is required? I do not think he does.

I think when the Legislature votes him a certain amount of money, he does not draw that money until it is required; he leaves it in the fund until it is required. There is no reason why the Minister cannot put his anticipated expenditures for Expo '70 accurately into next year's estimates.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I just stop you here for a minute. We went to Treasury board about October of last year with our budgets. We had no idea then what we would do at Expo '70; it was not decided to go into Expo '70 until almost the end of the year. And so the budgets were already made up. Otherwise we would have put in a figure when we put in our budgets.

We did not have the budgets made up. We did not know what we were going to spend. I do not know yet what the exact amount will be. We have put an outside figure on $2 million. We could not ask them to put something in the budget unless we knew what we were going to do in Expo '70.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a brief comment and I would like to put a question to the Minister, through you, on this question of foreign control. I have heard a lot about that tonight; and I

have heard about this question of branch plant economy that we have in the province of Ontario, and frankly, I think we do.

When I first came into the Legislature there were some interjections one night, and some debate took place. The Minister stood up and said that there were so many plants and so many jobs that came into the province of Ontario, and he said those plants consisted of numbers of employees—13, 15, 25. And in sum total, it was something like 75,000 jobs had been created by the Minister and the people in his department. They had created these jobs by enticing American subsidiaries to situate their plants here in the province of Ontario.

Following that statement, a few weeks later at a seminar of the Ontario federation of labour, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales) got up and panned this question of the small plants being situated in the province of Ontario, because these were the plants that were paying very small wages. Something like 23 per cent of these small plants were paying $3,000 or less.

The question I want to ask is this. Are we not only bringing in these subsidiary plants that give us this question of foreign control; in addition to that, are we importing poverty, in terms of lower wage structures through these small subsidiary plants, that are coming into the province of Ontario?

I think that if we are going to bring these plants into this province, then they ought to be paying a proper wage. So that the whole question of bringing these plants is more important than just saying that we have created X number of jobs. Obviously, we have to—when we create the job, we bring the plant in. This should bear some resemblance to the standard of living that we are providing in the province at the time that plant comes in.

But over and above that, I am firmly convinced that we ought to get some control of our industry in this province. We are allowing new industries to come in and the expansion of the present industry.

A good example of that is General Motors. I have been in that plant for 28 years and there has just been fabulous growth in the General Motors Corporation. They have just perpetuated the financial hold that they have in this province without anybody doing anything about it and it is just growing.

I am suggesting to the Minister that one day they are going to control our destiny. They are going to control our destiny and this is what is wrong with it. I think as Canadians we ought to at least be putting up some kind of fight to control our own economic destiny and our own political destiny. If we do not do something about it now, if we do not go to work on it now, then our children and their children are going to inherit something that we are not faced with at this moment.

But this is what they are going to inherit. They are going to inherit economic and political control from another country and this would be wrong. This would be wrong if we left our children and their children after them, that kind of heritage and that kind of environment and everything else that could exist.

So there are two things. One, I think we ought to control our own destiny and two, I would like to know if the Minister does take into consideration the kind of wage structures that these plants have before they come in here so that we are not inheriting poverty in this province. We have got enough of it now and we have got a tremendous job to take care of what we have without inheriting any.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, in answering the hon. member's question I can just say this. In most of the industries I know of, the men meet the labour regulations in this province. If they do not, the union soon gets around to find out what they are doing and gets them organized. Now any companies that I have beeen associated with have good union members, paid good wages. As far as this department taking credit for all the jobs—no we have never said that.

We said a year or two ago that there must be 75,000 new job opportunities created in this province to take care of the people coming into the work force. Last year, the number of people employed went up 115,000 jobs. We did not create all the jobs, but we say we created part of the climate for these people to get jobs.

Mr. Sargent: So did Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is all right. All governments are creating the jobs. But I say in this province here we created a climate whereby 115,000 people were added to the labour force. I would say that 54 per cent of the 132 companies we have brought in were assisted to locate by this department.

So we have played a great part in bringing in some of these new plants. Now, insofar as the wages they pay, I think that they pay the going rate. I do not believe that there are many companies today that are giving the

kind of incomes you are talking about. They cannot all get General Motors wages. They are not all working for General Motors—and I think you recognize this.

I have heard the story about branch plants before, my friend. Let me tell you this. If you do not start somewhere you are never going to have a plant. When MacLaughlin started, General Motors only had half a dozen people, the same as every—

Mr. Peacock: What became of MacLaughlin's interest?

Hon. Mr. Randall: A very small branch plant. I do not think we should worry how small the company is. I went to Fort William the other day to open a plant for a good Liberal. When he went to introduce me, he could not even remember my name and I said, that is what I get for coming up to do a job for a good Liberal. When I finished, a reporter said "You must have an ulterior motive. You would not come up here, all the way to Fort William, to open a plant with 20 people in it." I said: "My friend I would go to the end of the world in the province of Ontario to open up a plant for five people because, when you get five today, you may have 500 tomorrow." And so I think the questions is answered.

We are going to bring in any entrepreneur who wants to start a plant here, fits into our programme or we can help him expand. Now this, to me, is the only way you are going to create jobs. I say we will have to create more jobs in manufacturing. By 1970, you will have only 10 per cent of the labour force employed in farming, fishing, agriculture and mining; 34 per cent will be in manufacturing and the rest must find jobs in the service industries. And you only create service jobs by creating manufacturing jobs. I do not know which comes first, but I just say to you that as I chase this programme around day in and day out, I see these numbers of people coming into the work force and I wonder whether all are going to be employed. I think that we are doing a pretty fair job of setting up a programme for these small manufacturers with the EIO programme, helping them locate. Certainly we want to see them pay the right kind of wage. If they do not pay the kind of wages they should pay, then they are looking for public housing and other subsidies which the other taxpaper has to take care of.

Mr. Nixon: Did that big Liberal not come from Manitoba?

Hon. Mr. Randall: This was the head of the Liberal Party in Winnipeg—yes Manitoba, he opened a plant in Fort William.

Mr. Nixon: Surely he did not say he was going to the end of the world in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Always worked with the Liberals.

Mr. Pilkey: I just make the comment because the Minister, who obviously must have the statistics at his disposal, said that 23 per cent of the working force—and he pinpointed the small plants—are earning less than $3,000. As a matter of fact, he went a little further than that. He said that 47 per cent of them are earning less than $6,000 a year in the province of Ontario.

All I am saying is that there is enough poverty in this province. We have got a problem now to look after them without inheriting any, without bringing it into the country. So that all I am suggesting is that we ought to not only look at foreign investment in the province of Ontario, we ought to be looking at the wage structure of these people that are coming in if this province is going to grow.

I recognize on this question of foreign investment and foreign control that it is rather complex. I accept that and I know that the job is not easy. But it seems to me that we ought to be using some plan—a future plan—so that we can get more control of our own industry in our own province and that we ought to be making towards that direction.

It is not good enough to just stand up and say: "Well we are going to get all kinds of jobs coming in here because we bring in this foreign investment." I think we have got to work two ways. We have got to work on the question of creating jobs and then we have got to work in the area of controlling our own destiny. The way we do that is to make sure that the investment that comes into the province of Ontario is directed correctly. I do not think there is anything wrong with that.

One of the members here pointed out that you do not go into other countries without them having some say as to the direction of their financial investment and this is what we have to do.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401? The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to return to the question I asked the Minister. The purpose of the question is this, just to make it very clear—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): I was hoping you would tell us how—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. T. Reid: It is concerned with the three items in the main office estimates—"salaries," "postage" and the long one "advertising" and so on.

My question to the Minister concerns his past estimates which have been exceeded by his actual expenditures. I am not passing any judgment on that right now. The question I am asking is: Is the $667,000 in main office salaries going to end up being 16 per cent more than that? Is the main office estimate of $3,000 for postage next year going to end up being 35 per cent more than that? Is the amount for advertising and so forth—$1,247,000—going to end up being 20 per cent more than the Minister put down in these estimates? Because, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has a history of doing this. Now let me just say this.

He offered an explanation for the year 1966-67 for postage – which was $11,000 more than he came and got approval for in this House. He offered an explanation for the advertising section in which he spent $163,000 more than we approved in this House. He said it was tied up with a number of things, such as Expo. Mr. Chairman, I will give the Minister the benefit of the doubt, and say, "Fine, I am satisfied with the explanation of those two figures that I questioned." He offered me no explanation, if I heard correctly, as to why in 1966-67 he spent $70,000 more on salaries than he came and got approval for in this Legislature in that year.

Now, in 1965-66, the year previous, I do not see how he can tie in an explanation with Expo as he did in 1966-67. In 1965-66 he has the following things to explain. Why, under salaries, did he spend $57,000 more than he got approval for in this Legislature? Why, for postage, did the Minister spend $18,000 more than he got approval for in the Legislature? And why, for advertising and so forth, did he spend $244,000 more than he got approval for here? The point of the specific questions, Mr. Chairman, is that he has a history of coming here and asking for less money than he really needs. I do not like that. I wish he would come here and say: "Look, I want X dollars. Here is what I really think that I am going to spend. I want approval because I believe in my programmes and boy, I am going to explain to you why the programmes are good!" And away we go !

But, do not under-rate us, and shame us, by coming in here year after year and telling us that you are going to spend so much, and end up spending what amounts to 16 per cent or 35 per cent more. Those are specific questions, Mr. Chairman. I have not received answers to them all from the Minister, and I just hope that when we come into this House next year and we are back on these estimates that I will not find that the Minister was out again on all his estimates. I can judge that when we get the public accounts.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will try not to shock you, I promise.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the expenditure of $1,247,000. How much is going to be spent in the direct advertising of the item? I would also like a breakdown, if you could, of what you intend to spend within the province and what percentage outside.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Trade journal advertising, $40,000—

Mr. Bullbrook: I am sorry. General figures are fine, I do not necessarily want a breakdown entirely, just—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am sorry, but I cannot give you the percentages.

Trade journals $40,000, international advertising $400,000 and domestic advertising $200,000; and there is $100,000 for the *Ontario 1968* publication to be put out. These are the three main expenditures, is that what you wanted?

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, thank you, that is it.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat confused. As I understood the intent of the department, advertising was for exposure outside the jurisdiction itself. Now I understand that you are spending $400,000 in foreign advertising and $200,000 in domestic advertising. By domestic do you mean within the Dominion of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Within the province.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well what is the purpose of the expenditure of $200,000 in this connection within the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Randall: This is a regional campaign. Perhaps I could show you one that we had last year on northern Ontario? We were advertising northern Ontario. The people in northern Ontario did not see these ads because we were talking about people in the south going up north, locating up there and

taking their business up there. We were preaching to the unconverted in the south to go and locate in the north.

Mr. Bullbrook: Approximately one-third of the expenditure in advertising then is to redirect industry regionally; is that the idea?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, there is a tendency here—for example, "This is Northern Ontario Today"; this was domestic advertising last year.

Mr. Bullbrook: Just a few more questions, if I may, Mr. Chairman. Is there anything seasonal in your advertising programme at all? Do you find highs and lows?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. For example right now, with the upsetting circumstances in the United States and the election year over there. We wonder if our advertising is going to mean anything over there with the election going on.

We look at those factors and if we do not think we are going to get our money's worth we pull. So by the end of the year I may come back and say that we did not spend $400,000 there. We may devote money in here to domestic advertising.

If our imports go up very quickly, as they did over the last year—I think our imports rose by 12.5 per cent and there was about 13.5 per cent increase in export—when the imports go up we should do more about selling our Canadian goods to Canadian people.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would I be unfair in suggesting to you, sir, that in the months of September and early October of 1967 your advertising programme on radio and television was increased substantially?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it was not.

Mr. Bullbrook: The information given to me—and maybe it is not referrable to your department but to The Department of Tourism and Information—the radio station in Sarnia, this is hearsay, sir, secured expenditures for advertising, in the six weeks prior to the election, of four times as much as had been spent in all the preceding months of 1967.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am informed by my associate here that we were not advertising on radio last year, we were on television. We started to finish that around the end of August, that was our programme last year. At that time, if you were kidding, and I know that you were not kidding about the election, everybody figured that the election would be in June. We did not figure that it was going to be in June, I can assure you.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 401?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I have a question on item 6 on the women's advisory committee. I understand that the purpose of the women's advisory committee is to organize luncheons for Ontario women, as part of the "Buy Ontario" and before that the "Buy Canada" part of the trade crusade. Does the Minister have any ideas as to the kind of result that he gets from this? How many members of staff are involved, what sort of expense accounts do they have, and what is the connection between the advisory committee and the special projects committee? Is it a special office within the Minister's department or part of the special projects committee? In short, Mr. Chairman, what does the women's advisory committee do and how much money do they spend?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, their budget is for $27,000. They get no salaries, they volunteer their services. There are 25 women from all parts of Ontario, representing the women of Ontario who, we ought to say, spend 80 per cent of the money. We get the women involved in the activities around the province to sell the idea of shopping Canadian.

They participate in our Shop Canadian week. They participated down here with the fashion awards, the Edie Awards on Fashion, and they talked last year to something like 6 000 other women about the economics of the province and what the women should know about the affairs of the province. We think that they do a very excellent job. They participate in the economy of the province, and they certainly can also say to you—as my friend from Owen Sound will tell you—there is no political connotation there, since they come from all walks of life. We do not ask them what their politics are. They just offer their services.

Vote 401 agreed to.

On vote 402:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I have some remarks on vote 402 if you will permit me. I could really hold my remarks until we return to this vote again, if there is anybody who wants to interject with some constructive comments on the adjournment?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, that took me by surprise.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume the estimates to 1 o'clock, and then we will have the private members' hour.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:15 o'clock, p.m.

No. 120

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, June 14, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, June 14, 1968

Presenting report, Mr. Welch ... 4473

Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading ... 4473

Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading ... 4473

Assessment Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading ... 4474

Selling of time-payment contracts to finance companies, questions to Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Nixon ... 4474

Canadian Breweries stock, questions to Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Shulman ... 4475

Oscar award for "A Place to Stand", statement by Mr. Randall ... 4476

Estimates, Department of Trade and Development, Mr. Randall, continued ... 4476

On notice of motion No. 31, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Deans, Mr. J. R. Smith, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pitman, Mr. R. G. Hodgson ... 4510

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to ... 4520

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, JUNE 14, 1968

The House met at 9:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This morning our visitors are from a distance—the St. John Fisher public school in Forest. Later we are to be joined by students from Oakville, the Lorne Skuce public school and Munn's public school; from Sudbury, Macleod public school; from Willowdale, the Bayview junior high school; from Peterborough, the Keith Wightman public school; from Ridgetown, St. Michael's school; and from Hamilton, Scott Park secondary school.

We welcome these young people who are here now and will be glad to see the others when they arrive.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the 1967 annual report of The Department of Municipal Affairs of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE MUNICIPAL UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS ACT

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this bill implements the financial provisions relating to The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act arising out of the assumption of the costs of the administration of justice by the province and there is one other technical change in the amendments.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on the numerous amendments to The Municipal Act, which cover a variety of subjects.

Sections 1, 3, 14 and 23 are of a technical or housekeeping nature.

Four sections deal with remuneration with respect to councils, boards of control and police village trustees. They are sections 8, 21, 22 and 26. The amounts of remuneration will now be in the discretion of the individual councils.

Four sections—sections 2, 4, 10 and 28—deal with provisions for the oath of allegiance to be taken before entering into elected municipal office rather than at the time of qualifying.

Sections 5, 6 and 7 set out the procedure to be followed to fill vacancies in the office of alderman or councillor in the same manner whether or not they are elected on the ward system. In all cases, councils will be empowered to appoint. Provision is also made for breaking tie votes in council on the filling of vacancies. Sections 13, 15 and 16 amend or repeal the appropriate provisions in The Municipal Act relating to the assumption of the responsibility of the administration of justice.

Sections 17 and 19 deal with the consolidation of provisions dealing with the obstruction of drains and water courses, extending to all municipalities authority to force removal of the obstructions.

Section 17 also has provisions for granting aid to any association duly constituted for the promotion of the welfare and education of retarded persons. Formerly, these provisions applied only to retarded children.

A third provision under this section, Mr. Speaker, is similar to provisions in The Community Centres Act and The Public Parks Act. This provision is applicable to boards of management of arenas and community centres established in municipalities to grant them authority to sell refreshments.

Section 9 and section 27 amendments are complementary to the new part VI of The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Section 11 provides authority for a judge to engage counsel and other assistance for carrying on an investigation initiated by the municipal council.

Section 12 provides for the continuation of local government in the event of an emergency.

Section 18 removes the requirement for municipal board approval under certain provisions of The Municipal Act for specific undertakings longer than one year. It also authorizes bylaws to prohibit littering of private property and extends the provisions respecting garbage disposal to facilitate the locating of disposal sites outside the confines of any one municipality, subject to the approval of the Ontario municipal board. The section also allows municipalities to pass by-laws prohibiting parking on municipal property.

Section 20 deals with licensing and regulating of special sales such as "bankruptcy" or "going out of business" as has been enacted in private legislation.

Section 24 removes the three-month waiting period before county council can confirm a township road closing bylaw.

Section 25 makes provision to enable piling and shoring used in building construction to remain in the street.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, there are five amendments to The Assessment Act.

Section 1 clarifies the intent that paved parking areas are to be considered as unimproved land.

Section 2 removes an apparent conflict with a section of The Public Schools Act.

Section 3 gives the clerk of the court of revision a choice as to amending the original roll or preparing a new roll.

Section 4 extends the authority for the payment of grants to cities, on the same basis as to counties.

Section 5 is housekeeping.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, notice of which was given some days ago.

Is the Minister prepared to outlaw the selling of time-payment contracts to finance companies by retailers in the province in support of the recommendations at the interprovincial conference on consumer protection?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, may I say that there were no recommendations as such at the interprovincial conference on consumer protection to outlaw the selling of time-payment contracts to finance companies by retailers.

This first conference of its type was organized as a working conference of senior federal and provincial officials so that some attempts might be made at making ourselves familiar with each other's statutes and experiences in the consumer protection field.

Mr. M. H. Smith, assistant general solicitor with The Department of the Attorney General of British Columbia, outlined the situation to which the hon. leader of the Opposition makes reference as one of three specific areas which he describes as being of concern to his province. The general point that Mr. Smith raised was not to ban the actual sale of time-payment contracts to subsequent holders in due course. It was to preserve the equities lying in the hands of the consumer, having in mind such a situation as this, that a sale in law of a document or a promissory note or a bill of exchange, which the document is, to a holder in due course and without notice, may take away some of the rights of the consumer. It is really a matter of law. There is a great deal of merit in this and it is being considered and researched now.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask a supplementary question, and this is not directly a supplementary question. You might want to rule it out of order, but I would like to know if the federal department of consumer affairs—I may not have the name of the department correct there—was it represented at this conference?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It was—and by senior officials who played a very active part. This conference is not to be confused with the conference being called by Ottawa. This was an interprovincial conference, with the federal authority present. Tremendous co-operation. It was a great success. It lasted four whole days, something almost unheard in a conference of this type.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I trust the Minister's staff is aware that the two conferences should not be confused. It seems that a

statement made by one of the Minister's staff was associated with the confusion at the federal level in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There is no such situation. I will try to rectify that, but it was a most desirable, harmonious and constructive affair.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a question of this Minister.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have a question for the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, notice of which has been given.

Will the Minister order an investigation of the heavy trading in Canadian Breweries stock prior to last Thursday's announcement of an 11 per cent purchase by Rothmans to determine if stock was purchased by persons aware of the forthcoming announcement? Will the Minister lay charges against the directors of Argus Corporation for misinforming its shareholders, the shareholders of Canadian Breweries and the public by denying it was considering sale of its Canadian Breweries stock while it was conducting negotiations for this sale?

Will the Minister pass the necessary legislation to prevent any similar future corporate abuse?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first question, the securities commission, in conjunction with the Toronto stock exchange, are reviewing the trading pattern on and prior to Thursday, June 6, as a part of the normal routine of market surveillance in which unusual trading patterns are investigated. The announcement of Rothmans acquistion of this 11 per cent factor portion of Canadian Breweries stock was made after the close of trading on June 6. Now the insiders—if I could describe them in that technical way—Canadian Breweries have until July 10 to file reports concerning their trading. So this would have to fit in to this review that is being conducted.

With respect to the second question, I am informed that the only published statements, concerning the possibility of Argus disposing of its holdings in Canadian Breweries made by directors of Argus in the past several months, are those which appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star*, of March 4, and the *Globe and Mail* of March 5. The questions arose from the story which had appeared in the *Wall Street Journal* of the previous week, that Trans-Continental Investigating Corporation of New York was negotiating with Argus for its shares in Canadian Breweries.

The article contained a photograph of Bruce Mathews, Canadian Breweries chairman and Argus vice president, under which the caption appeared, I am informed, and I quote: "talks have been held". In the article in the *Globe and Mail*, without confirming or denying the fact of a meeting between Trans-Continental and Argus, it said that while the Wall Street article was quite erroneous in this form, the number of companies wanting to have conversations about various parts of the operations of Canadian Breweries was almost continuous.

I would like to comment on that Mr. Speaker because, having had no discussions myself with the officials of Argus or Canadian Breweries on this subject, or with the Rothman corporation, still over a period of time and the past year, I would think this department was formed in 1966, I have heard constant rumours on the street about a takeover of Canadian Breweries. Rumours to the effect that this would be a good buy, that there was good cash surplus available in the company and so on.

Now with respect to the hon. member's criticism, or his inferred criticism of the denial of, I presume, Mr. Taylor—I do not think we can just take a yes or no position on the situation like this. Had Mr. Taylor said yes, "negotiations are active", I would think, and with respect to any proposed purchaser of the Argus shares in that company, I would think that the damage to the market and to the public interest would be much greater.

I put this to you. It is a question of who is to say which; who is to say it is greater or less; whether I am right, whether the hon. member's opinion is right? I doubt that those questions will ever be answered satisfactorily, but the point of it is this—I know of no reason in the business world why a person is not permitted and privileged to make a categorical denial with respect to a business transaction that is being negotiated. I put this to the hon. member.

Now with respect to the third question—while I am presently unaware of any corporate abuse in relation to this transaction, the criminal law and the civil law on the subject of fraud and insider liability provisions in section 113 of The Securities Act are considered adequate to deal with either the misuse of confidential information by an insider or a fraudulent misrepresentation of the type suggested in the second question.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this is incredible. Will the Minister allow a supplementary question? Is the Minister aware that in the

securities market in the United States, it is against the law for a member of a board of directors to lie to the public in circumstances such as has occurred here?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I would want to look into that situation, because I do not think you could sum up the law of the United States on the subject of securities in one sentence in that way.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Before the orders of the day, I would just like to make a comment. Last night I had an award here that I was going to show the hon. members. But as we were discussing Expo, I did not want them to think I was trying to use the award in order to get through easy on the Expo vote.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) announced some time ago that the picture of "A Place to Stand" had won an academy award. It has since been received and properly engraved and was in the hands of Chris Chapman, the motion picture director of our film. I have it here this morning—and perhaps for the first time in the history of this province the award can be seen by the members. I am sure our young visitors here today would like to see what an Oscar looks like. That little statue over the years has perhaps meant fortunes to individuals and companies and has started many very famous people on very lucrative careers. So I would like to suggest that if anybody would want to view this at first hand, to touch it and rub off a little of the luck, come on over and have a look at it.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order; House in committee of supply, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT
(Continued)

On vote 402:

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The Ontario economic council has been reconstituted by statute at this session and the Minister has already had a chance to give us his views. It occurred to me that since the Minister's new department is Trade and Development, and the economic aspects of the government's responsibility are now going to be handled by another Minister, the council could come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Treasury and Economics; is that the name of the new department?

However, it has been retained with The Department of Trade and Development and that is a decision that perhaps can be changed in the future, because these various branches of government have had a habit of moving from one department to the other—I suppose depending upon the interests of the Ministers concerned, as much as anything else.

Nevertheless, the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) is going to be reporting for the Ontario economic council and he is going to have $227,000 in order to support their efforts. I would hope that by this time next year we can look forward to the report of the council as it is newly constituted. I would think that the stress on its autonomy and independence should give us the benefit of a report which will have stronger overtones of autonomy and independence and that this particular report will become, in the years that lie ahead, a cornerstone for the discussion in this House and across the province in the financial community and elsewhere, as to our prospects for the year; and as a real guide, not only to government policy but to the approach that citizens and taxpayers would take.

I can remember some years ago it was the habit of the economic—I do not know what it was called, it was a branch of the Minister's department concerned with the economy —to publish very well-prepared monthly reports. Perhaps they were quarterly, but they seemed to come quite regularly. Month-by-month or quarter-by-quarter there was careful review of business trends, not only in Ontario, but as they related to Canada and the North America economy.

While I am not professionally versed in these matters at all, I always found these reports of great interest and helpfulness. So, perhaps, as well as having a yearly objective review and prediction of the 12 months that lie ahead, we can expect regular reports from the council that would go to a mailing list that hopefully would include the members of the Legislature as well as many other citizens in the province.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Chairman, I do not know if you are referring to the *Ontario Economic Review*?

Mr. Nixon: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is still being published and—

Mr. Nixon: Is it published quarterly?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it comes out monthly.

Mr. Nixon: That is the one, and it must get winnowed out of my mails.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well everybody is on the mailing list right now. If you are not on the mailing list, I hope you will let us know. Of course, this now is being sent out by Treasury and Economics as you know, it is in their department. And it is available for anybody.

Mr. Nixon: What about the yearly report?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think we could work out a yearly report without any difficulty. I do not think there is any problem involved.

I think what you are referring to is something like the economic council of Canada setting guidelines. We have operated just a little differently to the economic council of Canada; as you know, they have a staff of probably 150 economists up there. Now that kind of work is being done in the former chief economist's department, and I would presume in the Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. MacNaughton's) presentation of his estimates that much of that information will be disclosed and could be reported on an annual basis.

The economic council, as we see it, in Ontario, is the use of many people in our economy, in all branches of our economy, that lend to the government their views and their opinions on matters that we feel that are of importance to our department in more ways than one. This information is forwarded to other departments of government, as you well know.

Mr. Nixon: I am not sure what the Minister means when he says that the council is going to be useful in more ways than one. But, from my past experience with the Minister I shudder to think what that might involve.

I can tell you that one of the things that we should look forward to from the economic council is an objective review of the economy of the province. I do not mean the Minister's part in expanding trade, or anything like that, but the part that Ontario is playing in the economy of Canada.

We know that the Minister and his colleagues spend a good deal of their time indicating what Ontario's place is, and usually it is the prime place. We on this side, and others, tend to discount these claims considerably.

I would suggest to the Minister that some of this money might very well be earmarked for this body, which has its own statute, and the independence of which we will judge on the basis of what they are able to put befor the public year by year. Really, I would have thought that one of the prime projects of such a council would be in giving us this year-end review and year-beginning prediction, which would be of great use to the government in more ways than one.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow up a point made by my leader. This year, Wednesday, May 15, 1968, page 2986 in *Hansard*, the Minister of Trade and Development said, referring to the Ontario economic council:

> This council will advise all departments of government which ask for the services of a council. They work with The Department of Labour, The Department of Education, The Department of Lands and Forests, The Department of the Treasury—which has the chief economist in it—The Department of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Chairman, I thought these were the terms of reference of the chief economist of this province, who was with the Minister's department. Is this not overlapping responsibility? Is this not duplicating? Perhaps the Minister could comment on this, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The chief economist attends most of the meetings of the economic council; this is an independent review.

I would say today that the chief economist's department is a group of civil servants who perform a task for the government with reference to the economy, but this is an independent review by outsiders—outside businessmen who sit on this council. As we have said, they are from universities, from labour, and from industry, and they give us their views as to what we should be doing with the economy of the province. In doing this they are quite prepared to sit down with all the departments of government and get their views on matters that they are discussing at the council table.

As I reported to the House at that time, much of the information that they produce they produce for a particular department. They work with all these departments on many matters that affect the operations of

other departments, so they are a service branch, in effect, an independent service branch, to any departments that want something looked into.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if it would be possible for the Opposition parties to have the services of this council, seeing that it is not a civil service group, seeing that it is an independent group?

It would be very helpful to us to meet with them some time, perhaps to have someone attend their meetings, and to hear about the things that these independent people in our society, from universities, from labour and from business, have to say about the economic policies of this government. Would it be possible to secure an invitation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, certainly, we would be glad to arrange it.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow up on the same approach I took last night, concerning the gaps between the Minister's estimates and the actual amount expended.

Last evening, Mr. Chairman, we discussed three of the items within the main office estimates in which the Minister consistently underestimated how much he would actually expend. And the Minister made some comments on my criticisms and answered some of my questions. But last night, Mr. Chairman, the consistent error, as I call it, in budget forecasting was all in the direction of asking for less than they actually expended. In other words, over-expending considerably in a number of items. And I felt that had a relationship to what we are being asked to approve in this Legislature for 1968-1969.

Mr. Chairman, turning to the Ontario economic council, we find that the Minister has made budgeting forecast errors again, but in the opposite direction. For example, in both 1965-66 and 1966-67, the Minister came to this Legislature and asked, for example, for $10,000 in "travelling expense" money for the Ontario economic council. Then he spent almost 40 per cent less than he asked for in 1965-1966, and almost 30 per cent less than he asked for in 1966-1967 for travelling expenses.

When we look at the other item—"maintenance," including allowances, fees, conferences, research and special studies—we find that the Minister, in 1965-1966, Mr. Chairman, came to this Legislature and asked for $140,000, and then he actually expended much less than this. In fact, about 11 per cent less. He repeated the same budgeting forecast error in 1966-1967. He came and asked for $147,000, and then spent 24 per cent less than he asked for.

When we take the total amount for the Ontario economic council, first we find that the piling up of the error in the same direction resulted in the Minister coming to this Legislature in 1965-1966 and 1966-1967, asking for more money than be actually expended.

Mr. Chairman, I would think that the Minister would learn from this type of past experience, and that he would come to this Legislature this year and, instead of asking for the same amount that he asked for in the previous four years for travelling expenses, he would ask for an amount which was nearer to the amount that he actually expended. In other words, he is asking us for $10,000 again. He has done this for four years and consistently, for two years, he has spent only $5,675 in 1965-1966 and $7,060 in 1966-1967.

We turn to the maintenance amount and we find that he has asked us for $140,000 in 1965-1966; $140,000 in 1966-1967; $145,000 in 1967-1968; and then, again, $138,000 in 1968-1969. The point is, Mr. Chairman, that in 1966-1967, for example, he asked us for $140,000 and spent only $105,978, then he comes back and asks us for $138,000 for next year.

I do not understand this. I would think he would learn from past history. If I were a medical doctor I suppose I would say that the Minister has a chronic propensity to make this budgeting forecast error. What does the difference mean? It means that if we take a look over a two-year period—if we look at the actual amount expended in 1966-1967 for the Ontario economic council—we find that it spent $166,345. Mr. Chairman, that was the actual amount expended. Then we look at the amount the Minister wants us to approve in 1968-1969—he is asking us to approve $227,000.

Mr. Chairman, the difference in what he expended in 1966-1967 and what he is asking us to approve today is $60,000, or, more precisely, about $60,655. That is an increase of 37 per cent in two years.

Again I will ask the Minister why, when he talks about economies in government, turning down inessential programmes, and particularly with the history of always spending less than he asks for, why is this Minister coming to us today and asking us to

vote him an amount which is 37 per cent more than he actually expended in 1966-1967?

Mr. Chairman, I would only add that he cannot use the arguments he made last night about being responsible and whatnot, because last night his error was persistently in the other direction. Has the Minister got an answer?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to sound facetious but I would hope that one of these days the hon. member will take time to sit down with some of the Treasury board and understand why there is a difference in these accounts. They can be justified 99 times out of 100. As to this one here, during that year that you are talking about we got a rebate from the federal government on joint participation of almost $37,000, and we are dickering with the federal authorities for a rebate on almost a similar amount for 1967.

When we get shared programmes which were not contemplated—sometimes we start into a year and a problem comes up, say in manpower, or The Department of Education, or The Department of Labour wants something studied—first of all we find out what share the federal authorities are prepared to pay for it. I can go back to a number of items in our department last year — for instance, a discussion on a survey in northern Ontario, when Mr. Sauvé in the midst of the year came out and said they would pay 50 per cent of a five-year feasibility study in northern Ontario. That has been accepted. If any of that was paid last year, that would be coming back to the department as a credit, but we could not foresee that if we had set up a study earlier and we were going to pay for it ourselves.

In the case of the economic council. I will not say most of their work, but a lot of their work is in conjunction with the federal authorities—for instance, in immigration, manpower and education. They pick up their 50 per cent of the cost and then the rebate comes back to us, which lowers the cost of operating that department. Again I say, if a department does not overspend its budget, I think this is good for the taxpayer as well as for the department. In the case here we had some revenue coming from the federal authorities that was not banked on at the time the estimates were settled the previous October, so this is where there is a discrepancy in the economic council expenditures and budgeted amounts.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would just make one further comment and a question for the Minister. In the Ontario economic council there must, of course, be forward planning in terms of research projects. The Minister is asking us to approve $220,000 for the Ontario economic council for next year. I find it very difficult to believe, Mr. Chairman, that he cannot be quite precise about that. In other words, the variation between what he is asking for and what he actually will expend in 1968-1969 should be, in a sense, forecastable.

If the Ontario economic council is doing its job as the Minister sees it, particularly in the area of research, surely the economic council under its chairman should know now what research projects it is going to do in 1968-1969? If they do not, they are not doing their job. If they do know what they want to do, then they should be able to know now whether or not they will get participation from The Department of Labour in Ottawa, for example, for the joint research projects. Similarly, in fields related to university research, if the Ontario economic council is really doing its job, Mr. Chairman, then it will have signed those contracts with university people to do research for 1968-1969, because you cannot get researchers just at the drop of a hat. You have to line it up six months to a year ahead of time.

So, Mr. Chairman, I simply repeat to the Minister that I cannot understand why, in the past, he has not been able to be more precise in what he asks for from this House and what he gets. Next year, Mr. Chairman, he is asking us for $227,000 and I find it very difficult to believe, even if I spend a weekend with his Treasury officials, to find out why the Minister cannot be more sure of whether or not his estimate is going to be close to his actual. I would just say, Mr. Chairman, I will follow this particular estimate with interest over the next four years.

Vote 402 agreed to.

On vote 403:

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): I note in the year ending 1967, Mr. Chairman, the amount for Ontario house was about $500,000, and the vote asks this time for only $284,000. Is this a cutback, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. There have been some changes. The immigration costs were taken up there. You see, we have the immigration department set up separately. The trade and industry costs are taken out of Ontario house and they have been transferred

to their proper departments this year. That would be the reason for the reduction. So this is just the operation of Ontario house now, without immigration or trade and industry expenses in there. They now reflect on their proper departments since we set up the immigration department.

Mr. Sargent: I see you are paying Mr. Armstrong about $22,000 plus allowance—about $30,000 a year. Is this not a pretty healthy sum for a cushy job?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would not take it myself and live overseas, I do not think, for $22,000 with all the difficulties they have to put up with over there. No, I think it is commensurate with the job, with the operation of Ontario house. We have kept it to a minimum. There are some other provinces that have almost a legation.

Ontario house has been operating there, as you know, since after World War II. It has done a very good job. In fact, just as many people come to Ontario house for advice as go to Canada house. Ontario house works very closely with Canada house, particularly in matters of immigration; they do almost everything in Ontario house except give the physical examination, which has to be carried on at Canada house.

No, I would not think that was too high a salary. That man over there has a very responsible position and it is in line with what Deputy Ministers are getting at home here. Of course, he has a lot of other difficulties insofar as living expenses are concerned. If you have spent any time on the continent or the United Kingdom then certainly you know the cost of living over there is a lot higher than it is here, and the inconveniences, I think, they have to be put up with would be certainly worth $22,000 a year. If you are looking for the job sometime, talk to me.

May I just say while we are talking about Ontario house that the gentleman who has replaced Mr. Armstrong, who retired on January 1, is in the House. I would like to introduce him to the members. Will Mr. Allan Rowan-Legge stand up for a minute?

Vote 403 agreed to.

On vote 404:

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, this is one vote under this estimate which I rather question should be in this department at all. I have become concerned with the hodge-podge groups of the various government departments. We have seen that the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welch) has certain duties having to do with new people who come to this country and now we, in this department, have started another branch of bringing people to our shores over and above what Ottawa does. I was wondering if the Minister would tell us, first of all, how many people are employed by his department under this vote 404, and how it dovetails, if it does dovetail at all, with the work done by the federal government in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, this is not a new department. As I suggested a few minutes ago under the hon. George Drew, when he was Prime Minister of the province, you recall the famous airlift back in the 50's.

That is right. We have always had an immigration department, but as you said, it was in some other department. When I inherited this portfolio, it was in Mr. Macaulay's department. We re-established it in view of the fact that we wanted to set it up as a very active department. This was in order to get the kind of people we think we need here, and the skills that we require. The department consists of 32 people, not only here but overseas as well. I do not think the department is overloaded with people.

I think the job they have done in getting the skills that we require here is certainly very commendable. For instance, last year I think we brought in 600 school teachers and there is quite a report on this. I would be glad to read it in detail if the hon. member would like me to. The record of the immigration department is a very excellent one, as far as I am concerned, because there are difficulties in immigration, great difficulties. It is a very sensitive area not only for us, but for the federal authorities.

We, particularly, in this province, are looking for skills because we recognize that we are getting the vast majority of the sponsored immigration. The sponsored immigration usually consists of people who are not as well equipped to find a job when they get here, or to earn sufficient money to do the things that they have to do to live in our kind of an economy. Our feeling is that the more skilled people we bring here, I say we—every skilled person we bring can support at least two or three unskilled people.

So we have, working with the federal authorities, concentrated our efforts in our immigration department to bringing in skilled help. I think from what we have achieved to date with 116,000 and some odd people coming in, out of 200,000, and some odd, we get 54 per cent of the immigration that comes to Canada. I think we have been rather

selective and have been able to do a pretty good job in serving the needs of industries who come to our department looking for this kind of support, and 32 people, in my estimation, are well justified in the immigration department.

I do not think it is overloaded. I think it has to be supervised, and, I would say, I think it should be supervised by our department because it is off-shore. There are not too many departments in the government that are in a position to handle an off-shore operation. We are, and I think that is the reason why it first came to the Department of Economics and Development, and, before that, whatever it was called—the other department—under Mr. Billy Nickle.

Mr. Trotter: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this department places ads in papers in Europe trying to seek trained personnel. Am I right on that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Trotter: Well, approximately how much do you spend?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would not say this year—as soon as our slow-down in jobs occurs here, we slow down the advertising for immigrants overseas.

Mr. Trotter: And this, as listed here, under item No. 4 on this vote—that is not what you paid for advertising from what I gather, it just says publication of reports.

I was wondering how much you pay, or will plan to pay, this coming year for advertising for various trained personnel in Europe?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Our general advertising last year was $25,000, but we did spend $96,000 for employers who gave us the money to advertise on their behalf—in the United Kingdom papers particularly.

Mr. Trotter: The thing that disturbs me about this particular provincial government doing, is that if all ten provinces start advertising in Europe, spending the taxpayers' money, it seems ridiculous if we end up competing with each other. This is why I feel it should be done through the Ottawa government. This immigration really, constitutionally, is a federal matter and surely the Ottawa government has the responsibility to supply services for Ontario people. I do not see why, from our Ontario Treasury, we should have to spend the money that we do.

Now, I would take it from the policy set down by the Ontario government, that they have felt over the years—no matter who has been in power federally, no matter which political party—that they have been doing a poor job on this.

Would this be the Minister's opinion, that no matter who has been in power in Ottawa, that they have been doing a poor job in bringing trained personnel to the province of Ontario? Is this your view?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I would not like to put the finger on anybody. I recognize the difficulties in immigration, having been involved in it myself. I can assure you, as far as the federal authorities are concerned, both under the present administration and the one previous, that this government works very closely with the federal authorities in Ottawa. We have their blessing on the immigration work that we are doing, in order to find the kind of people we wanted for our economy here and in the other parts of Canada.

I think it is up to every province to co-ordinate their activities with the federal authorities, as long as we are both going in the same direction. So far, we have had no complaints from the—

Mr. Sargent: You are in opposition.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, we are not in opposition. We are doing the same thing. We are co-ordinating with the federal authorities, in getting the kind of people that we would like to see come into Canada. We have had no—

Mr. Sargent: You would not run your own business that way.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have no differences of opinion with the federal authorities as far as our methods of recruiting people from overseas, off-shore, to come here. I think we have an immigration policy that is probably more open than any other immigration policy anywhere else in the world at the present time. But I know it has brought on some dangers, in more ways than one. We have to work very closely with the federal authorities, whether it is of our political faith or not. We have constantly worked with the federal authorities in Ottawa to make sure that we are not duplicating our efforts.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I rise perhaps on a point of order. I want to say something about what the Minister has said, but before I do, I should point out to him that while we sat long hours yesterday and are prepared to sit long hours today, we do believe that the government should at least have enough people over there to operate the House. There

are more in the Opposition by far than they have in all that expanse of empty blue chairs over there. However, the Minister is here and we do have some questions to ask him.

It has been our position for many years that these questions might better be put in some less formal committee circumstances than this. We do not want to put the government supporters out in any unrealistic way. They have to come in and support the Minister. However, my hon. friend from Parkdale indicated that he was concerned about the multiplicity of government agencies in this connection. I do not know whether the Minister is aware that his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), has an immigration department, in a sense, in his own department and his own jurisdiction.

I happen to be aware of that because I am trying to obtain some help for my own farm through his office. But, the point is that the member for Parkdale is completely right in that we have immigration responsibilities at the federal level, and they are proliferating here as well. Surely, there should be some effort to unify the responsibility as the administration sees them among the many departments of the provincial government.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I can just suggest to the hon. member that, regardless of what the department is looking for staff, whether it be The Department of Health for nurses, The Department of Agriculture and Food for farm help, or The Department of Education for teachers, they do work through our immigration department. There is no duplication. They may assign somebody in that department to be in contact with our immigration management.

Mr. Nixon: Have they got somebody assigned in that department to travel to the United Kingdom and other points?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right. They will go over like any employer. They will go over to our office, Ontario house, and working with Mr. Donaldson, our manager of the immigration department there. They will go into the areas he takes them, and he makes sure that they see the right people. In other words, he co-ordinates their activities when they go there.

They are aware of where—let us say—the bodies would be available. When the man from Agriculture or Education goes there, our people work with him to make sure he gets his contacts. It is a joint effort all the way, through, I can assure the hon. member.

Mr. Trotter: One remark that the Minister made, Mr. Chairman, I cannot let go by. He said that they had the most generous immigration policy in the world. I guess that is the enthusiastic salesman puffing a bit. I would rather suspect that the—

Mr. Nixon: He claims he has got the biggest floating crap game, was not that a quote of his?

Mr. Trotter: Yes, I believe this Minister has been attributed as saying that he has the biggest floating crap game in the world too. But when it comes to immigration, I believe that the policy of this department would be that it is the immigrants that it would seek would be strictly highly trained people. You are out looking for a particular type of individual; you are not just opening the doors to anybody. As a result I would assume that your emphasis is placed upon the United Kingdom and Germany, where most of the trained personnel are, who are available in the world and are apt to come to Canada. Would I be correct in assuming that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have a lot of people from Europe, of course. Perhaps I could give you some figures that would give you an idea of what people we are getting, and where they were coming from.

For instance, I said that last year almost 117,000 came into Ontario, out of 200,000–plus for Canada; 62,000 entered the labour force, and 54,807 were non-workers – they would be families or dependants. The operational groupings were: managerial 1,291, professional and technical 13,181. These are the kind of people that we have been concentrating on. Clerical was 8,616, commercial and finance 1,693, service and recreation 5,409, transport communication 876, agriculture 1,680, logging 109, fishing and trapping 10, mining and quarrying 140, manufacturing, mechanical and construction 22,996, labourers 6,150, others 833, and entrepreneurs 59. Sponsored immigrants to the labour force were 15,878, and unsponsored immigrants, 46,165.

The sources of the immigration in 1967 were: 73 per cent citizens of European countries; 12 per cent, citizens in countries of North and Central America; 9 per cent citizens of countries in Asia; 3 per cent Australia and New Zealand, and 2 per cent citizens of coutries in Africa.

Mr. Trotter: Is this total immigration?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No. Just for Ontario.

Mr. Trotter: This is just from your department?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, this is from Ontario.

Mr. Trotter: This is immigration that has come to Ontario, but not necessarily through your department?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No. I just said this is the total number of people that came into Ontario, and this is the breakdown of the classifications of where they came from.

Mr. Trotter: But that does not mean that you have got this trained help. There is no doubt about it, trained people want to come to Canada. We have our own immigration rules that more or less encourage the situation where the higher your standards of education, the better chance you have of being given a permanent landing visa by our federal government.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Why is it that most of them want to come to Ontario?

Mr. Trotter: They want to come to Ontario because there are more opportunities to work —the same reason you and I came to Ontario; the same reason probably why the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) came to Ontario. It is the same all over.

But the truth of the matter is that there is duplication. This is a federal responsibility here, far overweighing the provincial responsibility. When employers from Ontario give this government $96,000 to advertise for them, I do not see why our federal office cannot do the same thing. I would still feel that the Minister has not begun to answer this question, and that is the duplication that is obviously taking place. Quebec evidently wants to do the same thing. Mind you, if Quebec had set up an immigration branch or a Quebec house, as we have done over the years, there would have been a great uproar and everybody would have got mad at Quebec.

There is no doubt about it that constitutionally you probably have the right to do what you are doing, but I am questioning the economics of it, the over-duplication. These figures that the Minister just quoted as to immigration to this province are largely due to the efforts of the federal government, or just the fact that Canada is known as a prosperous country compared to the rest of the world. Even our poorest places in Canada are probably far better than most other places in the world and people are glad to get here. But the figures that the Minister gave me are just no answer. I would like to try to pin this down if I could.

Of the $96,000 that private employers gave your department, could you give me any idea, from the spending of that amount of money, how many of the required employees you obtained for the employers?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The first enquiries at overseas offices from this ad resulted in 17,165 people coming in after reading the ad to see about coming to the province of Ontario. Prospective immigrants counselled were 9,313; landed immigrants counselled in Toronto were 222. As soon as they got off the boat or the train, they came to our immigration office here. Employment applications received by employers were 16,709; this is the result of spending the $96,000 for the employers. There were 16,709 applications received, so I think the pull for their $96,000 was pretty good.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Two hundred?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Pretty good. Applicants offered employment totalled 2,035, employers making employment offers were 447. Employers interviewing overseas were 295—that is, teams of employers going overseas and using our offices at Ontario house, and bringing people in to talk to various groups—and employer expenditures and advertising, as I have already said, were $96,000. The highest occupational demand was for school teachers, followed by nurses and then by other trained hospital personnel. The demand for civil and chemical engineers was a loss substantially, and for mechanical and electrical engineers off slightly from 1966. The same applied for supporting technicians and draftsmen. The demand for skilled production line personnel was much lower than in 1966.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Excuse me just one minute and I can get finished.

Mr. Chairman: On a point of order.

Mr. Sargent: Somewhere along the line there should be something we can believe in these figures.

Mr. Chairman: What is the point of order?

Mr. Sargent: We have little chance of even hearing those figures, Mr. Chairman. Just a moment.

Mr. Chairman: No point of order.

Mr. Sargent: The Minister—

Mr. Chairman: The member has no point of order. The Minister has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: This is the biggest snow job ever!

Mr. Chairman: The member is out of order. The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member for Grey-Bruce thinks this is a snow job, I would suggest he go ahead and get the facts and prove it is a snow job. I tell you these facts are compiled by very reputable people on the civil service; and we are not doctoring anything, I can assure you.

Mr. Sargent: You are trying to justify your existence.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Certainly, we justify our existence and our reason on this side of the House. Why should we not?

I think, Mr. Chairman, I have given the hon. member for Parkdale the information he requested. That is all the answer I can give him. If he wants some more, I will be glad to pursue it further, but I would think you could see from the $96,000 spent by the employers, that we have got fairly good results for them out of our advertisements.

Mr. Trotter: I take it from those figures that they got 447 employees, or was it 2,035?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It was 2,035; the 447 was firms.

Mr. Trotter: It was what?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Firms.

Mr. Trotter: But when you would hire teachers, or at least make it possible that teachers could be hired in Ontario, who would you ask to do that? I understand through your efforts 600 teachers came to Ontario. Who would request that of you?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mainly school boards. School boards themselves would send their own representatives over to interview teachers in Glasgow and the United Kingdom and at Ontario house.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on 404, I note in the item entitled "maintenance" that in 1967-1968 the Minister had an estimate of $44,000 and then for next year, 1968-1969, he is asking for $72,000. This is not doubling but close to it, and when looking over the other items in vote 404, and at the total amount he is asking compared to the estimates for last year, I find the entire increase is almost made up of the increase in maintenance costs. I was wondering if the Minister could explain why there seems to be this discrepancy in the rates of increase in the various sub-items? Why does he think his maintenance costs are going to go up when he thinks the salary costs will not go up very much, when his travelling expenses are estimated to be the same as last year, and when the publication of reports, exhibits and displays is budgeted for the same amount as last year? Why this maintenance figure? Is this padding once again, or what is it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: When we reorganized the immigration department there were new classifications given for immigration men serving overseas and they were then given foreign service allowances which were not permitted before, and that is the reason why there is an increase in their allotments.

Vote 404 agreed to.

On vote 405:

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, last night I asked the Minister if he could give us the offices where he is operating, now under this vote 405? Like Dusseldorf, Milan, and so on. Where are you operating? Where do you have offices?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have an office in Milan, Dusseldorf, Ontario house, of course. We have an office in New York, Chicago and Los Angeles.

In the other areas where the men are operating they do not have offices. They use an office service but they do not have an office. In other words, we want them out Monday morning and back Friday night and not tied down with a lot of clerical work.

Mr. Sargent: We have, coupled with the $1.2 million in the first vote and $3 million roughly here, we are maybe talking about $4 million on promotion, and if ever an efficiency survey came into this government this is one area where we could cut back.

They tell me that when a business is in trouble, they start looking for areas to save money and cut back. Well, if any business was ever in trouble, it is this province of Ontario; this government here.

The debenture debt increase last year was $450 million—we are going into debt $1.5 million a day—so if we saved $3 million or $4 million here, it would only be four days lost, the way we are going now.

I would like to ask the Minister, could he tell us what results he gets from Dusseldorf, Milan and Los Angeles? For instance, I was down there—as I told the Minister before—I was in the office in Los Angeles a few months ago, and the man did not even have time to talk to me. The manager came out and he put me in a little cubbyhole in the outer office and gave me a couple of minutes. I did not tell him who I was, I just told him I was an Ontario citizen, but he did not have time to talk to me. If this is an example of how you operate your offices, it is a waste of money, Mr. Chairman.

What are we getting out of Dusseldorf or Milan or those places?

Mr. Nixon: Some fellow down there was selling cookies.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, you should see this office in Los Angeles. It is a plush Hollywood type. You walk in carpets up to your ankles, you have choice models for receptionists and all the trappings that reveal the con game that we have going on over here. So, in essence, if they are going to get any business out of the Los Angeles office, they are going to have to do a better job than they did on me.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 405?

Mr. Sargent: Just a minute, is the Minister going to answer some questions?

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister have a comment?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I have a comment. I do not know about the reception in Los Angeles, I was not there. I always say there are three sides to a story, yours, mine and the truth.

I am not doubting the member's word—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: You are going to check it out, are you?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will be glad to check it out. But just let me deal with Los Angeles for a minute.

The office opened there—the man was posted October 2 and it was officially opened December 1. At the present time, he is working on 53 new prospects for plant locations in Ontario. He is working on 23 joint venture arrangements, 33 manufacturing arrangements, 31 new marketing deals—that is the cookie deals where we take a product down there and sell it.

This is the kind of activity these people are engaged in—

Mr. Trotter: How many have actually come, though?

Hon. Mr. Randall: —and the same thing applies to our other offices. They look after trade missions when they go there, they set up appointments so that if you, as a manufacturer, went on a trade mission that man would set up sufficient appointments to keep you busy all the time you are there and make sure you talk to people who can say, "I want to buy." You do not go around ringing doorbells and leave there saying, "I didn't find anybody who had an interest." He sorts all those people out before you get there, so you do not waste your time and we do not waste our money.

This is the responsibility of these offices. They get many hundreds of people from Ontario that manufacturers send over. For instance, I know Consumers' Gas have been in Europe a number of times, in view of the gas find in Holland. They have used our offices over there in some of the connections they have made in Belgium and Luxembourg and other places.

At the present time in Dusseldorf they are working on eight new factory prospects, three joint ventures, nine manufacturing arrangements and eight marketing arrangements. This is the kind of work that these people are doing.

I gave the House an answer to a question the member asked me a few weeks ago; I gave a full answer on our participation in the Los Angeles market, where there are 22 million people, which is more than we have in Canada. We feel that is the place we should concentrate the efforts of a man like the man we have down there, the same as Chicago and New York.

About 80 per cent of the new plant locations we get—

Mr. Sargent: I never heard from them again.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will see that you get a Christmas card for sure this year.

I will tell you, as far as I am concerned, I think these offices are justified. In the areas

where we are getting the plant locations, about 80 per cent of them are from the United States and we have these—

Mr. Sargent: You still have not any industries yet.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sure we have industries out of the United States. They only opened up a few months ago.

Mr. Sargent: How many?

Hon. Mr. Randall: If the hon. member asks me a year from now I will be able to tell him.

Mr. Nixon: But you can tell us now and the answer is none.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I could not say whether it is none or not. We have an industrial review that is going to be published, I think in about two weeks time. Perhaps in that we will have a list of some Los Angeles plants.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me just point out one company, Douglas Aircraft. We have been working with Douglas Aircraft since they took over the Malton operation a few years ago. As you know, they are shipping out of there $100 million a week, or $100 million a month—$100 million a year—

Mr. Nixon: Get it right!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, the decimal point slipped this morning. It is $100 million in exports of aircraft parts that have gone back to the Douglas Aircraft Company in California. We have been talking to Lockheed about coming—

Mr. T. Reid: You cannot take credit for that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are not taking credit for anything. I just simply say—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh yes, we have done a lot of things for Douglas Aircraft.

Mr. T. Reid: You mean you are responsible for the parent company buying their stuff from their Canadian sub?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, no, no. Do not get excited now. Just wait a minute now, do not get excited. You have all morning, we will not be going out of here until 2 o'clock.

The Douglas Aircraft Company is placing orders here and when they place the orders, our people in Trade and Industry have helped Douglas Aircraft in Canada find dozens of small suppliers, so that many small towns are now producing parts for Douglas Aircraft. This is where we have helped Douglas Aircraft.

Sure, we do not take credit for the $100 million shipments to the United States, but we certainly feel we have done something to assist them in getting—

Mr. Sargent: They have to keep busy at something.

Hon. Mr. Randall: My associate here tells me I should read what happened in the month of April in Los Angeles. Perhaps it is just as well I do. Los Angeles office reports 17 new branch prospects, four joint venture prospects and 17 new licensing prospects for the month of April.

Mr. Sargent: Just like an insurance salesman.

Hon. Mr. Randall: In the area of marketing, the Los Angeles office reported sales on behalf of Essex Packers Limited in the amount of $1.6 million projected for a one-year period, and also Standard-Modern Tools in the amount of $500,000.

Of significant interest is the announcement by Lockheed California of a production go-ahead for 172 of the L1011 air buses being purchased by several major airlines throughout the world. As a result of this, Lockheed are expanding their California plants and they are looking abroad, particularly to Canada, for several sub-contractors in this project. It is to be hoped that many Ontario companies will be able to contribute to this programme, and the marketing branch is in the process of contacting interested suppliers.

The Los Angeles office reports that the California economy is particularly strong, despite uncertainties over the devaluation of the United States dollar and the pending corporate tax hike. The high level of employment and personal income and a favourable construction climate will ensure continuation of a record rise in employment which is now in its eighth year.

These are some of the prospects that we are sorting out with our people in this office and the other offices around the world. If we were not there, there is a lot of this business that I do not think would come to Canada. And it is obvious that we need the kind of people we have in these foreign offices.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, Under this vote, I would like to ask the Minister—I was not in during his opening remarks—in regards to industries, whether he stated how many industries located in the province of Ontario last year, Mr. Chairman, we know that they are settling in the big "golden horseshoe" in general, but so many of the towns and villages have been struggling for years and years and nothing has taken place. Of course, you have a new programme here—industrial opportunity, equalization of industrial opportunity in Ontario—and I would like to know how many industries really settled last year outside the "golden horseshoe", or in towns in rural Ontario during 1967-1968.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, all I can give you is what I have here for 1967—the EIO programme I announced in my opening statement. I told you how many went to northern Ontario, eastern Ontario and the rest of Ontario, but here is a list of the new manufacturing establishments and where they located last year: eastern Ontario, 6; northwestern Ontario, 2; Georgian Bay area, 13; Lake Ontario area, 9; northeastern Ontario, 4; midwestern Ontario, 18; Niagara, 15; Lake Erie, 7; St. Clair, 6; central, 52: for a total of 132.

These are pretty well spread, as you can see, throughout the province. We have no programme to force industry to go to one particular area, but the EIO programme is, in effect, doing that. As I said earlier, money talks. These plants are going where they think they can operate on a capital basis, in a designated area such as you have in Georgian Bay. If there are other areas now that have been redesignated, they qualify for the EIO programme. For instance, your former colleague, Mr. Whicher, was always worrying about getting industry in Wiarton. Well, as long as the federal authorities had designated areas such as Collingwod, Owen Sound and Midland, you can understand why some industries would not locate in Wiarton. But—

Mr. Nixon: Probably you will be able to fix that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: —now that they have been redesignated under our programme, a town like Wiarton, and say Meaford—some of those places—have an opportunity of getting an industry or two.

Mr. Sargent: It does not mean anything.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well I do not know. You say it does not mean anything, but some of these towns only need one industry. If they get it, that is about all they can absorb. There are many municipalities—and we will discuss it later—sending in applications. You well know in your own area they do not have any serviced land, they do not have any housing—but they just want to make sure they are on the list. If they can develop, if they get an energetic council or an industrial development officer, and they want some assistance from us as to how they can get an industry—that is what we are trying to do for them.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the—

Mr. Chairman: Is this on 405?

Mr. Trotter: Yes, it rises from what the Minister just said, that is all.

Mr. Chairman: That comes under the Ontario development corporation—

Mr. Trotter: Ontario development corporation? All right I can wait until then.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister—we see that rural Ontario population is going down and we have to export our educated young people, the greatest asset we have, to the great metropolitan areas. What has been told us in the past—that they are doing something for rural Ontario to encourage industrial development or some industry—is not taking place.

Mr. Chairman: I really think that comes under 406.

Mr. Spence: I am sorry.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister let me know before we go any further what type of financial assistance his department is responsible for—there trade commissions abroad? What are you paying for? What are the individual firms paying for?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We pay the air costs, the transportation costs to and from the area where the trade mission goes, and the manufacturer's representative pays all his own other expenses.

Mr. T. Reid: That is economy fare, is it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, always economy, including economy for the Minister if I go.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to a number of particular questions relating to the trade missions abroad.

As the Minister has stated, this government pays from the public purse, from the taxpayers' dollars, the air fares of the people from private companies who go on these various trade missions, and the private businesses pay for the other expenses. I have a series of questions here, Mr. Chairman, and I think I had better ask them one at a time and ask the Minister to comment on them, one at a time.

On September 9, there was a sales mission to Basle, Switzerland. Reading from the Minister's press release, I note that on this sales mission—led by Mr. McRae, a commissioner of the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario—one of the companies represented was Canadian Westinghouse Company Limited. I would like to ask the Minister whether Canadian Westinghouse Company Limited is a subsidiary of an American company.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, this was a nuclear mission. And when you send a nuclear mission you get people from the companies that are in the nuclear field. And we would invite people like Mr. McRae, the former chairman of the board of General Electric, who headed the mission for me. I could not go on it myself. Also included was Mr. Smith of the Ontario Hydro, who is the chief nuclear official for Hydro, and a member from Westinghouse. These are the companies that are building nuclear equipment. They were selected for this mission because of their knowledge and the fact that they can talk with authority about nuclear energy when they visit the various authorities in these areas.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, yes, that is correct. Canadian Westinghouse Company Limited is a subsidiary of Westinghouse Electric Corporation of Pittsburgh, which has a controlling interest in the Canadian Westinghouse Company. For the information of the Minister, on the board of directors of Canadian Westinghouse Limited are G. G. Main and A. K. McCord, two directors who live in Pittsburgh. So, it is definitely very highly owned by the American parent and has very good representation on the Canadian board by directors of the parent company in Pittsburgh.

Seeing that this was concerned with the nuclear industry in Canada, what assurances does the Minister have from the president of Canadian Westinghouse Company Limited, as opposed to the person who went on the trade mission, Mr. W. J. Stirling, who is definitely not a director—he is probably head of some department within the company—Mr. Chairman, what assurances does the Minister have from the directors of Canadian Westinghouse Company Limited that the information they picked up in Europe would not be fed right back to the parent company in Pittsburgh, so the American parent company in Pittsburgh gets the advantage of the Ontario government taking the subsidiary firm from Canada on the junket over to Europe? Does the Minister have any assurances from the Canadian firm or from the parent company in Pittsburgh, that the help he is giving to their Canadian subsidiary is not simply going to result in bigger profits directly to the parent company in Pittsburgh? Do you have any assurances of this? If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, this is like the question "when did you stop beating your wife?" I do not think there is any answer to a question like that. Let me first of all say that we talked here the day before yesterday about the Canadian heavy water system. The Americans are not in the heavy water system. This man who went from Westinghouse here would be selling equipment adaptable only to the heavy water system.

Now it is unlikely that he would go over there and try to pick up an order and have something manufactured in the United States —give them a lead to go back and get the order so they get the profit on the deal compared to the Canadian plan. I do not think we can give you any assurance on that and I do not think it is required. I simply say to you that on all these missions we never ask where the parent is.

If they are good Canadian corporate citizens, as most of the American companies are over here, they go out to work for Canada. They are doing that and especially in the nuclear field, because, as I say, our system is an exclusive system at the present time. They bring back business for their Hamilton plant.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, just to follow up on this—can the Minister tell me where the research centre of Westinghouse—including both the parent in Pittsburgh and the subsidiary in Port Hope is located?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think it is in Pittsburgh that they have a research centre. Whatever research they do here, they do in their plant facilities, I believe, in Hamilton. But they have many departments. For instance, if they are manufacturing light bulbs in Oakville, like maybe General Electric would be, per-

haps their light bulb research may be done there.

On the other hand, I do not think that Westinghouse—to my knowledge—have a research centre anywhere away from their main plant in Hamilton as yet. We are contacting both Westinghouse and GE because one of these days we believe that they would be interested in coming into Sheridan Park and putting a research centre there to use the people who are coming out of our universities. That is what we are trying to encourage them to do, and if you look at the list of people at Sheridan Park, you will find, I think, that 50 per cent of them there now are subsidiaries of American companies.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked that question was that the Minister said that this was a nuclear industry visit aboard and that he invited Canadian Westinghouse Company Ltd. because they were involved in this area in Canada. Then he said, Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly, that we would not have to worry about the subsidiary giving the information back to the parent so that the parent in the U.S. could get the advantage from the Minister's trade mission, because it was about something very particular to Canada, it was having to do with the type of nuclear energy we are developing in Canada.

Then I asked the Minister where the research centre is for this large international company, and then he started talking about them not being out in Sheridan Park yet. That is not the point, Mr. Chairman. The point is this: Does the Minister know, or does he not know, where this international company does its nuclear research? Is that nuclear research done in Pittsburgh, or is it done in Hamilton? If he does not know that, then he should never have invited this company to participate in this sales mission at all.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I disagree with the hon. member completely because Westinghouse do not make a complete nuclear plant. They make pieces and parts; they make some of the motors and equipment, the dynamos and what have you that go into a hydro generating station, and they are quite capable of making pieces and parts for a nuclear package without making a complete plant. So it does not matter to me where there research is done. If they have the knowledge in the Westinghouse plant now that they may have got from the American plant insofar as making their electrical equipment—as you know most of the energy plants are heavy users of big, heavy, electrical equipment—they have had that knowledge and they make whatever part of that equipment they can provide.

It is not unusual to find even some of our Westinghouse and GE plants co-operating with some of our Japanese or British or Swedish officials in supplying, on a combine basis, electrical equipment for jobs all over the world. As far as I am concerned the Westinghouse people are specialists in some of these things, as well as those at General Electric, and if they can manufacture them there with their manufacturing knowledge, it does not matter to me, and it does not matter to anybody, where their research is done. They have already been producing this same kind of equipment for some of our coal burning stations, so to them it is a standard product, it is not a research product.

Mr. T. Reid: Apparently, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has now said that these are standard products, which is again the point which Mr. H. I. Macdonald noted about duplication of American production techniques and output in Canada. Mr. Chairman, since the Minister has said that these are standard products produced by Canadian Westinghouse, what assurance does he have that these exports to Europe, if and when they come, will not be made by the parent company in Pittsburgh—which is making exactly the same type of products, by the Minister's own admission just now? What assurance does the Minister have that the export orders, instead of going into the Canadian subsidiary in Port Hope, will not go to the American parent in Pittsburgh? He has just said that they produce the same thing. They are not unique products, and if so, you just might be encouraging American exports from the parent company, which is, through research, something that does happen.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would not think that there would be much possibility of them taking an order in other country and shipping a part from the United States when they have the facilities here. If the nuclear package is put together here by Atomic Energy of Canada, Westinghouse, GE, and three or four others that are in the field. The package is assembled here before it is shipped to wherever their plant is going to be located.

For instance, I think for the one that we put in Pakistan, most of that equipment was manufactured here, but the Japanese, I also

understand, were partial suppliers of some of the equipment that went into Pakistan. I would have every confidence in the world in Westinghouse or General Electric producing the pieces that they offered to this programme, and they are producing them right here. I do not think for one minute they would be going on our missions and sending the orders to the United States. I am not gullible by any manner of means; it could happen, but I do not think it has.

Mr. T. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Leaving that and turning to another question, in a press release from the Minister's department dated January 27, it states that:

> Ontario's trade crusade programme hit the 500 mark today with the arrival of a nine-member sales mission on its way to the British toy fair at Brighton.

Later on, the press release lists nine of the manufacturers who participated in this particular trade crusade programme, and then the press release states:

> Two other Ontario manufacturers went as far as London with the sales mission. Then began a series of business calls across the United Kingdom on their own. Their companies are London Wineries Ltd., London, Ontario, and Echlin United of Canada Ltd., Rexdale.

My question to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is first of all did he pay the air fares of these companies that went over to England on private business, and got a hitchhike ride with the trade mission?

Hon. Mr. Randall: What we do is we pay the air fare to the mission field, and if they break off at the mission field after our job is done and they go anywhere else, they pay their own expenses. It may be possible that they can come back a different way from which they went and they come back with the same fare; that is fair game as far as I am concerned. But if they break off and make a tour on their own for their own personal interest, they pay their own fare.

For instance, when we took a mission to Russia in 1966, some of those men went to other countries in eastern Europe but they went at their own expense. Their mission as far as we were concerned was completed in Russia, in Moscow, and from there on if they did not come straight home, anywhere else they went they paid their own expenses.

Mr. T. Reid: If I understand the Minister correctly, Mr. Chairman, and he will correct me if I am wrong, for the tour of these two manufacturers, and there are several others like this as the Minister knows, the government paid their air fare from say Toronto to London and then from London to Toronto. If they spent two weeks touring around in the United Kingdom or staying in London, they paid their own expenses, is that correct?

This is what I find a bit worrying. The air fare from Toronto to Lonodon return is the largest part of travelling expenses, so they go with the Minister, they spend a day in London, say, or two days in London with the trade mission and then they spend two weeks touring around England on their own drumming up business, which is good, that is what they should be doing. But why should the taxpayers of this province pay the big portion of their total expenses, which is the cost of getting from Toronto to London, and from London back to Toronto, and the private firms are just paying expenses, such as $5 renting a car and driving around the United Kingdom?

Surely if they are going over there for private business, as well as what I suppose could loosely be called government business, he should split the total bill down the middle which is far better than the government picking up by far the largest portion of the bill, and then these company officials paying from company pockets or from their own for the rest. Surely if they are going over there on private business they do not go over there with you, and if they do not come back with you they should only get perhaps half their air fare paid instead of just subsidizing what amounts to a pleasure trip abroad with a hitch on your trade crusade.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I disagree that these are pleasure trips. These men are too interested in getting business for their companies to go on pleasure trips, I can assure you of that. I have been in areas where the air fare is the least expensive part of the trip. If you have been in London, England, lately and tried to get a hotel room, you had better take the crown jewels with you because I do not think that you can get a hotel room in London for much less than $30 to $35 a day if you can get in. The reverse to what my hon. friend said is true—the air fare to the U.S. is very meagre indeed compared to the cost of meals.

Mr. T. Reid: We are talking about the United Kingdom.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I know, but I am just using another example. You send a mission

to the United States, the air fare is practically nil compared to—

Mr. T. Reid: I am talking about overseas.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I know that you are, but let us talk about both things; let us talk about the United Kingdom—

Mr. T. Reid: My question relates to overseas; that is expensive for government funds.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Of course you can.

Mr. T. Reid: United States trips cost the government less than overseas.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Perhaps the Minister might be permitted to answer?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Of course you can. When you go to the United Kingdom, once you get there I would say in most cases, if a man stays there for two weeks drumming up business, he will spend a lot more than the air fare for hotels and meals, believe me, and other transportation.

Now if a mission was going to the United States, the air fare is minimal, but the hotel accommodation and the meals in the United States would be very expensive for him. On the average, I think that it balances out. I do not have any reason to believe that, if a man goes on a mission, he stays to the end of his ticket tour and keeps calling and getting more business. I hope that he spends as much time as he can at our expense over there, if we are going to commit ourselves to the fare. He is going to take the last hour, if he can, to get orders, and this is what they are doing.

Mr. T. Reid: May I ask the Minister if any of the people who have done this have felt the trade mission before the tour is completed? In other words, did they arrive in London, and then leave before your mission is over, or did they wait until the mission is over?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, they are scheduled —and we have a trade mission leader with them out of our own office and usually the member from the Canadian government trade office is also with us. They stay right to the end of the tour, I can assure you.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, on January 27, when he talked about this trade mission, the Minister said that two other manufacturers went as far as London with the trade mission, presumably, the sales mission continued, but these two fellows got off their hitchhike ride to begin a series of business calls across the United Kingdom on their own.

The Minister just told me just now that these people always stayed with the trade mission, yet on one of his press releases says that a couple of people left the mission.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the hon. member is reading the release as it was meant to read.

The mission was to the United Kingdom and, when the mission was finished, then they went off on their own to make other calls in the rest of Europe. They completed their mission with us, whether it was a week or ten days—as long as they are finished with our mission, then they are at liberty to go anywhere they like.

If they come back to London, then their air fare is paid back to London, and they get the return half of their ticket. Once they leave the mission, they are on their own. But they have completed the mission work and we do not take them unless they do.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I will just read into the record the Minister's own press release, because he said that I was not reading correctly. I was reading directly.

> Two other Ontario manufacturers went as far as London with the sales mission, then began a series of calls across the United Kingdom on their own.

Now perhaps we will have to get further explanation for that.

Mr. Chairman, turning to another aspect of the trade missions, I wonder of the Minister could tell me whether it is the principle of these trade missions to have people to go over who are in a similar field? Toy manufacturers, and so forth. Is this one of the principles of your trade crusade?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do you mean do we take all toy manufacturers? No.

These missions originated with the federal government. They used to take what they called a backplanning mission, such as all chemical manufacturers, or all rubber manufacturers.

We started our trade mission realizing that this was not the kind of mission that we wanted; we wanted order taking missions. So the men who go with us represent different industries. We would not take two toy manufacturers, for instance. We would take maybe a toy manufacturer, a washing machine manufacturer and a building manufacturer. The reason is that we have a better chance of getting business. The second thing is that when the appointments are made, a man will not open his office door and find 15 chemical

manufacturers all standing there looking for an order, or for facts.

That has been very useful, but even the federal government is now breaking up their missions and diversifying the people who go on the missions, similar to what we are doing here in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 405?

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, in a press release regarding the sales mission to Dusseldorf, Germany, about the Hanover fair, one of the companies that was represented at the mission was the Eastern Steel Products Limited, of Preston.

Some hon. members: Oh, no!

Mr. T Reid: Eastern Steel Products is a wholly owned subsidiary of Combined Engineered Products here in Toronto, and Combined Engineered Products Limited of Toronto had a working capital in 1966 of $1,782,419 and a net profit of $1,812,494. I have two questions on this.

Why was the parent company not asked to send a top level official who might have been helpful on this? I can, I admit, see reasons why you would want the Canadian subsidiary of a Canadian parent company to go along.

Second, with an integrated operation like this—with the commercial and industrial complex of Combined Engineered Products of Toronto—surely this is exactly the type of company that you do not need to help? This is a big operation, a big business even, though in this case, I think that it is Canadian-owned, which is good.

I thought that one of the Minister's purposes in the trade crusade was to help the smaller manufacturer who could not help himself, and who did not know enough to go abroad, and so forth. Why is this department helping big industrial complexes like this, with several subsidiaries, good working capital and a good profit rate? Why are we paying their air fare to Europe and back out of taxation dollars?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say that the rule of thumb as far as I am concerned is that I would just as soon leave the company presidents at home and take the hungriest salesmen that they have. If this fellow is out for blood, he wants to make a name for himself, and get the chance to get into the export field. If he gets an order, he gets very enthusiastic and he wants to go back. He will work a lot harder than the president.

I find if you take the presidents along, they meet usually, with the presidents of the other companies and they do not buy or sell each other. When they get back they make a speech to the Rotary club about the trip to Europe or wherever they went at the government's expense—and no orders.

I speak from personal experience, believe me. So we try to get the hungry salesmen of the company to go.

The size of the company and the wealth of the company, as far as this province is concerned, does not dictate the kind of people that we take any more than the EIO programme. We hope that the smaller companies can be helped to participate, so they can grow and expand, but our major objective in taking these people overseas is to see if they can make a contribution to the province of Ontario.

Whether it be a combined enterprise on the part of the company that you are talking about, or any other, the size of the companies, as far as I am concerned, do not have any bearing on whether they should go on a mission. If they are not doing business overseas and we want them to get into that field, perhaps this is a way that we can get them into it.

The mission that you are referring to was to the Hanover fair, where we were interested in getting these people to take a look at the many things that were being shown, to get licence arrangements and, if they could, bring a licence arrangement back here. This is one of the things I thought you pointed out yourself very well the other day, that if we bring back the licence arrangement, that means we are going to provide jobs and income for our people here. Many of these missions are looking for licence arrangements—joint arrangements for manufacturing overseas.

We think some Canadian money could be well invested in Europe today and have some of those dividends flowing back here.

So this is the objective of some of these missions; to keep our eye open for licence agreements. I would say the company you are referring to is one that certainly could present a good front if they want to get a licence agreement from the foreign manufacturer. They have got there wherewithal to produce the product. They can pay their bills and I think they would be more impressed with this kind of representation than they would with some little fellow going over and saying, "Well, I do not have a business now," or, "I have a very limited business

and I would like to manufacture another line of products."

Mr. T. Reid: That is very helpful, Mr. Chairman.

Have any of the larger companies with—you know, large working capital or large profits—ever offered to the Minister's department to pay their own air fare?

I am interested in knowing if any of these top—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sorry, would you repeat that question?

Mr. T. Reid: Have any of these companies, particularly the bigger ones who can very well afford it, ever offered to pay their own air fares and go with the trade mission? If they have offered, could they write you a cheque, instead of using taxpayers' dollars—could they spend their own dollars?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I cannot recall anybody ever going on a mission and sending us back a cheque.

But keep this in mind. If they have an interest in that market and they are successful, they will go back many times on their own. This is one of the things that the mission has done. It has developed a lot of instant international salesmen. People who thought perhaps they could never do any form of business in a foreign market have gone. They find that they can talk the language, they can understand the money and they can get business. When they do, they go back on their own.

Now the first mission they go with us. If they have never been there before, this opens up a whole new avenue to them. But to be honest with you, I do not think anybody ever sent us back a cheque.

Mr. T. Reid: Well it gets me to another point on this, Mr. Chairman. That is, since the Minister has this programme—and it is a helpful programme—and since he also pays their air fare, their transportation costs, he must believe that these firms need this particular incentive to be convinced to go on a sales mission.

Does the Minister really think it is necessary to pay their air fare to get them to participate in one of his sales missions abroad?

I suspect that a lot of these firms would be glad to participate in the Minister's programme. If he is a great salesman, why does he have to pay their fares to make them come? I think he can do it without paying them. That is the point I am really getting to, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not think I can answer for everybody who went on missions. But I do not think a lot of these people would be bothered leaving the job they now have and going overseas for two or three weeks unless this incentive was there to get them to join the mission. It is an invitation on behalf of the government to go and do something for the province of Ontario. This is how we get them interested in the export business.

Now keep in mind that, while that man is away, his salary is being paid by his employer, who is picking up all his other expenses. He certainly does not make any money on the trip, I can assure you. No, I do not think that we would be successful unless we had this kind of incentive programme to take them abroad. I think every other province in Canada, as well as the federal authorities, does exactly the same thing.

I have a note here. It says in many cases they do not understand the money over there. They do not understand the language. In some cases they do not know how they will get along. The CIF arranges for pricing and they have to go there to find out what they can lay their product down for and what the obstacles are.

I think I mentioned just yesterday that one of the last things Mr. Winters did before he left office was to send out 6,000 letters to Canadian manufacturers asking them to report back on why they could not do business in certain countries and what the non-tariff barriers were. I think the easiest way to find out what the difficulties are is to have a man go there and investigate them.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has outlined the purpose of the programme and it is a very worthwhile programme. The specific question I asked him, which he did not answer, was whether he feels that the paying of their air fares is necessary to get them to participate. I agree with the Minister's statement that a lot of these smaller manufacturers in particular just do not understand the markets abroad. Therefore, what he is doing is worthwhile. But that was not the question I asked him. I asked him whether he really felt that he had to pay their air fare—

Mr. Chairman: Well the Minister answered that question specifically. The member is being repetitious. The question was answered.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, if that is the opinion of the Chairman, I leave it. We will just have to check *Hansard*.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to comment on the following statement and apply it perhaps, to next year.

In 1966, I believe the Minister stated that the results of this particular initiative on his part, brought back $12 million worth of sample sales. If company profits are 10 per cent, profits therefore resulting from a trade mission amount to little over $1 million.

Now these are profits to the private sector, to the firms that participated in his sales mission. But the government spent $100,000, I believe, in that year. Therefore, for every $10 profit to the private companies which participated in the missions, for every $10 worth of profit the missions produced, the cost to the government is $1. This is a pretty major subsidy for the conduct of private business. I was wondering if the Minister—this is an argument my leader made last year—would comment on it for the current year.

In other words, when you estimate how much these new sales, these trade missions brought to private companies and when you make an assumption about how much profit they make on those sales, you get a figure. The more successful your missions, of course, the higher the profit. Then you have expenditures to make the programme work, including this transportation cost.

I would like to know if this is still correct: For every dollar that the Minister spends in his programme, it brings back $10 worth of profits for the companies that participate.

Hon. Mr. Randall: All I can suggest to the hon. member in answer to that question is that when we are finished with a mission the men on the mission will give us an affidavit which we have stating what they have sold, what they estimate they are going to selling the coming months. We analyze that. I had it broken down for every year, and we thought that, up to May 31, 1968, we would get an accumulative total of $186,668,000.

Against that, I can only suggest that you look at the exports for last year, which were something like $11 billion—higher than what Mr. Winters anticipated for last year. For Canada as a whole, 78 per cent of all manufactured goods in 1966 came out of the province of Ontario. Last year, 90 per cent of the exports came out of the province of Ontario.

Our unemployment figure at the present time is, I think, 3.1 per cent of the labour force. So, to all intents and purposes, we have full employment.

These are the things that we have to judge our performance on. Now as I have said, as far as trade missions are concerned, Macys do not tell Gimbles and Eatons do not tell Simpsons. A lot of the people who go on missions are in a competitive business and they are not going to come back and tell their competitors what they are doing in other markets. Sometimes they will us, sometimes they will not.

All we know is that they are now exporting out of this province and have enlarged their businesses because they have been able to get foreign business. This is the way we analyze the results of the trade missions. If we did not think they were successful I can assure you I would cut them off tomorrow.

But I think this is one of the most successful programmes this government has ever had. And I think this is confirmed by statements from men like Mr. Winters and Mr. Sharp, who wish that other provinces were doing the same thing, that they would get into the act and send a mission abroad the same as we do, every three or four weeks.

Mr. T. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A final question, Mr. Chairman, on this estimate. A number of Ontario firms participated in a food show sometime in the last couple of months. Versa Foods Services Limited participated in this particular programme of the Minister's department. Mr. Chairman, Versa Foods Services Limited has equity stocks and they are all held by Duplate Canada Limited. I would like to ask the Minister whether Duplate Canada Limited is a subsidiary of a United States parent company?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I cannot tell you that. I will find out.

If you talk about a food show, I think this is one put on by The Department of Agriculture and Food, is it not? You have the information there; I do not have it in front of me.

Mr. T. Reid: No, it says seven Ontario manufacturers took part in the mission sponsored by The Department of Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. Randall: What date was that?

Mr. T. Reid: This is one of the problems I have, because some of the press releases do not have any date.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I will be glad to get the information for you. I do not have it right here and Mr. York does not have that information either, but I will be glad to look it up. I do not know about Duplate, I think it is a subsidiary of an American company, but I am not sure.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, if it is, then all the questions I have been asking you for the last couple of days apply to that too.

Vote 405 agreed to.

On vote 406:

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister two questions and comment on this vote. You are asking for $791,000. How much money do you have available for loans in this department?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The corporation had set up $7 million of capital from The Treasury Department interest free. In other words, they transferred $7 million of their bank account to ODC. It is a wholly owned subsidiary of The Treasury Department, so it is just taking money out of one pocket and putting it in another. There is $10 million which has been allocated for the EIO programme.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman: I think we have established there is $7 million available under this department. The terms of reference are available for sick industry. Is this basically the terms of reference in ODC?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it is to help growth industries to create jobs, stop imports, increase exports; it is really not for sick companies.

Mr. Sargent: My first acquaintance with ODC was back in 1963. We had the honour of having the first loan made; the first loan made by ODC was in the city of Owen Sound. My point here, Mr. Chairman, is that I know from first-hand knowledge that this money is used politically to further the party as a political tool. At the time we received the first loan from ODC, we were happy to get the money. I think there was about $180,000 or so much available to Fairfield in Owen Sound, and, as events proved out, this money was used at the whim of the Minister for political purposes. The reason I am telling you this is to review the situation and how we should use this money for the small industrial people in this province. Fairfield needed help and so Mr. Etchen of his department came up and they gave the first loan to Owen Sound. This was in the spring, I think, of 1963.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the member would answer a question?

Mr. Sargent: I would be glad to.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am just wondering whether this is the fifth or sixth year you have raised this in this House.

Mr. Sargent: That is a good question; I shall raise it for ever and ever and ever.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I want to show for the record, Mr. Chairman, how you people can use public funds for your own gain, and especially in this important department.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I will show you how if you will give me a moment.

Many times I have asked for a review of this situation. And so, on Fairfield Industries, we have the directors now living in Owen Sound, the whole bit—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: This industry did not have a chance, we found out, of ever being successful. And so the directors of the company called a meeting in May, as a matter of record, it is on the record books.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Five times; you are repeating yourself.

Mr. Sargent: You bet your boots. I was mayor of the city at the time. And so they called a meeting of the directors and they said, "We cannot continue to operate this business because it cannot make any money; we will go out of business." And they wanted to close up shop. But about that time, you fellows decided to call an election, in the fall. And so the order came through from Queen's Park to keep that business—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Oh, do not be so silly!

Mr. Sargent: I will stake my seat in this House on these statements, and if anyone will question what I am saying, let him up and say it now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: These are matters of fact, Mr. Chairman, and if anyone is doubting my word, I would like them to stand up right now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: We are talking about maybe $80,000 of expended money that belongs to—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): You have wasted too much time on it.

Mr. Sargent: You are right, John. And so the word came through from Queen's Park to keep the business in operation, and a letter came out on the bulletin board of the company, signed by an official of this company, of the Ontario development corporation, to keep the company running until after the election. Mr. Chairman, against the wishes of the directors of the company who had their own money in the place too, the government continued to supply the money for this operation, and the day after the election, when the Tories lost the seat and I won the seat, everybody got their walking papers and all these people lost their jobs. And this is a matter of record, and I will stake my seat in this House—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: It shows, Mr. Chairman, how some $80,000 of public money—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the reason I am bringing this up is the Minister did not invent this propaganda machine we have here in front of us now; he inherited it from the hon. Mr. Macaulay I imagine. But the fact is that we have this operation here with $7 million available to them to loan out. Last year, with 49 employees, this outfit here loaned out in 12 loans $1.5 million. With 49 people, it cost them about $750,000 to lend $1.5 million.

This is a shocking situation where the smallest finance company in Ontario, with two employees, lends more money than that. But they take 49 employees to lend out 12 loans. My point of bringing this up, Mr. Chairman, is this: Across this province are thousands and thousands of small businesses—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Think tiny, that is the Liberal outlook.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for London South is getting more repulsive every day. There is an area for concern about small businessmen in this province who need help. And the only people who seem to get any help from this department here—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

The member for Grey-Bruce has the floor. Perhaps he could be permitted to proceed.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there is a great need for an awareness in this department for the need of small businessmen to get financial help, to get loans. The only loans that I see going through this department are to friends of the government. Holiday Inn received a multiple loan of about $400,000 or $500,000 up north there. Husky Oil, one of the largest oil operations in western Canada, were partners to a loan through this department, and a very close friend of the government was part of the deal. So, it is only friends of the government who have access to this money. I say this is wrong.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We have no enemies.

Mr. Sargent: You look after your friends too!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: You are the last guys to talk about enemies.

So we have this amount of money of $7 million available and last year they lent about $1.5 million. It took them 49 employees to do it. But I say forget about all this. What we need now is an awareness, Mr. Chairman, to help the small businesses across the province who cannot get financial help from their banks or anyone else. IDB is no good for him. You people, through ODC, are good for your friends and the big business men, now how about something for the small business man?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 406.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, on 406. I want to say something more about the EIO programme and I want to direct the Minister's attention to a question that has been on the order paper for some months—No. 18 standing in my name, which the Minister may feel that he has answered from time to time, but we have never been able to get the facts gathered together. If it had been answered in fact, I am sure it would have been discharged from the order paper. But it asks specifically for the number of grants and the industries

that received the grants and locations of these industries. Nor can I understand why that information has not been made available as an answer in *Hansard* before now. Would the Minister say something about that?

Mr. Chairman: There are numerous private debates taking place in the House and it is difficult to hear. Perhaps we could have a little more attention. Order!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, the information is available for the hon. leader of the Opposition. I do not understand why it has not gone forward. It was given to public accounts last week. The information should be available. I will get it for you. I did not know you had not got it.

Mr. Nixon: Well, the Minister has a very large and able staff, and I would think that one of the things that they would keep an eye on is the order paper. When we ask a question in the House that requires some detailed research, we are usually asked by either the Minister or Mr. Speaker to put it on the order paper. This was put directly on the order paper, and it is not our intention just to let them sit around there. We ask the questions because we want the information.

I must say to the Minister that I was quite surprised that in the six weeks—more than a month at least—that this has been on the order paper, the information was not forthcoming, because it was in response to enquiries that had been made for me.

The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has indicated that the recipients of funds in the EIO programme have in the main, and I believe exclusively, been larger corporate enterprises. Many, with subsidiaries of foreign parent companies, have been persuaded to locate some of their industrial expansion in designated communities because they have received government handouts.

Now this, of course, is a difficult matter for members of this House. We want to see industry moving into these communities, but there seems to be something wrong with the policy which is going to hand out large chunks of public funds to companies like Allied Chemical and Husky Oil and the list which I do not have before me, because the answer on the order paper has not been provided.

We have been able to clip from the newspapers announcements the Minister has made. Now surely he must be a bit sensitive to the fact that public funds are being used to pay the way for these international corporations, with tremendous financial resources. Surely there is a middle reasonable way by which we can have them locate in communities which need industry, which need local employment, so that their own people can have opportunities that we all wish for them and for ourselves without being in a position where the $7 million that is available is going to be used to finance the activities of these international corporations.

I would like the Minister's views on this. Surely he would agree with me that the argument is not entirely one-sided, and for once I would like to hear the third side—the one that he is often talking about.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, first let me say that the 31 loans made to date under EIO, 15 are 100 per cent Canadian owned, 12 are under foreign ownership and 4 are mixed ownership. Now we do not just loan money to wealthy companies. We have many guaranteed loans, which I read out in my statement the other day, and these are loans that the applicant has been able to get in his local bank where the ODC guarantee—

Mr. Nixon: Well, just a point, if you would permit me before you continue. It would help, I think, in the answer. Is it not true that the amount of money you provide in assistance is related to the size of the effort of the company that is going to move into the area? The maximum loan of, I believe, $500,000 has been received—as I look at the list that has since been provided—by companies like Kraft Food and Allied Chemical.

There may be some others, but they are in a position to get the major chunk of the funds available. I see from this list that there are several companies—creameries and so on—most of which are getting smaller sums such as $62,000, $25,000, $76,000.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well of course that is based on the equity they have in the operation. They do not get $500,000 if they are running a creamery and because they make application to EIO. I pointed out the other day that, for instance, Kraft Foods are building a $6.5 million plant in eastern Ontario. They qualified then for the full grant—same as Allied Chemical in Sudbury and Allied Chemical in Belleville. But there are others that range from anywhere from $9,000 to $100,000.

Mr. Sargent: Why did they get a nickel?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well now, you ought to know. You come from Owen Sound where

the federal authorities have a designated area programme. You did not object to them financing Pittsburgh Industries' $20 million plant. You were glad to get it. You are far better off to get a Pittsburgh plate glass plant than one making used bicycle handles which may go bankrupt in a few weeks with a government loan.

I am not trying to be facetious. I hope that the EIO grants will bring in more companies such as the federal authorities are able to bring into your areas—companies like Goodyear Tire and RCA Victor. These are the kind of companies that have staying power. These are the kind of people that will expand and give employment to more people.

Now we have not crossed out anybody with reference to the EIO loan. We passed one—I think it was yesterday—for $9,000, but this is in line with the equity that the company has in the operation itself. As you know, they are in 33⅓ per cent on the first $250,000 of their investment, and 25 per cent on the balance. The more they put in the bigger the loan, so—

Mr. Nixon: Did that $9,000 go to Dunnville?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I think it was Dunnville. Yes, that was the company. There were four passed yesterday, so the size of the company does not necessarily mean they get more money than a smaller one, but they are making a bigger contribution. I think the plant up in Sudbury—the Allied Chemical plant—is almost $9 million. The plant they are putting in Belleville is something like $7.25 million. So they are the kind of operations that we would like to see. That is the sophisticated type of industry we hope that, with the EIO programme, we can attract to the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West was up first.

Mr. Peacock: From the Minister's answer, Mr. Chairman—I know that we discussed this at some length in the debate on The Trade and Development Act, and the EIO portion of it. But, Mr. Chairman, at that time the Minister said he would bring into the House, possibly during the estimates, an answer to a question of mine as to the number of foreign-owned companies and the number of Canadian-owned companies receiving these forgivable loans, or grants as he calls them.

He has answered that in part today. But the remarks I made during that debate on The Trade and Development Act were to the effect that it seemed to me that only these large international corporations such as Allied Chemical, Union Carbide, Holiday Inns, Kraft Foods, could mount the scale of investment required to receive from Ontario development corporation the full grant of $500,000. I want him to tell us, Mr. Chairman, just how many of the 15 Canadian-owned firms received the full $500,000 grant, compared to the number of foreign or mixed ownership firms receiving the $500,000. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, in this formula the Minister has just described, that the Canadian-owned or independent firms have much less chance of participating fully in the programme than the large international corporations that the Minister says he wants to see brought into the province. I think he indicates by his statement that he almost prefers to have them in the province, rather than those smaller-scale firms that are more likely to be owned by Ontario or Canadian residents.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think the member is misinterpreting my remarks. I did not say that at all. I simply said that, as far as we are concerned, the bigger the company, the better for the economy. If a big company happens to be foreign owned, I do not think we should rule them out of the EIO programme. I am having these figures checked. I will tell you how many got the half-million dollars.

I can think of three at the moment—the two Allied Chemical plants and Kraft. They would be American-owned companies, but it does not rule out Canadians who want to build the same kind of an operation. The Canadians can earn half a million dollars, too. But again it bears out what I told the hon. member for Oshawa last night—that the foreign investment in here so far is almost creating two-thirds of the job opportunities in this province.

I do not think we want to rule out the opportunities for jobs just because the company is foreign. It happens that these people are prepared to put up an operation today under the EIO grants. I would hope a lot of Canadian companies would come forward and be encouraged to do exactly the same thing. But the bigger companies over here, particularly in the chemical field—I think you would recognize as well as I do—are foreign owned. How can we convince them, like we convinced Allied Chemical, to put their plant up against the smokestack in Falconbridge and trap those gases that are polluting the air up there, and turn them into a saleable

product? It not only stops air pollution but they have created employment and investment in the Sudbury area.

So our feeling is that we are doing the right thing as far as any company is concerned. I do not believe we have too much concern today about where it is owned, and I do not think we should have, as long as we want industry in here. I still go on the basis that if Canadian companies want to enlarge their operations, if they want to get in the same business, we will finance them on the same basis, and this is open to anybody. We are not drawing a line at whether a company is foreign-owned or whether it is not foreign-owned. In the future, I hope there will be more Canadian companies participating in EIO, but others are not ruled out, I can assure you.

Mr. Peacock: All right, Mr. Chairman, but I would appreciate having the Minister's answer just to see how they are doing under this programme in comparison with the international firms. And the Minister's answer raises another interesting question, particularly in respect of the loans to Allied Chemicals in Sudbury next to Falconbridge. Just how much of the cost of the pollution control facilities Allied Chemical is installing in Falconbridge is accounted for by that $500,000 grant, Mr. Chairman? I think that would be an interesting statistic to find out, just how much the taxpayers of Ontario are directly subsidizing the pollution control devices that company is employing.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am quite sure the member is not going to accept the fact that we think it is a good deal; he is going to take the reverse stand anyway. But I would suggest this is a very sound investment for Sudbury and a very sound investment where these plants are going and creating jobs, and that is my responsibility.

Mr. T. Reid: Did I understand the Minister correctly, Mr. Chairman, when he said that 15 of the firms received these interest-free, possibly forgivable loans were Canadian, 12 were foreign and four were mixed?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, four were of mixed ownership.

Mr. T. Reid: I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, how many of the 12 foreign-owned firms in Canada received two or more grants?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just Allied Chemical received two. They have put in two plants in different parts of the province; if they put in ten plants they would qualify.

Mr. T. Reid: So should I read that there were 13 loans made to 12 foreign companies?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, 12 loans; the two Allied Chemical plants are included in those 12 loans.

Mr. T. Reid: Thank you.

I would like to record, Mr. Chairman, that Matthews Conveyor Company Limited of Port Hope received, I believe, and interest-free, possibly forgivable loan of $193,033. This is a subsidy of Rex Chainbelt Incorporated of Milwaukee. I would like to know if that is one of the ones that the Minister is talking about. Uniroyal is another one. We can trace back its control through Canadian Lastex. The president of Canadian Lastex is also president of Uniroyal, and Canadian Lastex itself is heavily owned by Dunlop of Canada, which in turn is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Dunlop Rubber Company of Great Britain. So when we are talking about foreign ownership, one must be very careful to trace back through interlocking boards and interlocking holding companies.

I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, how many new plants have been located in or near Lindsay, Ontario, in the last two years with the help of funds, loans or grants from the Minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I believe at the moment on the EIO programme there are two. I think Lindsay was designated under the federal designation—I believe in the first federal designation, prior to the one where they designated the Georgian Bay area. But they had other new plants in there without any assistance from us. There are two EIO grants that I know of in Lindsay since we started our programme.

Mr. T. Reid: Those two grants are John Deyell Limited—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes; and Uniroyal.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I just again simply say this: It is very difficult to understand why a company like, say Northern Wood Preservers Ltd. responds to a fairly minor incentive. They got a possibly forgivable loan of about $90,000. This is a wholly owned subsidiary of Northern Tar, Chemical and Wood Ltd. of Port Arthur. The president of Northern Wood Preservers Ltd. is Mr. R. J. Prettie, who is also president of the parent company.

In this complex, the top company. Northern Tar, Chemical and Wood Ltd., had a working capital of 1966 of $1,278,079 and they paid on their preferred stock in 1966 dividends of $1.70. Here is a company that is in a very good position financially—fairly good, in paying out dividends and retaining a lot of its capital for future investment. I am not at all satisfied that this grant was really necessary to get their subsidiary, Northern Wood Preservers Ltd., to locate in Port Arthur.

I know the Minister would have to say he is convinced the loan was necessary, but how can he evaluate this? Does he simply sit down and bargain with them and say, "Well, look, I will give you—how about $40,000?" And they say, "Oh no." Then he comes back next day and says, "well, we will make it $70,000." They say, "well, we are getting interested." He says, "all right, clinch it, $90,000." And they say, "sold!" I can just see him working this way. Is this the way it goes? You have no criteria, you admit it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not understand what the member means by not having any criteria. We established a programme, an EIO programme, the same as the federal authorities established, and it does not matter if it is a British banknote company or Fort Knox that moves into the designated area, if you have a programme, they automatically qualify for whatever that programme will pay them. This is the same as the federal authories' programme. We use a different criteria from the federal authorities, but it is a designated area.

The size of the company and the ownership of the company have nothing to do with whether we bargain to give them $70,000 or $40,000. If we started looking at the balance sheets of some of these companies we would not give them a dime, we would ask them to pay us to go in there. I simply suggest that you have to understand why we have a designated area programme; it is to get industry of any kind to go into an area where we think that it should go—a slow growth area. We are following the same kind of procedure that is followed and was very successful with the federal authorities in their two designated area programmes.

If you want an example of what or why we think that the programme should be used, I could just go back to the case of the Ford Motor Company in St. Thomas. When the company was looking around to locate that plant, there was a toss-up to whether to locate it in the United States or Canada, and the only reasons that we got the plant in Canada were because we can build a plant much faster plus the fact that it was between Detroit and Buffalo, plus the fact that they could send all the cars manufactured in St. Thomas to those two points. In order to get that plant, within ten days we had to make four major decisions on water supply, highways, transportation for employees and the rezoning. If we had not moved in that direction, I am quite sure that there was the possibility that the Americans would have put that new plant in the United States.

We could have said we did not have to do anything down there and let Ford thresh out their problems themselves, but perhaps we would not have got the plant. The same thing applies to the EIO. You referred to Northern Wood Preservers, I have known this company and it has been up there for many years. It is 63 per cent Canadian and 37 per cent foreign owned, and they got $90,000 for expanding their operation. I cannot think of anywhere today where we need expansion more than we need it at the Lakehead. I estimate that this is going to be one of our major problems in the future to keep people employed at the head of the lakes, with its growing population. We are doing everything we can at the head of the lakes.

As you have seen, we have made two or three loans up there to help small people as well as large, and again I go back to the fact that the ownership of the company, the size of their balance sheet, has no bearing on the EIO grants. You cannot say to the Joe Blow Safety Pin Company, "We will give it to you because you are a little fellow with no money," and then turn down Kraft, or Allied Chemical.

This is wrong, you cannot reason this way. You have a programme or you do not have a programme. I might confess to you that some of my own people say, "Is it not embarrassing to give money to a wealthy company?" I think that Allied Chemical had a balance after taxes last year of $74 million. Look at Douglas Aircraft and a few of the others. I think that these are the kind of companies that we want to attract to Canada and particularly to Ontario.

I do not see any harm in using this as a lever to get these companies to locate in the province of Ontario. The overall programme is to get more sophisticated manufacturing into this province—more sophisticated if we

can, but have a continuity of job supply. That is the major factor behind the grant system.

Again, I say to you that I do not look at the size of the company. I hope that it is big and profitable and successful, because that means that they are going to stay here and provide jobs and pour money into the economy, so this is the criterion. We do not just sit down and wave a magic wand over these companies, I assure you. The size of the company and the size of the balance sheet does not enter into the picture, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Minister for stating his position very clearly—the way that he sees the programme and his hopes for it. He has made a very clear statement and I thank him for it.

I do believe, however, that there are programmes—alternatives for present programmes—in the spending of that money to get the same results without also getting increased dependence on foreign subsidiaries in Ontario. But I would like to thank the Minister for stating his position clearly. We can continue this debate over the next few years.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I say this—if anybody in the House has an idea of how we can improve the criteria, we would welcome it. We recognize that it is a difficult thing to accomplish without discriminating against some other municipality, but if anybody has a suggestion to put forward, we would be glad to have it, I can assure you.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, how many consultants do you have in the ODC? What salaries do they get per day?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We do not have any day-to-day consultants, but we do have full-time employees and we pay—32 of the 49 are consultants—people who will go to your town—

Mr. Sargent: These are retired businessmen?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Some of them are. As you know, we started out with a handful of retired businessmen, but it has become a very important department of the government and, particularly, of my department. Now we have to get the kind of people that have the experience to deal with the situations that we find ourselves in. They may not be retired businessmen, but just the best people in the field that we could get on the payroll.

Mr. Sargent: What is the salary range?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is $11,500 to $13,500, which is set by the civil service commission.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): In all of the companies that have been assisted by the Ontario development corporation since its inception, have there been any that have closed up or gone out of business, for any reason at all?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, as the hon. member pointed out this morning, I think that the first five or six were not too happy occasions, and since then I have been accused of being too tough. I can assure you that I have not been too tough.

I think that the last one was an Indian chopping totem poles. We loaned him $5,000 and he disappeared with the axe and the totem pole one night and we have not seen him since. To me that was a loss that perhaps we anticipated, but we have been very successful with the loan programme and the guaranteed loan programme at the banks, because now we have the staff to follow up.

We just do not give the money to these companies and say, "I hope that you are going to be successful." From the day we put the money in our consultants are in there at least once a month, or once a week, and we get their balance, sheets and watch the trends. We are able to guide these people. I mentioned yesterday about the number of people that we interview in depth—the amount of counselling that we do—this is all included in the services.

For instance, if we loan money to a small company, we watch their manufacturing and their accounting and if they need engineering assistance or staff assistance or marketing knowledge, our people are able to do that for them. This is what the 32 people that we have are doing—making sure that our investment is not wasted. As you will remember, most of these people come to us when they have gone through their own money, and figure that they had better go through somebody else's money. But when the taxpayers' is put up, we figure that we should have a back-up staff to protect that investment. That is why we are using our consultants in all these cases where the money is loaned.

I think that the reason for not having had any major losses since a few years ago is because we have had these back-up services.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's thinking seems to be sound, but would he

tell us how many and to what amount of the total is it effective?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think at the last figure which we had there were six companies total since we started in 1963 and a total of about $490,000.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the Minister must have talked over with his people the matter of loans for small businessmen, because we are the only jurisdiction that does not have this. Most states have small business loans legislation and there is a crying need for it.

I would like to get the Minister's slant on this. Is there any chance of getting this in here?

Hon. Mr. Randall: As you know, the federal government runs a small business loan programme. We have—

Mr. Sargent: That is not effective.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Wait a minute.

Our guaranteed loan programme is the same as a small businessman's loan. This is part and parcel of our programme—assisting small businesses, if they do not qualify for EIO. We just put this in this year, but they have been able to get along with loans through their banks which we guarantee. This operates in a similar manner to the small business loans in the United States, and I think that our programme is just as successful as theirs. Nobody who can qualify is turned down.

If a fellow walks off the street and says, "I have got an idea and I want to manufacture; will the government put up the money?" We will take a good look at it and try to find a financial partner. But if he has not got any investment himself, we are not interested. I do not think that even the small business loans in the United States will help him. But if he is in business today and he is operating even partially successfully, we will guarantee him at the bank.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Minister is trying to say, but you must know that there are hundreds of thousands of small businessmen in Ontario who cannot get money from the banks. You walk in there today with a bond and and they will not give you any money; they want you to cash the bond. They have no money to loan, so how does the small businessman operate?

You say that you will guarantee a loan, but the bank still will not give them any money, so there is a lot of double-talk somewhere on the line from Ottawa to here.

There is no way to help the small man in business today. You either have to be a big corporation—you are loaning money here and you have two loans to Union Carbide. They are wholly owned by the United States, and they got two loans from you. Union Carbide, Norfolk-Malone in North Carolina—they are a fully owned United States corporation.

They are getting loans from you, but these wealthy, million-dollar corporations can get all the money they want. A half million dollars from you. Federal moneys—$5 million, Pittsburgh got in Owen Sound from the designated programme of the federal government. Millions of dollars are going to the big companies, but there is no money available for the small businessman.

You say the banks will give it; the banks will not give anything to anybody. There is no money for them to make a loan.

There must be some way. Your portfolio is involved with helping business *per se*. It does not matter whether it is industry or what it is, as long as it employs people and helps the economy. These small businessmen are taxpayers and they keep you going and we have a responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has a responsibility to look after this great segment—hundreds of thousands of people in business in Ontario today cannot get any help from the banks. There is an area here where they have collateral, where they have equity, they have continuity of good credit, and they cannot get money from the banks at all. You should look at it realistically and say, yes or no, we will do something about it. Can I have your answer on this?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not have any figures on what the small business loan people have done in the United States, but since the inception of ODC we have loaned $18.7 million to small business men. We have also loaned them direct—we have guaranteed them at the bank—$5 million and I want to assure my friend that—

Mr. Sargent: In how many years?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Since 1962.

Mr. Sargent: In six years you have loaned—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Just a minute now, I want to point out to you that a lot of these people do not need money; they need advice, they need help, and this is more important to them than money, and there have been dozens and dozens of businesses—

Mr. Sargent: Try to tell a man who cannot pay his payroll that he needs advice. He needs bank credit.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Maybe he cannot pay his payroll because perhaps he should not be in business in the first place, who knows. You do not know and neither do I. I simply say that when they come to us and they have a financial problem we do a number of things. We first of all find out, has the man got a balance sheet? If he puts it together, he can go down to the bank and borrow money on his own. Some of these people do not even know how to make up a balance sheet; believe me, they do not know how to make up a balance sheet. We first of all see what assets they have; we put those assets together for them. If they can borrow money from the bank, which many of them have been able to do—

Mr. Sargent: But they cannot.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Wait a minute, some of them have. The ones that come to us. We do not advertise for everybody to come in to see us if they have money problems, but the programme we are running here we think is just as effective as the small business programme. I do not think any government, even the Canadian government, has enough money to take care of all the little people in business, like the mothers and fathers who want to run businesses. Say I run a small store and I need $500 or $5,000. I do not think that any government could finance these kind of operations.

But anybody in the manufacturing business or the warehousing business or the tourist business, if they come to us and they get a reasonable presentation and they get some assets, we think we can help them, and this is what we are doing. But loaning money is not necessarily the answer to keep these people in business. I tell you from my own experience in 35 years in industry, that in the companies I served with, money was not always the problem. Sometimes this is what gets them into trouble; they have so much money they get too free with it. I never had that privilege; I always worked on bank overdrafts. I let the bank lie awake at night and worry about where the money was coming from, but I can assure you that the people that come to us—

Mr. Sargent: You are out of step today; you do not know what is going on in business today.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh yes, I know what is going on in business, believe me. I am just as well informed as anybody. I do not know anything about your small business loan in the United States; I have not studied it, I do not know whether it is federal, or state. But I do not think anybody in any jurisdiction has a better programme to help small businessmen than we have here, because they have been up here checking our programmes.

Vote 406 agreed to.

On vote 407:

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on vote 407, before I say anything I would like to suggest that maybe we could take the last four votes together; they all concern housing. In fact it would be repetition to take 407 and 409. Are there any objections? Is that satisfactory to the Minister?

Mr. Chairman, these next four estimates are probably the most important four estimates that we have—

Mr. Chairman: Could I get the Minister's concurrence on that?

Mr. Trotter: He just gave it. He just said so.

Mr. Chairman: Is this agreeable to the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, it is agreeable.

Mr. Trotter: Under these particular estimates, Mr. Chairman, one of the most important problems we have in the province of Ontario, and certainly it is a problem throughout the country, is the problem of housing. The Minister has made numerous statements in regard to housing since he has been responsible for these estimates, and to read the history of his estimates and to read his speeches, I must say in all frankness, Mr. Chairman, that there is a bankruptcy of ideas in this department.

Unquestionably the Minister may be a good salesman, but when it comes to housing I feel that he has little or no interest in this problem, and it has certainly become a very major problem in the province of Ontario.

During the last week of May the Minister made a statement in the House—I do not

believe I was present at the time—something to the effect that money would be made available for builders in the building business in order to obtain mortgage money. Just what he meant by that statement and where they are going to get the money he did not explain. In the last remarks he made in his opening address on these estimates, he talked about co-operating with business and seeing to it that they would get the necessary loans.

When I am finished I would like an answer from the Minister in regard to this. I would just like to know where he intends to get the money to encourage builders to build, where the builders can borrow the mortgage funds? For example, Mr. Chairman, in 1966, there was a decline of mortgage loans made by trust companies of 48 per cent; by loan companies of 32 per cent. I think the average decrease in loans to builders in that one year alone was 37 per cent.

I pointed out before that the main reasons for the decrease in loans to builders was because of the mess that Prudential Finance and British Mortgage and Trust got the money market into. The money market was badly hit in 1966 because of these financial difficulties, and it has never recovered.

When the Minister makes these flamboyant statements that they are going to co-operate with business and they are going to see that they get the money, there is just no answer to it. The money at the present time simply is not available on the private market, nor is there sufficient public money made available. The Minister announced as a result of remarks in the Throne Speech that this was a very serious problem and the government was going to do something about it and we would gather that more money was forthcoming. More money from the provincial Treasury was forthcoming—$15 million. Last year the Ontario housing corporation spent, out of the provincial funds, approximately $45 million and now we are told that in these estimates it is going to be $60 million, a $15 million increase. This simply is not nearly enough in order to meet the problem that we are faced with in the province of Ontario.

Again I emphasize, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the members that when we see announcements made by the government—they talk of $400 million being spent in housing—so often the announcements appear as if this government was spending that type of money. Again I emphasize, that if the $400 million is spent, about $340 million of it comes from the federal government and $60 million of it comes from this province. When we consider the assets that are available in this province and the magnitude of the problem of housing, we simply are not beginning to approach the problem and use the approaches that we must use. The Minister is faced with a huge economic and social problem and yet we have heard nothing about land assembly. We have heard nothing about the importance of large government investment in this field and still we have to keep going over and over the sorry example of such an operation as the Malvern project.

We have literally a turnover of a few hundred people a year in Toronto in emergency housing situations. I do not mean just in the regular homes but in the emergency housing situation where people are kept in, what I consider, terrible circumstances. We have these people in Toronto and yet, for years we have land owned by government that has become bogged down in red tape. The Minister, neither through his own department nor any of the other departments in government, has given us any indication that there is going to be any type of uniform building code. We debated this matter in the House and it was tossed out in the private members' hour. It was just tossed out and has gone to sleep.

So nothing concrete is being done by this administration. Again, even the private land developers are still bound up in red tape when they attempt to get the plans registered. The Minister may say this is not under his department but I may point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that this department is responsible for housing. No matter where the problems are it is up to the Minister to find out. I notice they have on the estimates, $100,000 for grants to study housing no matter where or what the problems of housing may be.

The principle behind Ontario housing corporation is good in that there should be an agency of government that is responsible for housing. But my own feeling is that what we need in this province is a housing czar, somebody who will take charge of the situation and will be determined to see that the housing shortage is met.

I think it is a frightening thing—as in the statement made by the Minister yesterday—to say that a large proportion of our middle class are not going to be able to own their own homes unless it is something in the way of row-housing.

When we remember that the major problem in building homes today is the cost of the land, and when we remember we have

literally untold millions of acres of land in this country, it is a ridiculous situation that in Canada, of all places, we cannot make it possible for the vast majority of people to own their own homes.

I just want to give you, Mr. Chairman, an example of how phoney the work of Ontario housing corporation can appear to be in just one example in public housing.

Shortly after Ontario housing corporation was formed, the metropolitan government of Toronto went to the Ontario housing corporatin—some time about February of 1965—and said: "Will you supply us with 4,500 family units in public housing within the next three years?"

Then Metro looked over the situation, came back and said: "Will you supply us with 8,500 units within the next three years"? That was from April 6, 1965. Well, those three years have gone by and on March 7, 1968, Mr. Allen, the Metro chairman, made a very complimentary statement on how Ontario housing corporation had attacked the problem in Metropolitan Toronto and it supplied so many units. It asked for 8,500 units. If you are to look at the statements being made by this Minister and by the Metro chairman, you would think it had been done. My feeling is that the hon. Minister, being a very glib and very able speaker that he is, must have breathed into the Metro chairman, given him a good sales talk and shown him what had been done. And the Metro chairman, who is an experienced politician, got carried away.

But I just want to illustrate, Mr. Chairman, from the facts and from the charts of Ontario housing corporation how, in truth, this corporation is falling down on the job.

For example, we had asked—at least Metro had asked if 8,500 units could be supplied over a three-year period. This is public housing family units. Well, today there are 6,537 such units in Metro Toronto. You might say this is a big gain—although they may not have made it.

But the truth is that, of the 6,537 family public housing units in Metro Toronto today, 5,082 were in existence at the time Ontario housing corporation came on the scene. They have actually built 1,455 public housing units in Metro Toronto—when it was hoped they might build 8,500 three years ago. They have come to about 18 per cent of what was required.

Well now, what are these other 5,082? When Ontario housing came into existence they were already under a federal-provincial plan—2,310 public housing units in Metro Toronto. Then the Ontario housing corporation went out and bought housing that was already in existence like Flemingdon Park. I think that the Ontario housing corporation here has bought a total of 2,772 units.

But when they go out and buy a unit such as Flemingdon Park they are not adding to the housing stock. In fact, they are complicating a situation. They are putting the pressure on the so-called middle class or those who, up to that date, had been able to get a house on their own.

Many people who lived in Flemingdon Park were forced then to move out and to go onto the market and pay high rents. Again the policy of the government has, in effect, made it much more difficult for many people who were able to carry themselves. And it has certainly not added to the public housing stock, except for the 1,455 units.

Looking at this problem, Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand the inadequacy of this particular branch of government in failing to come to grips with this major problem. Nor can I understand the Metropolitan chairman, when he seems to think that Ontario housing corporation is doing a good job, because during the year 1967, the corporation housed 2,025 new tenants in Metropolitan Toronto. Now 2,025 new tenants are not very many when we remember that the waiting list for public housing, as of December 31, 1967—the applicants not just tenants—was 10,247.

There has been some debate, Mr. Chairman, as to whether or not the figures are actually accurate. The hon. member for Windsor West took up this argument and I am not going to repeat it. He pointed out that, after they had gone through the applications, there were still 3,000 and some new ones. And I suggest, having listened to Mr. Robert Bradley's numerous statements on these matters—he, incidentally, is a member of the same party as the hon. Minister—that the active applications on hand are 10,247 as of December 31, 1967.

Well, this corporation was able to place 2,000 tenants and I think it is appalling that government today can take such a lackadaisical attitude toward what is becoming a major social problem.

This is one thing that I want to dwell on, Mr. Chairman—the social aspects of what we are faced with in our housing situation. It is a social aspect because people cannot get housing, decent housing for a reasonable amount of money. The second situation is —what are we creating in our large public housing units as they have been built? How

are we treating our tenants? What type of life are they going to lead? This is a situation we are going to have to live with. Public housing is going to expand at a tremendous rate. I might say in passing, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister uses as a comparison the work done in public housing in the United States, although there are two areas in which we differ from the United States.

He has shown that in recent years our public housing advanced more rapidly than that of the United States. Now I want to emphasize this—the Americans, in their public housing programme run into a great deal of difficulty with their racial strife. There is a serious situation that the Americans have that we do not have.

The second thing is that urbanization in Canada, from the years 1950 on, has increased at 50 per cent faster than the United States. We lagged behind and then suddenly there was, after the war, particularly from the year 1950 on, a sort of urbanization explosion and we have gone on at a rate of 50 per cent faster than the United States.

As a result, our housing problem has become far more serious for the average person. I want to emphasize this. It is the average person, more or less the backbone of our society, that has been caught in the crunch of this housing situation.

When we look at the overall programme and the overall situation, Mr. Chairman, it is becoming a major social problem as well as an economic problem because of this: When central mortgage and housing came into the field it was believed that it could take care of approximately 60 per cent of the population and the other 30 per cent, the top third, could take care of themselves. They could go out and get loans and not have to worry about any government agency of any kind. Central mortgage and housing would take in about 60 per cent, and then you would have that bottom layer, maybe 10 to 15 per cent, that would somehow be dependent on government completely for housing.

But what has happened, and what is going to the very roots of our society and of our standards that we have had in the past, is that today only about 10 to 15 per cent of our people are going to be able to provide for their own housing without any government help—that is, without central mortgage and housing or any other type. So that 10 to 15 per cent are going to be able to help themselves and then central mortgage and housing, instead of looking after maybe from 40 to 60 per cent, in one or another, either through CMHC or through Ontario housing corporation, is going to have to give assistance of some kind to nearly 90 per cent of our population. In that 90 per cent, I include those who get the NHA loans which are quite common and acceptable today. But while I say acceptable, I do not mean by the interest rate—I mean socially. It is not looked down upon as welfare, because of CMHC.

When we look at this tremendous economic change that is taking place it means that government is going to have to vastly change its approach to housing. This Minister, probably by his old business background, just hates to see government involved in housing in any way. This is my impression of the Minister and I regret that he is the Minister in change of housing. Let him do the selling for the government if he wants, but this basic economic policy and social concern is simply being very dangerously neglected by this government. If we continue to lag behind as we have been doing in the past, then the situation will go from crisis to crisis and where it gets into an extreme situation it means that extreme action has to be taken. As I said before, I am one who is opposed to extreme action unless it is absolutely necessary.

Well, Dr. Albert Rose, who is a director of Ontario housing corporation, has said, we have to keep in mind the social consideration of housing. I wish the Minister and the other members of the board of directors of Ontario housing corporation would listen to him more often and read what he has written on the subject, because Ontario housing corporation certainly does not follow the theories and suggestions that he has set out.

I would like to know from the Minister—and no doubt he will be speaking on this a little later—what plans the government has, through Ontario housing corporation, in stepping up what we might call new towns. What are the plans for the necessary transportation that needs to be planned?

I know I was one of those who criticized the federal government when they had the housing conference early this year, wondering what they intended to accomplish. Yet, when you sit down quietly and read some of the briefs presented by the federal spokesmen, they had a number of ideas and have given a number of suggestions and showed that they were willing to help provincial gov-

ernments on a number of items. One of the major ones was transportation, and yet we hear no suggestions from the government at all on what is going to be done; not only in the immediate future but over the long haul, and there are so many things that could be done now.

Be it your zoning bylaws, your building bylaws, your planning for subdivisions, your planning for the Ontario water resources commission, all of these organizations seem to have gone to sleep, and I fear the government feels that by its simple statements, almost by the Minister waving his arm, it can dismiss this very serious matter.

Besides the social consideration of people who are in the middle income group and who cannot buy a home, there are these people, Mr. Chairman, who are already in our public housing developments and who I feel are not given the encouragement they should be given to obtain their own homes. When public housing was first introduced by Ontario housing corporation I think the idea was that this was a stop-gap; that people who went into public housing would be there long enough so that they could save enough money and then go out and buy their own homes and they would not be living all their lives in public housing. I think this is a commendable idea.

There are two things wrong with it. The first is that the cost of housing has become so high that it is impossible to save enough to move out of public housing. The average family in Ontario moves every five years. The average family in the public housing of Ontario housing corporation moves every seven years. So instead of it becoming a temporary place to stay, it is even more permanent than the home that the average citizen goes out and buys. Here again, instead of going forward we are going backwards, and remember that the average tenant, the average family in public housing in Ontario housing corporation units, is going to be there for approximately seven years, and there is a great danger when this happens of public housing becoming ghettos.

For example, I think the goal of Ontario housing corporation is to keep the number of mother-led families down to about 15 per cent of the total number of families that are in a public housing area. Instead of the mother-led families being just 15 per cent of the total, they are about 29 per cent of the total. The mother-led family or single-parent family is unfortunately becoming a large factor in our modern-day society. I think that, of course, some of these single-parent families are led by the father. I believe about 32 per cent of the families in public housing units in Ontario are led by a single parent, mostly the mother, but in some cases, the father. So that this again shows that there is a tendency for public housing to become a ghetto.

One thing that the Ontario housing corporation has managed to live up to is this: They said when they started out they had a policy that they did not want more than 20 per cent of the tenants of the families in public housing to be on welfare, and this I think is correct today—that 20 per cent of our people who are in public housing are on welfare. But bear in mind that in Metropolitan Toronto, coming under the control of Ontario housing corporation as tenants are 32,600 people, over 20,000 of them children. As we have constructed some of these units, they are in effect living in a ghetto, and what we must do, unless we are creating another great social problem, is this.

If we do not develop a greater housing stock, and give these people an opportunity to keep moving, they are going to stay where they are. This has been the tendency, and again I emphasize the average family stays two years longer in public housing than it does in the ordinary market, and this is a great danger. So you have 20,000 children, and there is little in the way of recreation, there is little in the way of, let us say, day nurseries, and these things are important in these large community areas. Our whole system of the way we set the rents is wrong. I think the system of gauging the rent to income was right at one time, but because the economic situation has changed, because the housing situation has changed. It is wrong.

I will give you an example. I know of one man—in this case it was a senior citizens' place—who is 66 years of age, and he had lived in a senior citizens' development for two years. He still had not retired, he had a part-time job; he was given a raise. He makes $6 a month more than he should, under the rates, so he is told to move, and where is he going to move? He is still receiving a very low salary—

Mr. White: You are contradicting yourself now.

Mr. Trotter: It is not a contradiction, because this is the answer.

He is told to move—to keep going. But the problem is, to where is he going to move? There is no place for him to go.

This is why it is a two-pronged situation, and that is why this government has to do far more than it has in increasing the housing stock that is available. If it does not, the people in public housing cannot keep going.

I agree with the policy that the Ontario housing corporation wanted in the first place—and this is for the enlightenment of the member for London South. This is not to keep the people there too long—to give them an opportunity to save money, and then to go forward. But there is no opportunity to save money. As a result, if you have rigid rent control, rigid rental systems, you then have people that are literally thrown out and it is a disadvantage to work. By receiving a raise in pay, they could be forced to move, and then pay a far higher rent than they can really afford.

I know of one case where the teen-age daughter had graduated from high school, and then she got a job. The rent was going to be so high, that it was cheaper for her to move out, and so she left her family. This is the system, and this happened not too long ago.

When men are asked to work overtime, it is often smarter for them to refuse to work overtime. One man told me, he said, "If I work overtime my rent is raised and I actually will end up paying more than what I am going to receive from my employer, and yet if I refuse to work overtime too often my employer might fire me." This rental system today is just outdated. It would not be outdated if there was some place for the tenants to go, but this is the major problem that we have.

There are wives who would like to go to work, but if they work their rent is raised and, because of the market, they find it is just not worthwhile. I say to the Minister that the entire rent situation should be completely overhauled.

I would make this one suggestion, because I know the Minister has a problem. We might say, "Why should people who go into public housing and start to make good money—why should they not move out, because of poorer people waiting?" Even if we charged a higher rent—in some cases when rent is gauged to income it goes as high as 30 per cent of the income—even if they charge 30 per cent and put a certain amount of it aside, so that if the tenant wants to move out and wants to buy, he has had a chance to save the money.

It is wrong for government to develop any scheme that is pie in the sky, or plans to give people something for nothing. The thing to do is to encourage them to save and encourage them to work. Our present policy is now so outdated, that people are encouraged not to work. "Do not work overtime," and often these people who do not work overtime turn the extra work down with regret. They simply look at it from a dollars and cents point of view.

One man I talked to the other day received an increase in his pay, and he ends up having $7 less. Because of the increase in his pay, he was in a new rental bracket, and it turns out he just loses by the time he pays the income tax.

So again, I say to the Minister, why is not something done long before this? He must be aware of these problems, and what is infuriating and so frustrating is that government just will not take the necessary action that seems to be obvious.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that probably there will be other opportunities, before this vote is passed, to say something else.

I just want to give you one final example of the lack of foresight and the stupidity in the way Ontario housing corporation plans its living conditions for the tenants. There are many people who do not want to go into public housing because, in many ways, it has not become socially accepted. Yet many people, because of their finances, take public housing and are glad to get it.

There was one subdivision, called Stapleford Farms where 75 per cent of the people bought their own property. The remaining 25 per cent scattered throughout the subdivision were in public housing, and you did not know who was in public housing or who was strictly on their own. This is the way it should be. But what does Ontario housing corporation do? Everybody that is in a house owned by the corporation—they go and plant a maple leaf flag in front of it, so that the kids in the subdivision know: "My daddy is paying taxes for the guy next door because he is in a house owned by Ontario housing corporation."

So, even when they had a opportunity to get away from this ghetto system, and even when they had a basically good idea—which I would heartily endorse—of mixing the various housing developments together and getting away from this idea of a ghetto, they go and do a stupid thing. This is not too long ago—putting a tree, a particular kind of tree in front of those homes.

Hon. Mr. Randall: May I ask the hon. member a question? Did you say a flag or a tree was planted?

Mr. Trotter: A tree. A maple tree, I believe it was.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You said a flag.

Mr. Trotter: I am sorry, I meant a tree.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I was going to ask if you would give me a picture of that, because I do not think we did that.

Mr. Trotter: No, you planted the tree.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think that is par for the course. In any properties we owned, I think that we would put shrubbery in. We would do all the things we had to, because we have to maintain the grounds.

We do not put it there—

Mr. Trotter: No, they did it in such a way—

Hon. Mr. Randall: —to point these people out as public housing tenants.

Mr. Nixon: But, in fact, that is what happens.

Mr. Trotter: But you planted a tree in front of all the houses owned by Ontario housing corporation. There is a lot of social feeling about this, because then they know which kids live in public housing and which do not. You had an excellent idea to begin with. You bought public housing in an area, but they were not all together. They were spread around. You got away from the idea of a ghetto. But then they send out and they say: "Well, we own 25 per cent of these, so many houses, put a tree in front of each one." They do it the same way and it is always marked. Now this is what has happened.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): That is stretching things pretty far.

Mr. Trotter: It may be. You may think so. But that shows how little you know about the housing problem or you would not make that remark. I think it is time you smartened up on that side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Oh, do not be extravagant!

Mr. Trotter: It is not an extravagant claim. I am telling you—and I have said it before and I say it again—that this is a major crisis in this province because of the lack of energy that you are showing in what policies you do have. There are some policies that have been a step in the right direction, but because they have been such mincing steps, what is happening is that the changes that are taking place are overcoming you. You are not even keeping up with the changes and the demands that are increasing each day. Each week a thousand people come to the city of Toronto, Metropolitan Toronto—to say nothing of the natural growth. For every house we tear down in the city of Toronto, for every twelve we tear down, only one goes up. You are going to ruin some of these large urban areas unless you have some type of planning—and not only the planning, but the vigorous action.

There is no sign of it, no indication of it, from the government. And so, again I repeat, it is not an exaggeration. It is a very major economic and social problem that you have. This Minister has not even begun to even look at it. I do not think he is interested. I do not think he wants to take an interest, and it is about time that the people in this province woke up to the fact of the utterly inadequate leadership we are getting from the present Tory government.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, last evening I spent some time talking about the extent of the housing crisis in terms of numbers needed. Just briefly now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words about Ontario housing corporation's relations with its tenants through its local housing authorities. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that a tenants' revolt is brewing in many projects under management by Ontario housing corporation.

The corporation appears to be as incompetent in discharging its management functions as it is in meeting the housing crisis. Not only do tenants not have any say in the multitude of rules and regulations which govern their daily lives, but they have no right of appeal from the decisions of the officials managing the local projects. The corporation is still using archaic forms of leasing, which reserve all rights to the authority and extend none to the tenants. As a result, tenants tend to feel that they are second-class citizens, and develop no pride in their homes. To overcome their growing sense of frustration, I am proposing the following changes in the corporation's management policies:

1. Tear up the outdated lease forms and draw up new ones which fully protect the rights of both parties.

2. Recognize the rights of tenants to organize themselves into councils, or associations which can, in effect, bargain on behalf of the

tenant over questions such as the fairness of rents, adjustments of rents, evictions, maintenance and the provision of social and recreational facilities. Provide for direct tenant representation on local housing authority boards of directors.

3. Establish an independent housing registry in each major centre to handle the allocation of OHC units according to need, based on a revised point system which is well publicized and understood—not just on suitability which is given so much weight now. Let us end the confidential nature of the handling of applications by the local housing authorities.

4. Set up an appeals procedure for applicants denied accommodation, tenants who are evicted or refused repairs and maintenance to their unit. At the moment, Mr. Chairman, a person can apply to Ontario housing corporation, or one of its local authorities, and have no idea as to why they have had to wait a number of years and find themselves still waiting.

5. Revise the geared-to-income rent scales to ensure that no family pays more than 27 per cent of its income for fully-serviced housing—the same percentage limit applies to carrying charges on NHA loans—or 25 per cent per unit in which tenants pay for services themselves. Take into account the number of children and family circumstances in setting the scales. Establish the ceiling at the economic rent for the project so that families who improve their circumstances are not forced to re-locate. Provide for annual review of the scales.

Now, I just have three or four more points, Mr. Chairman, so I believe I will be concluding in time for private members' hour.

6. Eliminate the prying into tenants' affairs by adjusting rents once a year and basing the adjustment on a simple statement of family income and circumstances, perhaps similar to the one used by the old age pension supplement. It would be subject to spot checks, as is done with income tax returns.

7. Make it possible for tenants in geared-to-income housing to build up a down-payment nest-egg by giving them the option of having a portion of rent increases resulting from improved family earnings credited to a down-payment savings fund.

8. Provide adequate staff for local housing authorities, and set up training courses to ensure that they provide efficient and courteous service to tenants; and I might say to members of the Legislature as well, Mr. Chairman.

9. Recognize that housing is not just bricks and mortar by integrating recreational and social services into the projects, day-care centres for children, counselling services, playgrounds, even swimming pools and gymnasiums in large projects are part of good housing for people.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that not another project should be built by Ontario housing corporation that does not include a day-care facility, and not one already in existence should go longer than can be helped without a day-care facility being attached to it.

When we resume discussions of these estimates, Mr. Chairman, I hope to make some further remarks in support of these proposals.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply reports that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commerical Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in this private members' hour, we will call motion No. 31, on page 6 of the order paper having to do with the voting age for electors.

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 31, by Mr. T. P. Reid:

NOTICE OF MOTION

RESOLUTION:

That in the opinion of this House the voting age for electors in future provincial elections should be lowered to age 18.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I move resolution No. 31 standing in my name.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to introduce the resolution that we lower the voting age in elections to age 18. Perhaps before giving the particular reasons why I would like this particular motion before the House, we should talk for a minute about just what a vote means.

First of all, a vote is the admittance of a person into full citizenship in a democracy. It is the recognition that this person now has

a legal right and has come of age, as it were, in Canadian society. It is a recognition of that person's worth and the possible contribution that he can make to his province and his country.

In proposing this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to lower the voting age and let it go at that. I do not propose this resolution in a vacuum. Concomitant with lowering, or before lowering the voting age, I would like to see an expanded education course in Ontario schools at both the primary and secondary level in Canadian history and civics. To my mind, at the present time, the courses offered are not adequate. They are not covering the subject. They do not impress upon the student in school the privileges that they have as a citizen of Ontario and Canada, and the privileges that they must exercise to maintain our democracy strong and healthy.

I understand from the provincial Department of Education that they are now considering the implementation of such courses in the school curriculum. I believe that at the present moment they have a civics course at the grade 10 level, but I do not believe that this is adequate. I taught high school for two years. For that time I had occasion to teach a Canadian history course and part of that course was what one might call a civics course. I do not believe that to my mind it covered the necessary points, and certainly it had little effect in impressing upon the student his rights and privileges as a Canadian and Ontarian.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a rather large change in the world since 1945. I would just like to give some brief statistics here. In 1945, the formal educational average for a 20-year-old Canadian was eight years; or he had completed public school. In 1966, the average formal education for an average 20-year-old Canadian was 11 years. That is eight years of elementary and three years of high school at that time. This average has been going up gradually, and by the year 1970 the majority of 20-year-olds will have completed a university education, especially under the proposed rules of the Hall report if they are implemented by the government.

I think that it would be in order at this point to take a look at the youth of today, those people who are between the ages of 18 and 21, and see what kind of animal they are. Certainly the most vehement argument against lowering the voting age to 18 is that the students are irresponsible and they are too young, they do not know what they are doing and so on and so forth.

I think that there is a certain validity to that, Mr. Speaker, especially if we focus all the attention on such communities as Yorkville and the hippies that abound therein. If this is the only youth that we are aware of, and this is usually the only activity of youth that is reported at any great length in our media, then certainly I would be reluctant to say, "Lower the voting age to 18." But I suggest to you, sir, that these are not the majority of the youth of today; they are a very small minority.

I would like to make a point concerning them, in any case, in passing. I think that our society today is partly responsible for the hippie movement and Yorkville. The people living there have opted out of this society that exists in Canada today. They have disassociated themselves with the average Canadian life. They have repudiated the values, both social and economic and religious, of the majority of Canadians. But we must ask ourselves this question: "Why have they opted out of society?" Why have they not taken the other option of trying to work within that society to better it?

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons that they have not done so is because they have not been allowed to participate and to be involved in the political process, where albeit no matter how slowly it is done, the necessary changes in our society come about. But so much for the hippies, let us talk about the majority of youth today. Those between the ages of 18 and 21 just a few years ago did not have television, or the supposedly modern educational system that we now have. But people are coming out of our schools with more education, as is shown by the figures that I quoted, more aware both politically and economically about the world around them, due in great part to the use of television in the home and at school.

The student of today is much better educated. I would like to give you an example of my own. At the end of 20 years, I had spent four years at university, I had a bachelor of arts degree, and I had taught school for nearly one year before the age of 21. I feel that at that age, and certainly even a younger age, I was politically aware enough to vote. When I was 18, I had completed two years at university and I think that the students today are much better educated both in academic subjects and certainly politically than those of our predecessors at the same age 10 or 20 years ago.

Just to suggest to you the responsibility and the particiaption of the youth in our democratic process and in the country as a

whole, I would like to quote briefly from an editorial from the Rainy River *Record*, a very good newspaper in my riding. The title is, "Proving their worth." It says:

> Youth of today is out for a good time. Young people do not want to study or work. Some take drugs or take trips with LSD or get into trouble with the law in other ways. These are commonly heard accusations, but sweeping condemnation of this segment of our society is unjust.
>
> Plenty of youngsters are willing, ready and able to do a good turn. The miles-for-millions marches held across Canada early in May proved that point. Thousands of young people, along with adults, took part in the marches, designed to raise money for good causes. And adolescents were prominent among the participants. In many instances it was the adults who dropped out along the way and the youngsters stuck it out to the finish.
>
> There is no denying that some young people are interested only in themselves and feel no responsibility to the society in which they live. It is equally true that in a barrel of apples you may find the odd bad one but that does not mean that they are all no good any more or that all should be blamed for the transgressions of a few. Basically the younger generation today wants worthwhile tasks to perform. Give them a challenge and they will usually measure up to it. Response to the company of young Canadians and the Canadian university services overseas bears this out.
>
> So let us not write today's young people off as irresponsible or no good. Instead, let us see if we cannot find more challenging undertakings for them. We will probably be agreeably surprised at the vigour and effectiveness with which they are tackled.

Mr. Speaker, I want to impress on this assembly that the young people of today between the ages of 18 and 21 are ready to shoulder the political responsibility that this Legislature can hand them by lowering the voting age to 18 years old.

I think the argument that while they are still at school they do not contribute anything to society is a false one and is a sophistic argument based on some of the more, shall we say, vague generalities of the society that we live in. It is quite possible, and in many cases very possible, for a student these days to be still in university at the age of 30 or 31. I have a friend who is taking post-graduate medicine and he has been in school now for some 12 years and he has another eight to go. So to suggest that because he is still supposedly living off society, because he does not contribute anything materially to that society, I think is a false argument. I say again that these people who are 18 years old have finished, for the most part, their last year of high school and are probably entering university, where I believe they are entitled to make a contribution to their society.

In the last few months we have seen a great deal of the political activity of young people for the election. I have a number of newspaper articles here. I will not bother reading them all, but they certainly exclaim or point out the participation of youth in the federal election campaign.

There is an article here in the Toronto *Telegram* entitled: "Where Did You Go—Out, What Did You Do—Politicking." It is aimed at people under 21. There is another article on the other page: "The Kids Take Over In Many Metro Areas." One of the paragraphs in this article states: "And don't let anyone fool you, say the workers and the candidates, these kids know what they are doing."

Just to give you an idea of how ridiculous our system really is with regards to voting age, I would like to tell you that across Canada we have various ages at which people are able to vote. Federally, of course, the voting age is 21—but there seems to be a good indication that this will be lowered.

Alberta, British Columbia and Newfoundland have a 19-year-old voting age and Quebec and Saskatchewan 18. The remaining provinces have a voting age of 21. I would suggest that in this recent leadership campaign, both Liberal and Conservative, a great many young people took part. But it was more than the mini-skirted girls waving placards and pictures of Trudeau or that other banana-eating fellow. A great many of them actually had a vote.

I would like to read from a couple of letters I have on the subject, one from the—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): I will remember you referring to that lobster-eating fellow.

Mr. T. P. Reid: A letter I have from the Liberal federation of Canada says the delegates' exact age was not recorded, but we are able to ascertain from the young Liberals

in Canada approximately one-third of the delegates were under the age of 25.

In effect what this means is that a number of young people under the age of 21 had a vote for the choosing of the Prime Minister of Canada. Those people who went from young Liberal associations or from the executive of senior Liberal federation had a vote the same as anyone over 21. In effect, they voted in an election for a Prime Minister. They voted for Mr. Trudeau or whoever their choice was at that time, but they voted for the Prime Minister. I am sure he is still going to be Prime Minister after June 25 so they, in effect, elected Mr. Trudeau.

This same thing happened at the Progressive Conservative convention. I had a letter also from them—not on such good paper as ours came on. It says: "We do not have a record of the ages of these delegates, so it is impossible to determine the numbers who are under 21. We can only generalize by making a statement that the representation from the youth wings of the party was more than double that of any previous leadership convention."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this underlines the great interest in participation of youth in the political process. The argument is in the last provincial election—the students at university did not vote when we went to all that trouble to make sure that they could have. I would suggest two things to this assembly. One that some of the statistics quoted in the Toronto newspapers were not correct and secondly that it may have been our own fault in that we voted by not voting.

In other words, they did not approve of any of the political parties or the policies that we were putting forward. If that is the case, then that is our fault and not theirs.

I have in my hand here a very interesting document—the report of the Ontario Legislature select committee on youth. Really the only thing one can say about this report is that the people who were involved in it are getting older. I would like to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You have found a way of getting younger?

Mr. T. P. Reid: I would like to read some of it to you, and perhaps you might follow up on some of the recommendations—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Certainly he would not be holding it in his hand.

Mr. T. P. Reid: —contained therein. Perhaps you have not read it. If you have, I would suggest you re-read it—and I recommend pages 294 and 295 to you. It says: "The voting age. Young people at age 18 to 20 today are generally more educated and more knowledgeable than any previous generation at the same age.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would hope so.

Mr. T. P. Reid: One of the great weaknesses noted by the committee in its many contacts with young people was the inability of adults to give youngsters responsibility commensurate with their knowledge and capability. Probably this stems from the unfortunate image that has been created by those few irresponsible, often immature teenagers who all too frequently come to public attention.

Certainly they do not typify nor represent the large numbers of stable and good-living young persons who make up our great body of youth. Many opinions have been expressed regarding the desirability of allowing young people under 21 the right to vote. Would a lower voting age be in keeping with the responsibility that should and could be sustained by young people and help them develop more responsible attitudes towards their community?

It is believed that students at the entrance level of university, or the work force of the province are sufficiently knowledgeable and responsible to intelligently exercise the franchise. Many such persons are married and raising families before they are 21. They pay taxes, fight for their country, drive cars, are treated as adults before the courts and in many other ways are accountable for their actions as adults in our society.

Knowledge of the functions of democratic government and personal responsibility in the democratic process, cannot claim much respect by a group of intelligent young people who have no voice within such a process. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have a great opportunity by lowering the voting age, to harness that energy, that enthusiasm, that idealism, of the young people, so that we will have a healthier democracy. I would like to quote from a statement made by that great Conservative, Premier Manning, in his book:

> The younger generation of Canadians are capable of political thought and action at a level of maturity much higher than that characterizing party politics in this country at the present time. Youth today is quick to detect and is strongly repulsed

> by sham and superficiality. Young people who are looking for purpose, conviction, inspiration, and leadership in matters of private and national concern will not, nor should not, be expected to be satisfied by gimmicks and school slogans, clichés and promises, and slick, shallow promotional campaigns. There will be little room in the Canada of tomorrow for elections without issues, politicians without philosophical standards, parties without relevant policies, or citizenship without definition of purpose—

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that had we had this in the last provincial election we would be sitting over there and that superficial sham government would be sitting over here. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a great many of the comments that we have concerning youth today, the riots in universities, even at high schools, are because the students do not have a voice in the way they are being governed.

They are told they are to enter school in grade 1 at age five and they are constantly told in our schools—and I know because I was a school teacher at one time—you are here, you will do what you are told, we know what is best for you. I suggest that circumstances have changed, the world has changed, the educational system has changed, and that these people deserve a voice in the government and the way they are being governed.

Now I would suggest in closing, Mr. Speaker—I notice my time is running out—two things:

That this resolution to lower the voting age to 18, as suggested in the report of the Ontario Legislature select committee on youth—although I must point out that some of the members were in favour of lowering the age to age 19—but I suggest, as the committee did, that this problem be presented to the select committee on election laws, which I understand will be in session during the summer. I would suggest that this be one of the prime areas of interest for that committee, and I hope that they would see fit to bring in a bill in this House next fall to lower the voting age to 18.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, in rising to enter this debate, I cannot help but be somewhat amused by the fact that this resolution was introduced from the official Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: It has been introduced for four years.

Mr. Deans: Yes, but it seems that you are unable to convince those at the federal level of the need for this sort of thing. In fact, it seems that you are unable to convince anyone else in Canada that adheres to the Liberal policies that lowering the voting age in this country is a desirable and necessary action.

There is no province in Canada under Liberal administration that has lowered the voting age to 18. No province has lowered the voting age to 18 under a Liberal administration, that I can find.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: It is also worthy of note that the leading province—the province that led the way in this social reform—is the province of Saskatchewan, under a CCF-NDP government. It just shows the social progress, the electoral reform, in this country is directed from the left.

It is not my intention to cover the points that were made by the member for Rainy River. He has painted a very accurate picture of the youth of this country and of this province, and I subscribe to the things he said about youth. I believe that they are capable and ready now to assume a rightful position in determining the policies of this province and this country.

I will, for a moment, summarize some of the points that have been made in years gone by, and two or three that were made today, in regard to the matter of having the voting age at 18.

To begin with, the *Labour Gazette* in June of 1968 showed that in Ontario there are 235,000 people in the work force that are under the age of 19. This represents 6.2 per cent of the work force. These people pay taxes, they contribute in great measure to the prosperity of the province, and yet they have no say of any kind in the law making or the legislative processes that take place in this House. This represents a very sizable portion of the people of this province and yet they have no say, and it is of some importance that we recognize this.

Secondly, the Ontario legislative select committee, as the member for Rainy River said, recommended that the voting age be lowered to 19; but the important part is that five members of this committee felt in their wisdom, after studying the matter, that 18 would have been a more appropriate age for voting.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The majority being Liberals, I might add.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, that is very enlightening.

The report points out that in a great many provinces in this country the voting age has been reduced below the 21 age level—in Alberta, Newfoundland and British Columbia, to 19; in Saskatchewan, as I mentioned before, and in Quebec, to 18. Ontario, the province of opportunity and of affluence, decides that 21 is the age that we will have.

It seems that once again, as we have been in many pieces of legislation and debates in this House, we get to the point of saying that again we are at the tail end. We never seem to be leading, we are always dragging our feet along in the changing of the legislation in this country.

The select committee points out that a great many people are married and are raising families, much before the age of 21. Upon getting married, and upon taking on the responsibility of providing for children and providing a home for a wife, surely these people also have acquired sufficient knowledge of the ways of the world in order to be able to cast a sensible ballot at election time? They pay taxes. They fight for this country, whenever it is necessary to do so. They drive automobiles. They are treated in the courts as adults and are, for the most part, accountable for their actions as adults in this country. Yet, between the age of 18 and 21, they are refused the opportunity to have a say in the legislative processes.

I am sure that you will agree that one can hardly claim to have a better understanding, a more full understanding, of the needs of this country because one is 35, or 62, or 98, or 21. It is nothing to do with age; it is to do with maturity.

It has been said in this House, and I agree, that the youth of today is maturing both intellectually and physically much more quickly than their predecessors. Because of this it is necessary to make these changes; it is necessary to recognize this maturity. It is necessary to give them the opportunity to fufill the desire that they have as competent citizens of the province.

But these arguments are arguments we have heard many times. I am sure you have listened to them year after year.

One other area that I feel ought to be taken into consideration—and I say this assuming the end result of this debate will be the lowering of the voting age. We must ensure that within the educational system there is a prescribed and definite plan to educate the children from the early formative years in the affairs of government, and in the affairs of social responsibility in order that, when they get to the age of 18, they not only are desirous of casting a vote but also very, very, aware of everything that is taking place in this province. Not just from a historical point of view, but also from the point of view of what could have been done as opposed to what has been done.

One of the great dilemmas facing us at this time and one of the great problems that has confronted this government at least once in this year and many years gone by has been the student unrest—the uprising students, the demand by students for their right to say something about the processes that they are forced to live within. It is in this area that reducing the voting age could probably best serve the community. If these people who feel they have something to offer to this community—if these people who feel that they have something to offer to the progress of this province—were given the opportunity at election time to voice their opinion as to the right or wrong of the government policies, the chances are that they would not then see the need to conduct the type of unrest, of riot, of student revolt, that we have seen.

If for only this reason you were to reduce the voting age—if it were to be the only reason, in order to give those people who have matured so much more quickly and so much earlier in life, the opportunity to take a meaningful part in the processes of this province then it would be worthwhile.

I do not believe that reducing the voting age will be the cure-all and I do not think anyone else does. We are going to get people in the 18- to 21-year bracket who will cast their ballot just the same as the people in the other age brackets—without giving very much thought to why they are voting and for whom they are voting. Very little will be done to change that unless, as I said before, we initiate into the educational system a proper comprehensive social and political course that will enable those children from the formative years to accumulate the knowledge necessary to cast their ballot with some reasonable assurance that they are familiar with the circumstances and conditions existing in this province, and this country.

But I do believe that when people get to an age when they have the responsibility of adults, they should be given the opportunity to take part in the democratic processes. We, in this party, agree that the voting age should be lowered to 18. We not only agree, we have led the fight in this country to have the voting age lowered to 18, and we would ask, please do not wait until we are the last province in this country. Take some steps now,

reduce the voting age, give these people the opportunity to be meaningful, to be useful in the community. Thank you.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): I rise in support of the general principle embodied in the resolution before the House and moved by the hon. member for Rainy River. I think if the hon. members of this House were to reflect on the story of the fight for women's suffrage in Great Britain, they would find many parallels to the arguments both in favour and in opposition to this proposed resolution today. In 1884, during the debate on the reformed bill in the British Parliament, the all-time-great Liberal, Gladstone, vigorously opposed the bill with his famous pronouncement, "The vessel carried as big a cargo as it could safely carry."

Mr. Speaker, I know there are many who would oppose reducing the voting age on this basic premise of not wanting to rock the boat. The chief argument advanced against women's suffrage, of course, was the premise that the duty of citizenship implies the ability to protect the state in the capacity as soldiers and policewomen. I would, therefore, like to remind the hon. members of this House that at 18 years of age, young men of this province can be called upon to fight for their Queen and country overseas.

The war service of young men in the two great world wars and Korean conflict, together with those serving with our peacekeeping missions abroad in Canadian armed forces, justify the extension of the franchise for our young men and women.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other arguments proposed against the extension of the franchise to women was that it would cause a divided House, and that was something that could never be tolerated at Westminster. Today we often hear of the generation gap. If we are to positively and effectively cope with this problem, it could be aided by having a balanced Legislature of men and women of all ages, just as we have men and women from every walk of life in this House.

I cannot help but feel that this responsibility—for many of the young people today who are registering their views by social protest against various political and moral issues by demonstration and and other activistic means will channel their actions into being responsible political electors and legislators of this country. We in the Progressive Conservative Party well appreciate the support of young people, and for the information of the members of the House I would remind them we have the largest student political movement in Canada, called the Progressive Conservatice students' federation.

I find it almost incredible today that back in 1912, Viscount Helmsey opposed the extension of the franchise to women because of their militant tactics, which had been used in the attempt to force the government of that day to extend the franchise to women. Today, we are probably faced with the opposite situation in that many of our young people are rather complaisant about the extension of the franchise to them.

Surely, the classic example of the contribution of youth to the legislative state is embodied in the famous career of William Pitt, who at the age of 21 was a member of Parliament; at the age of 24 was the Prime Minister of Great Britain. During the 18th century, young men of Great Britain could find an easy admittance into Parliament, but they had to be an aristocrat or plutocrat whose family could afford the purchase of a rotten or pocket borough. Just as in 1867 Lord Derby called upon the House of Commons to take "a leap in the dark," I trust the hon. members of this House will unanimously support the principle of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the recommendation of the report of the Ontario Legislature's select committee on youth, 1967, where, on page 408, recommendation 275, the voting age in Ontario be reduced to 19 years of age. At this age a young man or woman is a major contributor to the retail sales tax and many have commenced to pay income taxes.

While on this particular subject, I will refer the hon. members to a recent article in the *Canadian* magazine supplement of June 8, 1968, which outlines in great depth the billion-dollar teenage retail market. Surely, one of the chief arguments in favour of the extension of the franchise to young people is the fact that by 19 years of age the majority have finished high school and have joined the labour force or they are attending an institution of higher learning.

I would further venture to say that a greater percentage of 19-year-olds of today are better informed and educated than their parents were when they received the franchise at 21 years of age. Thus today and in the future it will be especially the province of the young Canadian to make decisions not only for himself but on behalf of many others. For they, more than any generation

of youth that went before them, are better equipped and, therefore, in a better position to find the right answers.

Several weeks ago, I asked a number of young people in my riding of Hamilton Mountain to express to me their views on the extension of the franchise to young men and women 19 years of age and over, and I would like to share with you a letter that I received from a young lady, 14 years of age and a grade 8 student at George L. Armstrong public school, Hamilton Mountain, dated June 1, 1968. The letter says:

Dear John:

I am in favour of lowering the voting age in provincial elections to 19 years of age, because I feel that the balance of 19-year-olds are ready to choose parties by then. Ontario's young people have much to offer. The 19-year-old today has superior education which the 19-year-olds of 30 years ago did not have the benefit of. As a teacher, you are aware that education today does not consist of academic subjects only. The educators of today try to challenge their students to be citizens of tomorrow.

There are those who will argue against the lowering of the age of voters by saying, "The majority of 19-year-olds do not support the government with taxes; why then should they vote?" My reply to this argument is that the average housewife who is not employed outside the home does not earn money either. Are these people saying then that she should not vote? Teens like myself who have a keen interest in politics are constantly exposed to it via radio, television and newspapers. We are encouraged to be enthusiastic and take part in the various associations for young people. In return, we are frustrated by having to wait until we reach the age of 21 to vote. By this age the interest might burn out.

There are also teenagers who insist on burying their heads in the sand during their teen years and when the first election comes after their 21st birthday they are faced with the dilemma of having to choose, at this age, a political party.

I am saying here that I think Ontario political parties have to reach out and encourage the young voters. We have to get a political grounding sometime; why not get a good start at an earlier age? It is not beyond the comprehension of any 19-year-old, with a sound mind, to understand the workings of the three levels of government. Why not let them vote?

It is simply not my belief that politics is a fad with young people. In fact, I think Ontario's teens have finally awakened and are beginning to observe more than any other generation because of our great freedom. It is true that some 19-year-olds are not ready to vote—but, then again, 21 is no magic number either!

These are my views on lowering the age of voters to 19.

The letter is signed by Marion Nancekivell, 48 Knyvet Avenue, Hamilton, Ontario—and I must say that I thought it was a truly outstanding letter by this young lady.

Mr. Speaker, I have confidence in the young people of our province and I would urge every member of this House to support the extension of the franchise to our citizens to persons 19 years of age and over. We are not going to be taking a leap in dark but rather we are going to let our young people share with us the responsibilities, privileges and rights of a mature citizen in the wonderful province of Ontario. We cannot afford to delay this reform any longer. Let us leave the cave of Adullam! Far from leaping into the dark, Mr. Speaker, we will in fact be bringing some new light to our political process.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, now that the positions of the NDP and the Conservatives have been made clear in support of the resolution of the hon. member for Rainy River, I would think that very little, if anything, stands in the way of this particular amendment to The Election Act of Ontario. We look forward to many changes but this is one that should be achieved with little or no difficulty. I just wish that more colleagues of the member for Hamilton Mountain were present to hear his urgings that the Conservative Party, which has been holding up this development, put away these prejudices and support it wholeheartedly.

It seems strange that we cannot move in the direction of real electoral reform in this province more effectively than we have in the past. I myself have been under the impression that the government's efforts in this regard have been nothing but window-dressing undertaken in the months immediately previous to an election. In fact, we in Ontario are falling behind farther and farther and are the most regressive in our approach to electoral reform, this particular democratic reform, when compared with other provinces.

The hon. member for Wentworth was somewhat critical of the Liberal position in this regard. I guessed he was not aware of the fact that electoral reform has been a very important matter as far as our position in this House is concerned, that John Lesage as Prime Minister of Quebec has undertaken reforms very far-reaching in their implications and importance, and even that great progressive in Newfoundland has undertaken reforms along the lines that have been put forward in this connection.

I have no doubt that the Prime Minister of Canada, when he has an opportunity to bring forward his programme to the new Parliament, will certainly bring forward the reforms of the type that are involved—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Will he reform the Senate too?

Mr. Nixon: —in the bill before us.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): He said "no" last week.

Mr. Nixon: And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions can look forward to his place in the Senate—perhaps in the far distant future—and he can sit there and take part in those debates with all of the deliberations that he gives us here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am glad the hon. leader of the Opposition said "far distant". I am not old enough for the Senate—

Mr. Nixon: But, Mr. Speaker, I know you have not always been so independent of partisanship as you are at this particular time. You have taken part in political campaigns, and I know you would agree with me that one of the most interesting experiences is when you are put up against the young idealistic, inquiring mind from a political platform or elsewhere. And you hear the questions and views of these young people, particularly at the universities, because most of our students, with the exception of the precocious types like the hon. member for Rainy River—most of them are in university after age 18 and not after 16, as was his case.

He has shown his great abilities there as a student and in this House subsequently, and we expect great things from him in the future. But in this particular connection, most of the people affected would be either in the senior grades of secondary schools or at university, and it is here in recent electoral campaigns that I have been most impressed with—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So have I. They know how to vote. They voted for me.

Mr. Nixon: I was waiting for that interjection. I was impressed with their idealism and their incisiveness, the fact they were prepared to approach local politicians and even visiting dignitaries with a certain hard-nosed cynicism that really cut through some of the hash that surrounds campaigns. They are prepared to ask the questions and make the comments that showed they are as interested in the real issues of the day as any other age group in the community—perhaps more so. I have had an opportunity, as has every member of this House, to talk to students. Frankly, in the senior levels of secondary schools, I have been most impressed with the reluctance of these students to agree with my position and our position that they were ready to have the responsibility of the vote.

I have talked to many grade 13 students who have said that they felt they were prepared to wait until they were 21. I thought perhaps this particular approach showed that they were as responsible and ready for having the responsibility perhaps thrust upon them, as were any other group that were finally taken into an enlarged franchise over the years with the historical development that has been put before us by the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we have achieved something this afternoon in getting all-party agreement in the approval for the principle behind this bill. The matter has been researched by the select committee on youth and the agreement in that particular body is available for us in the report.

I hope that this particular change will only be a part of the electoral reform of the law that governs elections in this province before 1971 or when we have the next opportunity to go to the people of the province. There are far-reaching reforms that are obviously required, but the one embodied in this resolution is one of particular importance and concern.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, may I say at the outset that I intend to take my seat so that this House will have an opportunity to move on the resolution put forward by the member for Rainy River, but I do want to make one or two comments in these last few fleeting moments.

I am concerned about a series of events which have taken place over the last number of months which have involved young people and has involved the whole area of politics.

And my feeling has been that we have not really involved the young people, we have used young people. I look back at the last two leadership conventions which have chosen leaders for the two major political parties in this country, and I get the terrible feeling that young people are being hauled in to provide crowds, to provide dancing girls, to provide colour, to provide glamour—to provide all these things.

But they were not being used in order to provide any kind of new dimension. They were not part of the input. I would say that the present campaign of the Prime Minister of Canada, during the last few weeks was the most obvious use or misuse of young people that I have seen in my years in this country.

We want young people who are involved—not young people who are being used in politics. This is why we come forward supporting this particular measure to allow these people to be part of the input.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked about unrest in the universities, and it is the bright young people who are a part of this unrest. I would suggest that, unless young people feel that they are going to be a part of the input, that there is going to be a back-lash—I think you can see the beginning of one when Mr. Trudeau, for example, turns to the young people of Canada and says not to worry about those $10,000 scholarships that we promised a few years ago; "Too bad your parents did not look after you properly."

You know: "The boys with the statistics were wrong. Some of you will not get back. Is that not too bad?" I thought that was one of the most disgraceful things that I have heard a Prime Minister say in the history of this or any political campaign.

Here was a promise that was made to the young people of Canada and has been reneged on and now it is being simply ignored. It is simply an example—the worst example—of the usage of the young people.

If I may suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the recommendations made by the Hall committee a few days ago indicate a new overview of what the role of young people should be in this country of ours, and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this will be a part of our new recognition of the role of young people both in the educational world, as a part of the input there, and also as a part of the political world.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I believe the only question in this whole debate is whether the franchise would be given to the 18-year-olds or the 19-year-olds.

Part of the reason for discriminately lowering the voting age in other provinces of Canada was the Korean war. Veterans came back to this country at 19 and 20 years of age. In the armed forces they had the franchise, and suddenly they found on entering civilian life once again that they were forbidden the privileges.

Also the select committee on election laws which ended in the election of last fall, found that in Quebec, as a result of lowering the voting age the youth voted almost entirely as their elders did—except in and near the city of Montreal, where in the opinion of those involved in the elections it was that they voted differently and they voted for the separatist element in that province. Therefore I view very seriously the recent *Star* article which mentioned that one of our members of this House said that there should be protest and uprising in students.

I also want to say that the university level covers about 15 per cent of our youth in this province, many of the accepted principles of election law reform were accepted by the select committee and the members, and I am sure that if this is reconstituted at the end of this session, Mr. Speaker, we will find much of this work will be reaccepted by the new members of that committee and we will also find that they will do very useful work for the province of Ontario and its people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the question is whether to make it 18 or 19 years of age. I personally have felt that the youth committee report suggesting 19 years of age and its recommendations were based on their studies, although I know that there was some dissention, and that in selecting the age of 19, I believe the fact that the 19-year-olds contributed more in taxes and that there were more 19-year olds in the work force in this province had a great deal to do with that decision.

I believe our youth does have more knowledge of how we are governed. I would like to have seen much more constructive work in the proposals for ETV on how we would portray to the youth of our nation a proper respect for the government by the people, and for the people. I also feel that this is field that we can bring to our youth of tomorrow, through ETV, the ways that we are governed and the interests of this nation, also further their ability to vote at the lower voting age.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): On Monday

we will continue with the estimates of The Department of Trade and Development, and thereafter with The Department of Lands and Forests. I would ask the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, to keep in mind that on Tuesday the afternoon has been set aside for a special debate on one of the motions on the order paper.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion could the Minister give us the following estimates that might be dealt with.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I have given it. Trade and Development currently on, then Lands and Forests and then the Attorney General; and tentatively my own Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 2:00 o'clock, p.m.

No. 121

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, June 17, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 17, 1968

Introducing His Eminence Josyf Cardinal Slipyj, Mr. Yaremko 4523

Content and identification of stuffing in upholstered and stuffed articles upon their manufacture, sale and renovation, bill to control, Mr. Rowntree, first reading 4524

Power Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, first reading 4524

Impaired drivers, bill respecting, Mr. Shulman, first reading 4524

Mr. R. J. Hutcheon, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman 4524

Letters to Ontario jails re visiting MPPs, question to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman 4525

Teachers' superannuation fund contributions, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Shulman 4525

Ontario housing corporation, question to Mr. Randall, Mr. T. Reid 4525

Hall report on education, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. T. Reid 4525

Estimates, Department of Trade and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 4526

Recess, 6 o'clock 4565

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, JUNE 17, 1968

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Again today, we have a good many students visiting the Legislature. In the east gallery, there are those from Briarwood vocational school in Hamilton; and in the west gallery from Dalewood senior public school in St. Catharines. Later this afternoon we will be joined by students from Britt public school in Britt, from the W. J. Baird public school in Blenheim and from Holy Name school in Welland. We are very pleased to see these young people here today.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity of welcoming on behalf of yourself and all members of the Legislature a most distinguished visitor to this House. In Mr. Speaker's gallery we have His Eminence Josyf Cardinal Slipyj. As major archbishop of the Ukrainian Catholics, his eminence the Cardinal can be accepted in a way as the titular head of the World Ukrainian Catholics.

His eminence has begun his visit to his people throughout Canada. Here in the capital city of the province of Ontario, over the weekend, tens of thousands of Canadians of Ukrainian background have had the opportunity of meeting with him.

Mr. Speaker, Canada is a great land. Ontario is a great province. We have welcomed, through the years, men and women from all lands who have come here and have found their freedoms; freedom of assembly, freedom of speech and above all, freedom of worship. To no group has Canada been more bountiful than to those Ukrainians who now for some three-quarters of a century have settled here.

His eminence will travel the length and breadth of this country and he will find men and women of his stock who have found their rightful place in this country. Later on, Mr. Speaker, we will have the opportunity, I hope, of visiting with you in your chambers and just to the right of your doorway, his eminence will see a plaque which was erected back in 1952, in commemoration of the diamond anniversary of the coming to Canada of the first Ukrainian immigrants to this country.

His eminence has had a long career of full devotion to his people, but that life has been marked by the trials and deprivation of prison camps of Siberia. He has come to symbolize, to his people and to men and women about the world, the ideal that in the end, justice and freedom will triumph. We are fortunate indeed that he has been spared to come from Rome to Canada, where he will find a warm welcome on behalf of all citizens.

With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to his eminence those traditional words of welcome which are used on this occasion in the mother tongue of my parents and in his mother tongue—

BITAEMO BAC
BEPXOBHNN APXNEPEЮ!

Mr. Speaker: I am certain that the members of the House are honoured at having his eminence, this world leader, visit with us today. I am sure that he will take away memories of the Ontario Legislature and the members thereof which will indicate to him that our people in Ontario live in one of the finest parts of the world, where freedom of the individual is above all, a most important thing.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have a bill to introduce, of which notice has not been given, but I have spoken to the leaders of the other parties. It has to do with a transfer of certain legislation from The Public Health Act to a separate Act of its own.

UPHOLSTERED AND STUFFED ARTICLES

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to control the content and identification of stuffing in upholstered and stuffed articles upon their manufacture, sale and renovation.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to safeguard the health of the public and to protect the consumer by ensuring that the content of upholstered and stuffed articles is as represented by the manufacturer. For its part, the industry is entitled to the province's protection in the maintenance of truth in the desciption of its products and the elimination of deception and fraud.

The province of Ontario first enacted legislation in this field in 1938. The proposed Act will consist of the legislation presently found in The Public Health Act and the regulations passed thereunder. Administrative, procedural, and penalty sections similar to those existing in The Consumer Protection Act and the other registration statutes administered by The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, have been incorporated into the new Act and this new legislation will come under The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs rather than The Department of Health.

THE POWER COMMISSION ACT

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Power Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, if I might just give a short explanation of the amendment, section 1 of subsection 1. This amendment is intended to clarify the entitlement of members of the commission to participate in the Ontario Hydro pension fund.

Subsection 2: This new clause will authorize the commission, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in council, to make regulations respecting the transfer of pension benefits.

Section 2: The basis of valuation of the type of buildings described is brought into line with current valuation practices.

Section 3 has to do with assessment again and is self explanatory.

Section 4: The amendments are designed to enable the commission to act effectively in emergencies.

IMPAIRED DRIVERS

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting impaired drivers.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill is similar to the law which was passed in England and which has been so successful in cutting the mortality on the English highways and other jurisdictions. But it has one very important added proviso—which is put in to meet the objections of many persons who may object to the accuracy of the breathylizer test—that the driver involved may have the option of either having a breathylizer test, or having his blood or urine tested for alcohol. I would submit, sir, that this will be a very effective bill if, and when, passed.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has two questions from the other day. The Ministers are now here.

Mr. Shulman: I have a question for the Minister of Reform Institutions.

Why has the work of Mr. R. J. Hutcheon, in the rehabilitation of prisoners from Ontario reformatories, been hampered by the department's refusal to allow Mr. Hutcheon to correspond with the inmates?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, on June 10 last, the hon. member asked me a question regarding the instances when individuals are prohibited from writing to inmates. I stated at that time, and I quote:

> This prohibition may be applied from time to time at an institution when it is deemed advisable in the best interests of the inmates, and/or those writing to them, or the security of the institution, and/or the protection of the public.

That is the end of that quote, Mr. Speaker, and the decision with respect to this gentleman was based on these principles.

Mr. Speaker, may I at the same time answer another question asked by the hon. member?

Mr. Shulman: Will he allow a supplementary—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are welcome.

The hon. member asked question No. 674. First, the question:

> Following my complaint that a letter had been sent to Ontario jails instructing that visiting MPPs' conversations be written down and forwarded to the department, was a second letter sent to the same institutions instructing that the first letter be removed from the files and locked away by the local jail governor?

Mr. Speaker, when this matter was raised by the hon. member for High Park during debates on the estimates of my department, I advised him that I had no knowledge of any such letter being sent to the institutions. I have since checked with my senior staff, and I am advised that no such letter had been sent in the first instance; certainly therefore, there was no second letter.

The second part of the question was:

> Will the Minister please rescind the instructions that visiting MPPs' conversations with prisoners be written down and forwarded to the department?

Mr. Speaker, since no letter was sent to the institutions requesting staff to write down conversations of MPPs, there is no such order to be rescinded. In any event, it has been our practice in this department to permit any hon. member of this House to interview an inmate privately, and I am sure many have done so.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education.

Why are teachers who have resigned after ten years of service refused a refund of their contributions to the teachers' superannuation fund, even though the synopsis of The Teachers Superannuation Act and Regulations 1967, as issued by the teachers' superannuation commission, states that such teachers are entitled to a refund of their contributions?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, there has been some question raised with respect to the interpretation of the Act, which can and will be clarified by legislation very shortly. Pending clarification to legislation, applications to the superannuation fund have been held up, and they will be processed once the legislation has been presented and through the House.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister allow a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Am I to understand that this legislation will allow these teachers to get their funds?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough East has questions?

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Development.

Is the Ontario housing corporation involved in any way in a low-rental town house project, between Sylvan Avenue, Lake Ontario, Livingston Road, and Marine Drive in Scarborough?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): No we are not.

Mr. T. Reid: I have a question for the Minister of Education. The question is in three parts.

What is the Minister's estimate of the number of copies of the Hall report on education in Ontario, that will be sold to Ontarians within the next year, at its current price of $9 per copy?

Second, does the Minister believe that his estimate is consistent with the goal of ensuring that the Hall report receives the wide publicity study and discussion that it apparently merits?

Third, what is the Minister's estimate of the number of copies of the Hall report that would be sold to Ontarians within the next year, if its price were changed to $1.95 per copy?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to distribute free to the school boards, to the educational organizations and to the schools a copy of the Hall commission report. We also intend to distribute it as widely as possible and at as reasonable a price possible to other interested members of the public in this province. It is, I think, a shade premature to determine just what the extent of this interest will be, and there has been no determination yet as to what the cost of the publication will be.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask a supplementary question?

I believe the Minister was reported as having said during a press conference, that if the sales of the book at $9—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I never mentioned $9.

Mr. T. Reid: Well, could I make a statement and the Minister could correct me for the record?

Some people have understood the Minister to have said that if the sales of the Hall commission report are substantial at its current price then he might consider lowering the price. I would like the Minister to comment on this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There has been no price set as yet.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 16th order; the House in committee of supply, Mr A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

(Continued)

On vote 407:

Mr. Chairman: I would remind the committee that we are dealing with votes 407, 408, 409 and 410, collectively. The member for Scarborough East.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, in the light of those remarks, I would like to deal specifically with the votes concerning the Ontario student housing corporation, because it has aspects which are different from the normal.

Mr. Chairman: It is quite in order, the member may proceed.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the Ontario student housing corporation. To preface my remarks, I think that it would be helpful to deal with the history of student housing and how it has been financed in Ontario, in order to see the rationale for the establishment of the Ontario student housing corporation and to judge its effectiveness in meeting the needs for student housing in the province. That is to say that it is necessary to give some background on some of the history and on how student housing has been handled to see if the present technique of financing student housing is better than the previous system. In evaluating the OSHC and the money it is scheduled to spend for next year, we should see if it could be better spent in some other way, on different criteria, and so forth.

I would like to take this opportunity to deal with this issue, which I consider to be a very strategic issue in the area of university affairs as well as in the area of providing housing units to students in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, until the late 1950s universities wishing to build halls of residence on campus had to rely on two sources of capital finance: first, gifts or donations from interested parties and alumni; second, capital funds from fees and federal-provincial grants. Since well-established universities such as Toronto, Queens, Western, and so forth, were located in centres of considerable population, the pressures were not too great to construct residences at a very rapid rate. Those that were built from time to time were additions to a paid-up stock, so that the administrative and amortization costs could be spread over the whole operation.

Two other factors assisted the situation at that time. First, residences were quite often financed by denominational bodies such as part of the college structure—for example, Victoria College and Trinity College at the University of Toronto. Second, living in residence was considered a privilege for those who could afford it, rather than a necessity. The idea of "self-amortizing" student housing had not taken root at that time.

In effect, universities were willing to subsidize residences out of both capital and operating budgets even though this usually meant inequitable use of funds between in-residence and commuting students. With the rapid growth in the number of students wishing to go to university in the late 1950s and 1960s—as the Minister has so often reminded us—the number of universities has more than doubled from six, in 1955, to 14 in 1965.

Some of the new institutions were already existing and were upgraded to degree-granting status—for example, Guelph. But many of them were entirely new, and did not have recourse to either paid-up existing facilities, or to alumni—for example, Waterloo and York Universities. To compound the problem, some of these new universities were located outside centres of population, and did not have recourse either to a commuting population of any size or to digs or boarding situations off campus—for example, Trent, Laurentian and, to a certain extent, Brock University, and the Lakehead University.

For most of the new institutions, housing took on a role of special importance, since, if they were to grow as planned, and serve the whole province or at least their own areas, they would have to provide housing for a higher proportion of their students than the older campuses had. Since this situation

affected institutions across the country, Mr. Chairman, the federal government was urged to take action by representative bodies such as the then Canadian universities foundation and the national conference of Canadian universities. The result was that in 1961 The National Housing Act, controlling central mortgage and housing corporation, was changed, to allow that body to make low-interest long-term loans to universities for the express purpose of building student residences.

The terms were generous and practical. CMHC would provide 90 per cent of the capital cost of residences to a maximum loan of $7,000 per bed on a 50-year basis at an interest rate at that time of 5⅜ per cent. Mr. Chairman, this interest rate has of course risen and is presently at, I believe, 6⅞ per cent.

The universities would provide the remaining 10 per cent or, if the per bed cost rose above $7,770, the capital over and above $7,000 necessary to build the student housing they wanted. Very little control was exercised by CMHC in the operation of this scheme. Of course, designs and working drawings were checked to ensure that they complied with health, fire and building codes and in some cases where plans were noticeably deficient in one way or another, CMHC would advise the institutions applying for loans of the changes that should be made. But, Mr. Chairman, in all cases the automony of the university in deciding what kind of housing best suited its needs and the needs of students was respected. Universities were free to employ their own architects, and to retain full design and operational control of their own projects.

The popularity of this scheme can be seen when one realizes that, in the first four years of its operation, some 94 separate student housing projects were financed at a cost of $139 million across the country. Many of these, of course, were in the province of Ontario.

In 1954 alone, Mr. Chairman, seven new projects and one conversion of an existing building were financed in Ontario at a total cost of $18,369,000. This represented, in that year, additional housing in Ontario universities of 2,500 beds. These statistics are in the CMHC publication of 1964, page 56.

The scheme was effective and popular with the universities and, indeed, is still in wide use in eight of the ten provinces across the country but not, as we shall see, in Ontario.

Late in 1964, the Ontario government announced the establishment of a new provincial scheme for the financing of student housing on campuses in Ontario. The government at that time stated as its main reason for its action the fact that they were concerned that universities in this province were borrowing too heavily to build student housing, and that students were suffering due to the high residence fees necessary to amortize loans representing 90 per cent of the capital cost of student housing construction.

In addition, they felt that universities were not facing up to their responsibilities in constructing residences; that they were building too few resident places at too high a bed cost; and, in many cases, that they were still subsidizing housing out of general funds to the detriment of other academic necessities and to the detriment of the welfare of commuters.

The rationale of this scheme of the Ontario government in 1964 seemed impeccable, and the scheme devised was ingenious. It was to be administered by the provincial Department of University Affairs, which was also created in 1964, and the basic characteristics of the plan were these:

The province would give a per bed grant of $1,400, which represented 20 per cent of a total per bed cost of $7,000, provided the university concerned matched that with an equal contribution of $1,400, again coming to 20 per cent of $7,000, and that the university did not borrow more than $4,200, which represented 60 per cent of the $7,000 per bed cost.

Mr. Chairman, the scheme had built-in incentives to encourage universities to build cheaper student housing. If the university could manage to lower the per bed cost below $7,000 the provincial grant did not reduce, but remained at $1,400. This meant, in effect, that if—and it was a big "if"—if the university could manage to design housing for students for a total per bed cost of $3,500, for example, the grant would represent 40 per cent of the cost. The remaining 60 per cent could be borrowed and the university would not have to contribute at all.

Mr. Chairman, with the introduction of the so-called Department of University Affairs, or what I will call the DUA scheme, a number of realities became immediately apparent. First, that the scheme was devised by a provincial government worried about federal intervention in education. This became apparent when a major Ontario university made representation to CMHC in early 1965 and were told by the officials of

CMHC that universities in Ontario could not use the original CMHC scheme without first obtaining approval from the province—that is, The Department of University Affairs—and that this was not forthcoming. In effect, Mr. Chairman, the provincial scheme had replaced the earlier and obviously popular schedule scheme. For universities in Ontario, it was not an alternative at all but a replacement. Along with this came the realization that the province had used the $7,000 CMHC maximum loan of 1961, that maximum loan figure which represented only 90 per cent of a possible $7,770 total cost as a simple maxim, thereby taking the top end of what was previously possible.

Second, that if universities would build the kind of student housing they considered suitable for their campuses, it would be most certainly in the $7,000 per bed cost range and they would be expected to raise 20 per cent of the capital cost rather than the earlier 10 per cent under the CMHC scheme. Where 10 per cent was difficult earlier, 20 per cent became simply impossible for universities desperately short of capital funds anyway. In effect, the only universities capable of using the scheme were those well established institutions with generous benefactors, endowments and fund raising possibilities. The newer institutions in greater need of student housing were being forced either to build inferior or inadequate facilities, or to dip into their sorely needed general capital funds or not build at all.

Third, that the province was not at all concerned with the value of student housing as a legitimate and important element in the learning/living process, nor for the variety of types of housing suited to the various needs of a very diversed group of institutions with a healthy diversity of housing philosophies.

In one short year of operation of this new scheme—notable principally for the rising clamour from universities in dire need of realistic assistance in their housing needs, and noted for the marked reduction in the student housing projects undertaken—with this in mind, it became apparent that the scheme simply was not going to work and that something had to be done if a major breakdown between universities and the province was to be adverted. So the province did take action.

At the request of The Department of University Affairs, the Ontario housing corporation was brought into the picture. Their solution to the difficulty was simple. They would deal with student housing in the same way that they dealt with the provision of housing units of other kinds. They would undertake to work with universities using what is known as the developer proposal call system, and for this purpose the Ontario student housing corporation was established as an arm of the Ontario housing corporation.

The method of financing to be used is simple. The Ontario student housing corporation, would in effect, revert to the use of CMHC funds for 90 per cent of the per bed cost of student housing, and the province would provide the additional 10 per cent to the earlier 1961 maximum cost of $7,770 per bed.

In other words, for the first time, universities were being offered 100 per cent financing for residences, a seemingly generous and unbeatable offer. Of course, this time around, Mr. Chairman, the provincial government were careful not to mention their previous concern for the student and his rising residence fees because it was not 60 per cent of the cost of student housing which had to be amortized but a full 100 per cent and this had to be paid for through student fees.

They made it known instead that they were deeply concerned about the need for the residence places, and that this would be the only effective way of keeping supply up with the demand.

It took almost no time on this occasion for intelligent university administrators to realize that they were being forced to pay a fantastic price if they were to use the Ontario student housing corporation scheme. In return for 100 per cent financing, they would first have to accept the fact that they were to relinquish virtually all design control over projects to be built on their campuses—since they would not even know who the architect was to be for their project, let alone discuss their requirements with him and reach a creative and responsible solution.

Second, the universities had to accept the inevitability of agreeing to the results of a competition among developers in which cost would be the overriding factor in the choice of a winner.

Third, the universities would be subject to the financial and supervisory control at all stages of construction by the OSHC. And fourth, and most important, the universities would have to live with the results of the kind of design and workmanship that the less reputable apartment developers would

be capable of, and their captive architects, since these would be the kind of people who would succeed in the proposal call conditions.

It was entirely incomprehensible to some that the kind of building—cheaper apartments—thrown up to be amortised for a quick profit over ten to 12 years, should be forced upon the universities, who would be paying for them for 50 years and would probably use them for longer. Maintenance costs on good quality buildings are bad enough in our universities, but on poorly constructed buildings, they are crippling within a very short time of completion.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to note that the decisions of the Ontario student housing corporation accepting projects of apartment builders with their captive architects, will have a direct effect on the estimates of The Department of University Affairs over the next decade. I will just note that. Because of the cheap buildings, the costs of operating grants to the universities in the years ahead as they appear in the budget of The Department of University Affairs, will be astronomical. There is lack of co-ordination here, to make the point simple.

The immediately evident problems of planning control, design control, quality control, and of maintenance costs were bad enough, not to mention the end cost to students in money and welfare, but the few universities that heaved a sigh of resignation and set about to use the system as best they could were staggered to find out that their efforts were not only unwelcome, but ignored. It became apparent to a few universities that their only real avenue to some control under these conditions was to prepare the original proposal call document so carefully that the worst of the submissions would not be admissible.

This meant that the documentation, including well-defined perimeters, and social content, design content, educational content, and performance and material specifications, was necessary. To prepare such a document, at least one university, the University of Toronto, went to considerable expense in employing the best consultant assistance possible, only to find that the OSHC refused to use the data, since such well defined requirements virtually prohibited developers from using their normal price-cutting and corner-cutting methods for so-called economy.

For those universities conscious of the tremendously important role that student housing must play in the total scope of the educational process, the prospects are today very bleak indeed. They must either accept virtually 100 per cent government control, which comes with 100 per cent financing, knowing that the control of the provincial government is brought about by a provincial government contribution of a meagre 10 per cent of the actual capital, or not built at all.

Many of these universities must be looking wistfully at the days when they had access to federal moneys on generous terms, which carried a minimum of control and recognized the independence and autonomy of the university. No doubt if the provincial government understood its role in this matter, in the same way as does CMHC, it would revert to the more valid role of a true money lender only, trusting that the universities would be responsible enough to use the money wisely and to undertake the loan repayment necessary. One hundred per cent financing of this kind would be simple to administer and would prove a boon rather than a bane to the universities in the province.

The sad thing, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, is that a creative and successful solution is near at hand. Responsible members of both the architectural and contracting professions and university administrators have made it abundantly clear that the valid cost controls sought by the government are available under various forms of negotiated contract, in which the university concerned would benefit by being able to select not only its preferred architect, but its whole construction team.

The knowledge and know-how of contractors and developers would be put to truly creative use and the whole university environment would benefit. It seems that the present government is bent on strong-armed face-saving tactics to cover an inept and badly managed background in the whole field of student housing. In a few short and critical years, our universities will begin to pay the staggering price of imposed poor quality and meddling, and The Department of University Affairs will have to dig deeped into the public purse to pay for the high maintenance costs of ill-conceived and low-quality student residences in this province.

Mr. Chairman, I could ask the Minister some specific questions, but I was wondering first of all whether he has any general comments to make?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): I certainly have. First of all let me make it perfectly clear to both you

and the other members of the House that the universities are still free to go to CMHC and build on their own; they do not have to come to OSHC, they can still borrow direct if they wish. But they came to The Department of Education and said, "We are in difficulty. With the influx of students, we need beds and we need them in a hurry, can the OSHC help us out?" That is how we got into building student beds.

Now we also say to you that the universities do not have to take the designs that we offer. They sit down with us, and are involved in all the designs. They tell us their basic needs and requirements and then we design to those needs. So they do have a say in what we are doing with these buildings. We are in complete consultation with the universities at all times before these buildings get under way. The universities themselves, as I have suggested, can get direct loans from CMHC if they wish; they can build on their own, and they can design their own buildings; it is entirely up to them.

The provincial scheme has not replaced any other schemes that they had; it has merely supplemented what they have been doing in the past. If a request is made for student housing by the university, the housing corporation sits down with them, as we did with Guelph, London, the University of Toronto, and others. We ask them what their needs are, and we bring in some of the designs and show them what we suggest they can get for the money. That is when we go ahead with the proposition. The cost is not the factor in builder proposals. The factors are excellence of design, and quality. I do not for one moment think that you would say in this House that people like Ellis Don are not competent builders, or some of the architects used are not competent. We use the best in the business; very qualified people. To suggest even for one moment that these people are incompetent is incorrect. We use reputable builders and architects.

As far as the design and quality are concerned, I would be inclined to stack up what has been done in student housing today, with anything that they have done in the past. As you yourself pointed out, cost is about $7,770 per student bed. With the savings that we have been able to make by using the builder proposal which is acceptable to the university, we are asking $5,000 per bed, and the universities in turn have more money to put into academic facilities, which is what they wanted. If they are in the dormitory business, they cannot be in the academic field, I think, with the kind of funds that they require. So they have asked this government, through The Department of Education, to take that part of the load off their shoulders.

We have been able to do that, and I think the savings that we have made to date on student housing indicate that we are moving in the right direction if we are going to house all this influx of students coming into our universities. We have not yet built any single student housing off campus—it is all on campus. The married student housing is the first development down here at Charles Street, which you see going up. I do not think you will find a finer building anywhere than we are building down here on Charles Street. So I cannot accept the fact that the universities are unhappy with the Ontario student housing programme. In fact I think it is to the contrary, I think they are very happy so far, and if you have evidence of anybody who is unhappy with what we are doing I hope they will come and tell us about it, but so far we have not had a complaint.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, we will no doubt be getting into this in greater detail in the months ahead. I do have some specific questions for the Minister on this subject.

Could the Minister give me some idea of what types of facilities are not allowed in student residences? Just let me give the Minister a synopsis of the problem. On the university campus, the residence must be considered part of the educational and learning environment for the university. In some universities, and my colleague from Peterborough (Mr. Pitman) probably knows this much better than I do, there is a definite philosophy of education tied with residence, tied with the living accommodation within the university.

For example, in some universities the student, particularly one who has been working with the university planning boards on helping to say what should be in the residences, has said that things like common rooms should be in; perhaps even a dining room might form part of the residence as opposed to part of another building. Some of the student union facilities might be in the building that you call a residence. In some campuses we call them colleges, of which a residence is an integral part, instead of an apartment building shoved on to the academic building, or even the student union building.

So one of the points that I have here is that, given a philosophy of student living

within a university attached to the academic learning, where the philosophy of learning says that the common room should be there, there might even be some offices there for some members of the faculty, there might be some student union facilities—even the dining halls might be integrated within a so-called residence building.

Now, could the Minister tell me how this is worked out within the view that the Ontario student housing corporation simply builds an apartment building for students to live in? They go there and sleep, and then they go back to the university—even though it is the ground of the same environment. In other words, Mr. Chairman, what does the Minister responsible for the Ontario student housing corporation exclude from his definition of housing?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We do not know of anywhere we have excluded anything—common rooms, dining rooms, the don's room, offices, TV recreation rooms. They are all included in this project of ours, and they are all approved by central mortgage and housing corporation as well as by ourselves. There are not any areas that we know of that have been excluded, unless the universities have adequate facilities when they join these buildings and say they do not require them, but ask for more student accommodation. I do not know, I do not think we have had any of those to date. They have all had this accommodation built in.

Mr. T. Reid: This is getting to the real crux of this issue. Obviously a residence plan includes more than simply rooms with beds and perhaps a desk in the room. If it includes fairly good don suites, if it includes common rooms and so forth, the cost per bed is going to go up from what it would be it if was stripped right down and became, in a sense, a dormitory. The costs go up when you put other things in it.

The thing that I have never been able to sort out is the relationship of an Ontario student housing corporation and The Department of University Affairs—or as the Minister would say, the advisory committee to the department—when a university includes facilities which are also eligible to be financed from the capital fund on the advice of the Minister, or the advisory committee to the Minister.

In other words, if one university puts a small library reading room into the residence and comes to you with a higher per-bed cost because it put in the small reading library in the residence, does the Ontario student housing corporation then go to the Minister of University Affairs and say: "Look, this university has the philosophy of a residence as a learning environment and wants to put a small study library right in the residence. Will you make a grant directly to the Ontario student housing corporation so that we can knock that part out of their plan in estimating the per bed cost, because it is really a substitute for something they would come to you for in one of the capital projects?"

Let us talk about that one example, because it is a transferable resource and the only question is where do you put it—in the academic building or the residence? Surely there must be enough flexibility, there must be enough co-operation between two bureaucracies of government to ensure that something which does not add up to more total government money is not restricted because of lack of consultation and communication between the Ontario student housing corporation and the people in The Department of University Affairs responsible for capital grants for academic buildings.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think you have to request, as I have said earlier, the $5,000 which covers all the facilities I talked about, including the furniture. The university affairs people sit in at these meetings with us and if some university wants a special library, then University Affairs will grant that direct. After the building has been amortized it will probably belong to the university anyway. So it does not matter to them, I suppose, whether the special library is in the building where the dormitories are or whether they are in a building across the street. But as far as the central mortgage and housing and Ontario housing corporation are concerned, we build all the living facilities. Any specials are granted by University Affairs, and on the university side, where it once had special facilities. Does that answer your question?

Mr. T. Reid: Yes. One final point on this, it is on the same wrap-up.

Mr. Chairman: One more question? The member for Wentworth was up but if he will yield the floor it is quite all right.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, the next question is a fairly blunt one and I will make the blunt statement first. Are the activities of the Ontario student housing corporation illegal in the sense that they contravene RSO volume 1, 1960, The Act respecting architects in Ontario? Now, the reason I state this is

that the developer call system means that the developer gets an architect and it might be someone in his back room. But he is an architect in the profession, covered by the law of this province relating to the architectural profession. I have here, Mr. Chairman, a press release of the Ontario association of architects dated March 8, 1968, and they are very concerned that under this system set out by the Ontario student housing corporation, the developer call system, that the architects who work with the developers do not get paid fees required under the legislation of this province.

They have not come out that bluntly and said so, but I gather that the architects working with developers who submit plans to Ontario student housing corporation are not paying the fees set by the association of architects which is operating under a law of this province. If they are not being paid fees, then the Ontario student housing corporation should not accept plans from apartment builders in particular, who are not paying architects the fees. This is what is called the "captive architect" of the developer. I was wondering if the Minister could comment on this?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I recognize there has been some concern on the part of the architectural profession. They would like to be able to be the only tenderers on a building, whether it be university or even public housing, and then they will likely go out and tender for contractors. We have gone through that bit to the point where we find now that most of the major contractors have architects on their own staff. They are quite free to go and hire architects—and these are professional men. If they work for a lower fee than the association is referring, I think—and my people think—that it is up to the association to police their own fees.

We do not think it is up to us. We put the job out for tender whether it be a university building, or whether it be public housing. The architectural profession is upset about it, I agree with you; they have been in to see me. They want to know why we cannot go through the architects and then to the developer and builder. But I would suggest to you to look at Ottawa, where they are building that downtown court—those three or four major buildings down there. There is a developer with his own architectural staff.

He does not use outside architects and the buildings are erected there for, in some cases they tell me, $10 per square foot less. The architectural professional system claims that maybe you do not get as good a building. All I suggest to them is that these buildings are laid down in the specifications. They have to meet the rigid specifications of not only ourselves, but central mortgage and housing corporation, and the universities. I am quite sure that the value of those buildings is not any less because we do not use an architectural association.

They do have professional architects on the staffs of most of these big construction companies. I would not say that the day of specialization has gone, because we are getting into specialization in more areas than one. But in this instance, I think the cost indicates that the job is done faster, and that we are getting good value for the dollars spent. I do not think we are in any way contravening the Act insofar as architectural fees are concerned.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I have some questions regarding the home ownership made easy plan. Some of them are related and some are not related, so I will ask them one by one if you do not mind.

First of all, when will the lots be available on Hamilton Mountain that are supposed to be coming out this year under the home onwnership made easy plan?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is anticipated the first will be this fall. The hon. member is not referring to Saltfleet, he is referring to the other part?

Mr. Deans: No, I am referring to the Hamilton—

Hon. Mr. Randall: This fall.

Mr. Deans: This fall. On what basis will they be sold? Will there be a predetermined price, and they will be sold at that price, first come first served?

Is there a waiting list now for the people who want them, or is it going to be on a bid basis? How are you going to sell these lots?

Hon. Mr. Randall: They are primarily leasehold, and they will be advertised. It is first come, first served. That is the same basis we have always used under the HOME programme.

Mr. Deans: And it will be first come, first served after the advertisement?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, on the day.

Mr. Deans: After the advertisement or can people be applying for them now?

Hon. Mr. Randall: On the day that the lots are called for sale.

Mr. Deans: Now, as to the houses that were built under the public housing on Hamilton Mountain—and I can name one of the streets; I cannot find out the name of the survey, but the street was Thorley, it runs off Upper Gage Avenue and you may be able to find it on one of your maps. I do not know exactly but they were built toward the end of last year, last fall.

At the time that the people moved in there, they were led to believe that there was the possibility of them being able to purchase these homes. Is this a real possibility?

Hon. Mr. Randall: These are the ones that are built on the 90-10 basis that we talked about earlier. They will be sold just as soon as The National Housing Act is changed. It was in the process of being changed when they called the election. It is my understanding they are still going to go ahead and change the Act. We were talking to Mr. Hignett, president of central mortgage and housing, not less than two weeks ago, and this is first on the agenda, so that whatever government is returned, the housing Act will be changed I presume it will be Mr. Stanfield who will change it.

Mr. Deans: Well, I think you are making a false presumption, but it is entirely up to you to presume whatever you like.

Now, the price. Will these be sold for the original building price, or are they going to be sold in accordance with the inflated prices of today?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, these will be sold at market prices. The house will be estimated as we are estimating the cost of these houses in all areas. They will be sold at the market price of today.

Mr. Deans: Very unfair. How are you going to determine the down payment on them? Are you going to take into consideration the rent that has been paid by the people who are living in them now? And will this be allowed in some way to compensate for the down payment?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No. They will be sold on the HOME plan basis. We can take the land cost out, and rent them the land if they wish, and they can make the lowest down payment on the property, same as they can on the HOME programme. There, I think the highest down payment is $1,200 and the lowest in some cases has been $600, depending on the price of the building that we are selling.

Mr. Deans: When you are determining the rent for these homes, do you take into consideration not only the income, but also the size of the family? I have one case for example—a family of seven paying $193 a month. I am just curious if you take into consideration the size of the family in addition to the income of the bread-winner?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Would you mind repeating that? I did not quite get your point.

Mr. Deans: When you are determining the rent, do you take into consideration the size of the family? Do you decide that someone who is earning—and we will pick a figure—$7,000 a year, with three children, can perhaps afford to pay more than someone earning $7,000 a year with five children? Do you consider this when you are setting the rent for these accommodations?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think the answer to your question is—and I think we had that here the other day—insofar as the number of children in a family is concerned, the rent scale does not take into account family allowances for the size of the unit required. To this extent, the rental scale does take into account the number of children.

Mr. Deans: No. We will go back to the Saltfleet satellite city. In February, we started talking about this, and in March you told me that you felt it was not in the public interest to disclose the price paid. I disagree with the method used in gathering this land together and I disagree more violently with the method of paying those people who are working for the government. In the case of Kronas real estate, how much money was paid on commission to Kronas real estate, when they gathered the 1,500 acres that is to be used for Saltfleet satellite city?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We did not deal with Kronas real estate. Nothing was paid to Kronas.

Mr. Deans: Whom did you deal with?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I told you the other day. Jon-Enco construction company, or Jon-Enco Limited.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I told you the other day. day.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. I mentioned it. You asked a question, I gave you two names. One was Jon-Enco, the other was B. Kronas, the real estate man involved.

Mr. Deans: How much did you pay them? How much did you pay Jon-Enco, I believe, I was told it was?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We bought the properties of Jon-Enco. We did not pay him any commission.

Mr. Deans: What was the full purchase price of this?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That we are not going to disclose.

Mr. Deans: Why?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Because we are still assembling land in the Hamilton area, and we do not think it is in the interest of taxpayers to disclose it at the present time. And let me tell you this, as far as the prices are concerned—when those properties are looked over, they are looked over by the Ontario housing corporation.

They are approved by our people; they are approved by the board of directors; they are approved by the Treasury in this province; they are approved by the Cabinet; they are approved by the Treasury board in Ottawa, and by central mortgage and housing, and we do not think that is in the interest of the taxpayer today for the government to go out and talk about the prices for which it gets its land, and so establish new prices at which we will have to bargain tomorrow.

Mr. Deans: Fine. How did you arrive at purchasing that particular property out in the middle of nowhere? Why do you people not follow a policy of building where the services are available instead of having to buy a piece of property and wait until the services are brought to it? At the time you bought that, there was no trunk sewer on the mountain capable of servicing that property.

There are subdivisions in that area that have been there for ten years and which have not been able to get services and yet below the mountain, on the part adjacent to the lake, there are all kinds of property available for building. Why did you go into that particular piece? Did they come and offer it to you or did you go out looking for it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are always looking for property. It is known that the housing corporation is in the market for property in any urban area. They came like many others and offered us property and the services for that property are right at the base of the Hamilton Mountain now. In our discussions with Mayor Copps and his people, we recognized that there was an area that could be serviced very easily. That is why we are interested in the property.

Mr. Deans: Surely, the area where the services are now, at the base of the mountain, would have been a much more economical place to build—not only more economical but it could have been built on now and would have served the needs of the area much better than having to wait five or ten years to develop this other piece.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am informed by my people that the land the member is talking about is owned by a number of entrepreneurs who are building rather expensive homes in that area and it was not available to the Ontario housing corporation.

Mr. Deans: All of the land in Saltfleet township?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, the member said at the base of the mountain.

Mr. Deans: Well, the base of the mountain is Saltfleet township.

Hon. Mr. Randall: A cost of $20,000 an acre is what they were looking for in the area the member is talking about. It was too rich for our blood.

Mr. Deans: Do you know if you are going to be able to pipe into the city of Hamilton and use their water?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We already have their approval for that.

Mr. Deans: You have? Thank you.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): There was mention made of the rental-to-income based on the size of the family. I think I misunderstood that, sir. I always thought it was on income rather than size of family.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is. We just pointed out that the size of the family might be taken into consideration, but it is based on income.

The note I read here a few minutes ago indicated that on taking it on the geared-to-income basis, it does give consideration to a man with several more children than another, because it does not take in all the family allowance he gets.

Mr. Worton: Oh, all right.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks about the whole question of Ontario housing, particularly as it relates to smaller communities.

I am not going to give a critique of housing in Canada—it is being done in other forums today. But I do not think that after listening to the Minister's speech and reading his statistics, you can look at statistics from one direction to another: one can look at it from the point of view that all the activity which is going on right now indicates that much is being done, or one can just see how far away the government was from planning for the needs of this province and particularly the community I represent. It seems to me that the important thing is to recognize that this government is responsible for housing in this province. I will just read from the statement of housing policy, under the Minister's name of the HOME plan:

> Constitutionally, provinces are responsible for ensuring that the housing needs of their citizens are met. The government of Ontario recognizes and accepts its responsibility to provide or assist in the provision of adequate accommodations for its citizens.

I am not going to repeat the comments of my colleague, the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Peacock), but I can only say this, in looking at the terms of the Minister's activities as they relate to need, this is one of the most fantastic failures of this government. In Peterborough right now there is something like 500 people who are registered for rent-to-income accommodation, and how many units are in operation in the city of Peterborough right now? Twenty-two. After these years we have 22 units for rental-to-income people.

And speaking of those 22 units, may I also comment on the way in which those 22 units were announced? There is nothing closer to the Minister acting like a laird of the barony than the description in the release which came from the Ontario housing corporation, announcing an official opening in Peterborough on Monday, August 28—this was at the beginning of an election campaign, of course—by the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Wells), representing the Minister of Trade and Development. The official party assembled at the city hall and proceeded to meet the new tenants. If I was the Minister of a government which could only produce 22 units, I would be so ashamed I would try to get them opened as quietly as possible.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): That is why he sent the hon. Minister without Portfolio.

Mr. Pitman: So we had a presentation of keys to new tenants. Of course, presenting the keys to new tenants who were already in their homes was a little bit ludicrous. The ribbon-cutting ceremony was scarcely a 1967 way of recognizing people who are receiving needed help in rental-to-income housing. It represents the most backward attitude towards people who need government's assistance that I could ever imagine. What we are trying to do is integrate people in communities who have rental-to-income housing, and here the Minister has a ribbon-cutting ceremony for 22 units when there are hundreds of people waiting for these units in the city of Peterborough.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have even had a ribbon-cutting for five.

Mr. Pitman: I know a number of civic officials who boycotted that particular presentation. They said they were so ashamed of a government which would go out and try to identify people in that manner in the community and could only come up with 22 units out of the hundreds that were necessary.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the member knows that his own council up there must pass a resolution asking for public housing and anything they have asked for we have been prepared to give them. Now, do not put the finger on us; go back and put it on the council.

Mr. Pitman: They asked for a good deal more than 22 units and your surveys indicated they need between 300 and 400 units, so let us not confuse the issue. I am willing to admit this to the Minister, that his agency is not the only one at fault in this area of housing, but to try and put the finger on the city council on that basis is just absolutely ridiculous.

The next area of need: I have the report from the family counselling service in which it indicates that the problem in the city of Peterborough, in so far as keeping families together, is not the "other woman" or booze,

but rather the need for homes. I have here a report, which indicates the number of people they are meeting day after day after day who desperately need housing and are not getting that housing from this government. The Minister can talk about statistics; the statistics I like are the ones that involve individuals.

For example, I heard from a woman just a few days ago who is still living in a house in the city of Peterborough with an outside toilet. We have a woman with 11 children whose husband makes $1.30 an hour, who cannot receive housing help in the city of Peterborough. Then, of course, you can have the children's aid society tell you a little bit about need. They have indicated they cannot keep families together, they cannot put children with their own families because of the lack of housing in that city. We have had two housing surveys indicating we need something between 300 and 400 units, and the city of Peterborough council has been trying to get that housing from this government. Perhaps the most incredibly disgraceful act this government ever pulled off was of course the action which took place during the election in the fall of 1967.

I have a question on the order paper, Mr. Chairman, which has been on the order paper for three months. I would suggest to the hon. Minister and to this government that these questions could be answered in 30 minutes, but this government is so embarrassed about the answers to these questions, I suspect they would just as soon not have them on the order paper. They have been sitting there, as I say, for three months unanswered. And what are the questions?

When did the Ontario housing corporation take an option on 292 acres of land known as the Dixon farm in the city of Peterborough in the township of Otonabee? From what company did the Ontario housing corporation pick up an option on this land? And what was the cost of the option? Indications that have been in the press, of course, were that this land was held at an option for $500,000—land which was assessed a few years before at $145,000—and a number of intermediary steps took place in which land transferred in one day from one company to another at an enormous profit. What was the offer of the Ontario housing corporation for this land? At what price had the land in question previously been bought and at what value had the land been assessed? Finally, were there any investigations of land use made to discover the degree of appropriateness of this land for housing?

One of the things that I find in this document here on the HOME plan is that throughout, your organization intends to work with municipalities at each point. Well, the municipality knows nothing about the buying of this land. In fact if the Ontario housing corporation had gone to the city planning office, they would have seen a map there in which this land was declared a conservation area. The deal was under water most of the year, and if you go to the city engineer's office you discover where the trunk sewers were going, this was about the last area where the city expected to build trunk sewers in the planning of the municipality. I would have thought that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) would have been going up the wall with a thing like this happening in this government.

This went on very well until just after the election took place, and perhaps I might read the statement of the Ontario housing corporation of September 27:

> An agreement to purchase 292 acres of land for development under the home ownership made easy land assembly programme was announced today by the hon. Stanley J. Randall. Mr. Randall said 192 acres are located within the southwestern section.

And it goes on to point it out, and it even describes what is going to happen:

> Mr. Randall, the Minister responsible for the Ontario housing corporation, said the land in the city will be developed as quickly as possible to satisfy the overwhelming demand for lots under the HOME plan in the city of Peterborough.

I can agree that "overwhelming demand" is certainly right. The 292 acres will represent approximately 600 lots. Then, of course, the representative of this government in the city of Peterborough indicated that much of this land will be used for senior citizens and for people on fixed incomes.

What happened? On November 2, suddenly the option was dropped. We did not even realize it was an option. We understood it was an agreement—an agreement to purchase 292 acres. The Minister announced it on September 27, and shortly after, in November, the option was dropped. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is the most disgraceful example of the use of people's needs for political purposes which I have seen for a long time.

I do not know how the Minister can answer those questions, but I hope he will try. I think the time has come to find a solution to

housing in this province. It is certainly in the hands of this department, but I would hope we could take the housing out of the hands of this department. It is a "poor relations" department. The Minister is a great guy when it comes to selling things to other people and I wish he would spend 100 per cent of his time doing that. One only has to look at the housing corporation's offices on University Avenue, as compared to the ones you see up on Yonge Street, to see who are the poor relations. The housing corporation's offices look like a parody of a newspaper office in those 1930 movies we used to see.

It is being run by an overworked few. I would be the first to admit that the people he has in that department are good. They are good. But the man who looks after Peterborough is looking after every housing operation from the border of Manitoba all the way down to Cornwall. It is absolutely ridiculous and just cannot be expected.

I suggest that we place housing in a department of housing and urban affairs. If we want to re-establish The Department of Municipal Affairs as Housing and Urban Affairs, fine. But for heaven's sake establish permanent regional offices immediately in these small cities, where you can keep in constant contact with the municipalities, where you can go in the community, where you can rezone, if necessary.

This is what often happens with the Ontario housing corporation. Some of them get the idea they want to change, for example, an area of land assembly. After the CMHC plans have been given out to the people in the area, suggesting a certain kind of housing, they come along and want to rezone. Then they turn it over to the planning board and the planning board has to pull the hot coals out of the fire because the Ontario housing corporation does not even send a representative to the planning board meeting to try and explain what it is doing.

In fact, the planning board and city council have to pass a resolution to have the Ontario housing corporation come to the city and tell what the dickens they are trying to do and where it is going and what it is up to.

So I suggest very strongly that we get it out of the hands of this department and into a new department. Get serious about it and establish regional offices and then sit down with each of these municipalities and plan a short term and a long term plan. Correlate the need for housing with the needs for urban renewal in each of these cities, and with the official plans in each of these areas. A city like Peterborough, for example, is completely hung up. On the one hand you have The Department of Municipal Affairs and its community-planning branch trying to hold back any kind of urban development in rural areas. So the people cannot go outside the city and they cannot get any help inside the city either.

I suggest very strongly that we get serious about housing and the first step would be to take it out of the hands of this department.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that we have another salesman in the House. He has done a good job with selling his ideas. I do not think they coincide with ours and also, I do not think they coincide with those of his own council. I have here about five pages of resolutions from the city of Peterborough, of which I would be glad to let you have a copy.

It is the most frustrating area that the housing corporation has ever been involved in, in order to get a housing programme underway. Perhaps you would like to discuss it with them. If you could get them to sit down with the housing corporation and make up their minds what they want, we could get on with the job.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Are you going to tell us that Peterborough story?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. I will tell you the Peterborough story too. Do not go away. You will be here all afternoon, will you not?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh yes, today, tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You will get the details. Do not get excited. I have got a good story for you—always have a good story. You talked about the 22 units we have under management now. Yes, we have 22 units under management but—

Mr. Pitman: And more going up.

Hon. Mr. Randall: —but when we made a survey on what was needed, at the invitation of the city of Peterborough, they said they needed 245 family units and 90 senior citizen units. This was their own approval of the survey and this was what they passed a resolution for.

Of the resolution, there are 145 family units at the planning stage now and there are 90 senior citizen units at the planning stage—that is a total of 235. In the proposal stage,

there are 50 family units and under construction there are 50 at the present—so that is 335. Now, if they have got 500 people waiting for housing, they have not told us about it as yet.

These are the figures we got from the council itself. If they are wrong, you had better go back and talk to them and get the figures corrected. Give us the correct figures. We will go back in again.

Mr. Pitman: We do not want another plan.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, all right. If you are going to build a house yourself, my friend, you would have to sit down and figure what you are going to build. The housing corporation does not have a magic wand. We have to figure out what they want. We have to design it. We have to call for tenders. We have to get it under way. We have to find the land in some instances. Now what do you expect to do, wave a magic wand?

Mr. Pitman: Well, we have had two surveys.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I know it is very easy to say build them tomorrow. You get the numbers you want, but it is not that easy to do—and you know it. So you take a look at what is being done in the city of Peterborough. You will find that we are living up to what Peterborough has asked us to live up to. If they want any more—

Mr. Pitman: What have they asked you to live up to?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will send you over a list of the resolutions. Take a look at these and look at the frustrations. This is one of the things the housing corporation has no control over. If the council itself cannot make up its mind we cannot go ahead and do the building.

Mr. Pitman: I said that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, all right. Then we agree with each other.

Now let me, before I get on to the land assembly deal, cover the last two points you made. You talk about having a Minister of housing in the province of Ontario. I would say you could have a Minister of housing in Ottawa without any difficulty, because the Minister of housing in Ottawa is concerned primarily with banking—where the money is available from central mortgage and housing.

But if you come down to a province, this is one or any other, and say: "We want a Minister of housing here"—he has to take precedence over the Minister of Education, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Treasury Department, Minister of Energy and Resources Management. All these people have to be subservient to the Minister of housing. I do not know how he could ever get anything done on that basis, because these people are all affected by what happens in housing.

We have something working in this province we think is better than that. We have a task force made up of men from these departments. When we walk into a meeting we have these task force men in here. We say: "We are going to build X number of houses in Peterborough or Sutton, or wherever we are going to build them, and these are the problems we are going to create. If you have any objections will you go to your Minister, your department, come back at the next meeting and tell us whether we can or cannot go ahead? What are the objections? What are the restrictions?"

That has been operating now for nearly a year—and very successfully in this province. So I do not think that you are going to gain very much by having a Minister of urban affairs and housing unless you are going to put all the other Ministers underneath him. That means The Treasury Department too, and I do not think you are going to get away with it. I do not think even I could sell that.

You did make another suggestion with reference to regional offices. We think it is a good suggestion. We already have that under study with the board of directors of the housing corporation and I think before long perhaps there will be some areas in which we will have a regional office. I think we have a man stationed at the city hall in Hamilton at the present time. He was in Hamilton for a time, but we have had men stationed in various parts, but they do not have an office.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Try and find him some time!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, we give him an office and a coat hanger, tell him to keep his head under, and remind him not to be there. They are out doing a job in the field. We do not want him to be sitting around, we want him out on the job. Let me answer the question with reference to the proposed land assembly in Peterborough, and I will read a statement so that there is nothing left unsaid. I think that I covered all 10 points you mentioned.

At the time the Ontario HOME plan was announced, OHC was inundated with offers of land in various parts of Ontario. In many instances, there were no formal offerings, but there were personal visits from landowners to the offices of OHC. This was the case with the land offered OHC by the Trent Park developments. A representative of the developer called in at OHC's offices in May, 1967, and made known to the corporation officials that the land was available for purchase.

Mr. Singer: What was the name of the representative?

Hon. Mr. Randall: A site inspection was carried out by an official of OHC on May 26, 1967. At that time, the site was discussed with the local manager of CMHC, Mr. Carl M. Hollett, and Mr. W. Parnell of the Peterborough assessment department. Also, I have a note here to the effect that they did go to the planning office and were told that that land was right for development.

The land in question comprised approximately 282 acres—182 acres within the city limits of Peterborough, and 100 acres in the township of Otonabee. The report of the OHC property agents indicated that, from a superficial investigation, the property was acceptable and would warrant consideration as a land assembly project. It was also indicated that sewer and water facilities were available immediately adjacent to the property. On June 30, 1967, a formal offer of the land was made to the OHC by Trent Park developments limited. This was in the amount of $2,400 per acre for the land within the city boundaries and $400 per acre for the lands in the township of Otonabee.

The offer was conditionally accepted by OHC on July 7, and a deposit of $100 was made to Messrs. Gordon Keyfetz, Paul Baker and Goodman, solicitors for Trent Park developments limited. The expiry date of the offer was August 18, 1967. During the early part of July 1967, OHC applied to CMHC for authority to proceed with further investigations as to the feasibility of using the land for development purposes. On July 12, 1967, OHC was advised by the local manager of CMHC that further information would be required before the approval in principle of the corporation would be given.

On August 29, the proposed development was brought before the board of directors with the recommendation that the lands be acquired. This recommendation was based on the fact that these lands in Peterborough developed by OHC and CMHC, might represent a problem in terms of continuing development due to the lack of sewer trunks to the area. It was felt, therefore, in order to maintain a reasonable supply of serviced land to meet the residential market of the city and thus have a controlling effect on land prices, OHC must ensure a continuous supply of serviced land and reserve raw land for future years.

A total of 192 acres of the land under consideration were within the present city limits of the city of Peterborough and adjacent to trunk services. On the basis of this report and after careful consideration of the matter, the board of directors approved the purchase of these lands, and order-in-council authority was then obtained. Although the necessary provincial approvals have been received, the corporation was aware that further investigation had to be completed prior to receiving CMHC's agreement to participate, and accordingly on August 31, 1967, an arrangement was made whereby the closing date of the purchase would be extended to October 31, 1967, on payment of an additional deposit of $50,000. As is the normal practice, OHC made the deposit subject to the condition that all moneys deposited would be returnable in the event that terms and conditions of the offer of purchase were not met.

As I mentioned earlier, the corporation's reasons for considering the purchase of these lands was the difficulty of servicing the balance of the land already owned in the city. This would involve extending a major trunk sewer for approximately one mile, at a cost in the region of $1 million—in addition to the time involved. As the land which had been offered was immediately adjacent to adequate trunk services, this appeared to be a way in which the corporation could maintain a supply of serviced lots in the city of Peterborough, pending the development of other holdings.

However, when the proposed transaction became known, and it became the centre of a political controversy, it was obvious that local resistance could result in delays in obtaining the necessary rezoning, which would negate any advantage in terms of time, over the corporation's other holdings. In consequence, the provincial government authorization for OHC to proceed with the purchase was withdrawn. The wisdom of this course of action has been since substantiated by the fact that the owners of the lands in question have applied for rezoning from agricultural to residential, and this rezoning

has been refused by the municipality on the basis that the proposed development was premature.

Notwithstanding, OHC had continued to discuss the proposal of purchase of other lands in the city of Peterborough and will continue to do everything possible to ensure that the demand for serviced lands is met. As recently as May 30, the corporation's manager of land development met with the committee of the council of Peterborough to discuss ways and means of servicing its remaining holdings. In addition, OHC has undertaken the development of that part of its existing holdings that can be serviced and some 180 lots will be serviced and available for building this year. When it was subsequently decided not to proceed with the purchase from Trent Park developments limited, the owners were so advised, and in due course all the deposit money was returned to OHC.

Mr. Pitman: I would like to ask the Minister a few questions. Is the Minister suggesting that the 292-acre proposal was dropped because of the political controversy? I am sure that he said that.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Look at the other thing that I talked about. The price of the land went up in that area.

Mr. Pitman: The thing that seems rather strange to me is that I am wondering what would have happened if the Conservative candidate had won the election in the fall? Would that have meant that there would have been no controversy and therefore the whole thing would have gone through?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now you are being strictly political.

Mr. Pitman: I am just suggesting what the Minister has indicated from his remarks, that because of political controversy, therefore, the whole proposal which would have meant so much to Peterborough has been dropped. Now, I am not being political.

Hon. Mr. Randall: What do you mean, would have meant so much to Peterborough? They would not rezone to allow it. Was that political controversy?

Mr. Pitman: Is it not the policy of the OHC to go to the municipality to find out if it should be zoned or whether the municipality is willing to rezone before a matter such as this is dropped? For example, the statement of the Minister is that an agreement to purchase was made. Now, an agreement to purchase, it seems to me, is a very different thing from just having a general option which is going to be exercised if and when someone does win an election.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We had reason to believe that we could go ahead. We had discussions with Parnell and also Whitehall in the engineering department of Peterborough. We had reasons to believe, when we first negotiated, that we could go ahead. But as I say, after the political discussion got into it, we did not think that we could go ahead with it. The time that we would lose would mean that we could go ahead and develop the properties that we had.

Mr. Pitman: I do not think that it was either/or. I think that the development of the property you already had in the land assembly property was 183 lots up there now. But the point is that I cannot see what change takes place because of the political controversy, because there was no change at all. The people on the city council did not change, and the people on the planning board did not change except that I left it, so I cannot see—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not say that it changed. I simply said that in the discussion that came up, it appeared that they were not going to zone that for housing and if we were going to get involved with the city of Peterborough over zoning, we might just as well have waited and taken the time and energy to develop the properties that we had.

Mr. Pitman: No question came before the planning board about rezoning. There was no application made because I sat on that planning board for several weeks after and nothing came before the planning board asking for it to be rezoned.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, could I ask a couple of questions arising out of this? In the first of the Minister's statements, he said that someone from Trent Park approached OHC. Who was the person who approached?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not have it here, but I can get the name for you.

Mr. Singer: I see.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think that you already probably know it. Why do you not let me have it?

Mr. Singer: Well, I would like to know. I only know what I read in the papers and

that is not necessarily factual and I thought the Minister might know who first came to see him. I would like the name to come from the Minister.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): The Minister would like to forget, no doubt!

Mr. Singer: I am unable to follow this!

Hon. Mr. Randall: They do not come to see me as a rule.

Mr. Singer: Well, all right, they went to see an official of OHC, and I would like to know the name of the person who first introduced this project to the OHC.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): That is coming to see the Minister in our constitutional process.

Mr. Singer: I had great difficulty in following the Minister's history of this project. As I recall from his statement, he said first of all that it was a $100 option, and that at the time he made the option, he made certain inquiries and found out that there were services reasonably available, and it was a logical piece of land, and on and on and on. In fact, he thought it was so good that later he entered into a binding offer of purchase and sale, and upped the deposit, the $100 option to a $50,000 deposit. Now am I right up to that point, or did I say anything wrong?

Hon. Mr. Randall: There was never an option, it was always a deposit.

Mr. Singer: What was the $100, the first $100?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That was a deposit.

Mr. Singer: That was a deposit, that was just sort of to let you look around and they had to hold the land until you did look around for a certain time limit.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: All right, but when you moved from $100 to $50,000, there was a substantial change in figures. It was my impression that the Minister said we then had a binding offer of purchase and sale, and there were terms in it to the effect—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Subject to conditions.

Mr. Singer: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Subject to certain conditions.

Mr. Singer: That is right, subject to certain conditions. And there were terms in it to the effect that if the vendor was unable to deliver the land to the province, subject to all those conditions, that you get out of the deal, and the $50,000 would come back to you. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes. If the deal did not go through we would get all our money back.

Mr. Singer: All right. Now, can you tell me how—and it reads like a very good deal for the vendor—in view of the fact that everything was fine, there were services, the land was good land, the faults about the land that the member for Peterborough who talked about it apparently are not so bad. The land was fine, the services were fine, the price was fine, why did they let you get out in August and get your deposit back? It seems more than strange to me that they would give you back the $50,000.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not necessarily. He said that if we did not go ahead with it we could have our money back. We decided not to go ahead with it, on account of the conditions I have already outlined.

Mr. Singer: That is not what you told us in your statement, and I wish you would refer back to the statement.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I read it.

Mr. Singer: You had a binding offer of purchase and sale. And it has certainly been my experience that as a lawyer—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Subject to certain conditions—

Mr. Singer: —where there is a binding offer of purchase and sale—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Subject to certain conditions—

Mr. Singer: All right. Well then, which conditions did the vendors not fulfill, which allowed you to get your $50,000 back?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It was a condition that he did not fulfill. We did not go ahead with the deal.

Mr. Singer: Oh, now, that just does not make sense. That does not wash at all, Mr. Chairman. Let us review it again. Here, according to all the facts that have been elicited this afternoon, and all we have read in the newspapers, was an A-1 deal for the vendors. They were going to make a very substantial profit on it.

Mr. Sopha: Was it $125,000?

Mr. Singer: Very substantial; the land doubled or tripled in value over a period of a few months, and particularly as the result of a series of transactions, it at least doubled in value. The vendor comes in and he gets a good offer to purchase, a binding offer to purchase, from OHC. He gets $50,000 of provincial money in his hot little hand. Then according to the Minister, because there is a political flurry, he suddenly says, "I give up my big profit, and here is your $50,000 back and we will all go off on our merry ways." That just does not make sense, Mr. Chairman.

The vendor had a good deal going for him, a tremendous deal; he was going to make a substantial $140,000 profit. He had a binding offer to purchase; he had your $50,000 in hand. I want to know what induced him to give it back to you? Why did the vendor let you off the hook? He had you cold. Why did the vendor let the Minister off the hook?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not think we will ever buy off the original Indian any more in this province, the original owner of the land, because land is transferred from one to another, particularly in urban areas, maybe 100 times before we get our hands on it. You say, why did we back away from the offer? We had not, at the day that the offer expired, received provincial or federal authority to make the purchase, and on the basis of the explanation I have given you here, we decided that we would not go ahead with it, and we backed out of the offer. It was we who backed out of the offer, not the vendor.

Mr. Singer: Well, in the normal chain of events, Mr. Chairman, if you backed out of the offer, the least that would have happened would have been that you would have forfeited your $50,000 deposit. Surely when you get to that stage and you have a binding offer of purchase and sale, it is not just unilaterally binding? If one side wants to back out of it, at that stage surely he has to suffer a penalty? Under the ordinary terms of any offer to purchase—and most lawyers in the House, all lawyers in the House will agree with this—under these circumstances the $50,000 at least would have been treated as liquidated damages, and would have been held by the vendor in the event that you tried to back away.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: All right, then. Will the Minister table the agreement? Will he table the agreement before this debate is over, otherwise the debate will have to keep on going, and show us in the agreement and from the agreement the basis on which he was entitled to demand and get back his $50,000. I suggest that he cannot do it. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there is something more in this deal than meets the eye, and I would suggest it is a most unusual proceeding. The Minister's casual explanation that because a political storm blew up in Peterborough in the month of August, 1967, just does not stand. There must have been something more to it than that. Does the Minister want to add any further explanation than he has already given us?

Mr. Sopha: It was during the election campaign—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let me say this. I am quite prepared to table the agreement of the offer we had with the people involved. We have nothing to hide. We are in the business of buying and selling land, or building houses. If you think we have done something that is not according to Hoyle, we are prepared to put the facts on the table. I thought I had them here, I thought you would accept them, but if you want me to table the offer, I will be glad to table it.

As far as the housing corporation is concerned, we are always going to be under the hammer, I think, when we make deals for land. People like, I think, my hon. friend from Wentworth, perhaps rightly says that maybe we paid too much. If the government does not come forward and say exactly what it has paid, everybody says, "You must have something to hide."

But I just remind you that the housing corporation is in a very tough position when it comes to bargaining for land. There seems to be a feeling that when the government goes out to buy something, it should go with a band and have neon signs put up, and say, "Here is the government going to buy something. Get your prices up." As far as we are concerned, if we use a private source to do the buying, the critics say, "Well, how much commission did they get?"

We are not going to advertise in the areas we are looking for land. We are not going to run a band ahead of the Ontario housing corporation and say, "It's the housing corporation; the taxpayers buying. Now you know who it is, get your prices up." I just suggest to you that as far as we are con-

cerned, we are going to be making deals similar to this from here on in. Perhaps they can all be open for discussion, but there are certain things we can suggest with reference to prices and values and certain things that I do not think it is in the interest of the taxpayer or the housing corporation to disclose.

If you want to have a look at the offer, you are quite welcome to have a look at the offer. We have nothing to hide.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be led astray by any of the red herrings that the Minister has just strewn across the trail.

Mr. Trotter: And he threw a lot of them.

Mr. Singer: We are not talking about the general course of business and offers and negotiations and whether or not you are getting a good buy or a bad buy. We are talking about one specific deal. We are talking about the Minister's explanation of that deal, which he read from a prepared statement. In his prepared statement, he said he had a binding offer of purchase and sale, and he put up $50,000 as a deposit to guarantee his good faith in regard to that. It just does not make any sense when the Minister can give us no reason as to why the vendor, who apparently had an outstanding deal, gave him back the $50,000 and let him get out of the deal, and that was the end of it—or so the Minister said.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): But he did!

Mr. Singer: All right, he did. I agree with the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, he did, and this is why we want some more answers. We want to know why he did it. It just does not make sense to me that a seller of land, a vendor of land who has government money, good government money in his pocket, and who stands to benefit substantially from a deal in which he appears to be making at least $125,000, is going to give back the $50,000—particularly when the Minister says this was a good piece of land, he had investigated it, there were services available.

Hon. Mr. Randall: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is misleading the House and he is quoting me as saying I had a binding agreement. I had no such thing; I had an offer given to these people on the basis that it would be provincially and federally approved. When it was not provincially and federally approved, the money was returned. It was no binding agreement. He did not just give back the money because we put the heat on him. He had no binding agreement, so let us make that perfectly clear.

Mr. Pitman: On a point of order, I am reading from a release from the Minister's corporation itself, which is an agreement to purchase 292 acres of land for development under the home ownership made easy plan.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sure. A qualified agreement. We have hundreds of them.

Mr. Singer: Where is the agreement? Can we see this?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, we will get it for you.

Mr. Singer: Right now, this afternoon?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We will send for it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, there is no point, really, in trying to discuss this thing until the Minister has in hand all the documents. His explanation that they got out of this deal because a political flurry grew up, was the first ploy. There was nothing in his statement that said it depended on approval from Ottawa; there was nothing in his statement that said it was dependent upon approval from Ontario; the only thing his statement said was, "We withdrew from the deal because there was a political flurry that grew up." What was the extent of the political flurry? Was the political flurry the story that appeared in the papers apparently involving the former Conservative member for Peterborough? Was that the political flurry that embarrassed the government?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Singer: Well then, what was the political flurry? Surely this government has been there long enough and has withstood political flurries when they felt they were right? If, in this case, they withdrew because there was a political flurry, they must have felt that they were wrong, and it must have been equally embarrassing for the vendor, otherwise he would not have given you back the $50,000. It just does not make sense, Mr. Chairman. The Minister is not disclosing the full story to this House.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to make a few more comments on the purchasing of land. I disagree entirely with the method used by this government in purchasing land. It has been stated that the

purchasing of land is based on the buying of marginal farm land. At the present moment, in dealing with speculators, you first of all pay inflated prices, but that is not the worst part of it.

The reason for Ontario housing corporation going into the buying of land was to try to reduce the cost of homes, and the practice that is presently followed by this government, of selling the land at today's price when someone wants to buy it to build a home, is wrong. We should be trying to bring down the cost of lots, and when we buy land as a government, as a people, to make available for the HOME building programme, we should be prepared to sell at the cost that we paid for it in order to try to bring down the cost of land.

If we are going to sell ours at the same price as the speculator is selling his, then we are not helping one bit. We are not contributing at all to reducing the cost of homes. Now when we buy land in Ontario, we should be buying it in order to use it as a lever to eliminate the land speculator from the home market, and we are not using it in that fashion. As far as the Saltfleet satellite city land is concerned, you were right. You paid too much—away too much. It changed hands three times before you bought it. I do not know who John Anco is—I tried to find him in the book but they are not available—I suspect they do not really exist.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 407?

Mr. Singer: Oh no, we are a long way from through.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to divert the attention of the member for Downsview for a moment back to the Chapel-Glen project in Flemingdon Park. I had intended to raise this again with the Minister even though I dealt with it in my remarks Thursday evening, because the Minister's rebuttal Thursday night, Mr. Chairman, raised a lot more questions than it answered. Many of them have been raised by the members for Downsview and Peterborough in connection with the Peterborough land agreement to purchase.

I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, in respect to the Chapel-Glen project, has Ontario housing corporation an option on the property there held by Olympia and York, or has it a similar kind of agreement for sale, with conditions attached to it? Among those conditions, is there the rezoning of a right of way for use on that property for development, and the conveyance of that right of way from Metropolitan Toronto to the borough of North York? Has an application by the developers been made, and is this one of the conditions for the rezoning of the land for condominium use?

I would like the Minister to tell the House if the developer, Olympia and York, has submitted to the planning board of North York a subdivision plan, a division into lots of the properties—because it seems to me that these questions have to be answered in the light of the Minister's assurance Thursday night that this project, which he forecast on October 14 of last year, three days before election day, is well under way as he stated Thursday night in reply to my remarks.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I will give you a complete explanation of Flemingdon Park. I would be delighted to. With the passing of The Condominum Act in June, 1967, a great deal of interest was generated among developers as to the possibility of providing such accommodation in the metropolitan area where housing conditions continue to be somewhat acute. As a consequence, the Ontario housing corporation was approached by Central Park estates limited on July 11, 1967, with an offer to sell a portion of their holdings at Flemingdon Park in the borough of North York.

These lands consisted of some 63 acres and were located east and west of the Don Valley parkway, and south of the Hydro Power Commission's transmission lines. The land offered permitted the use of 3,461 apartment suites. Also offered was a golf course consisting of approximately 50 acres of valley land. After thoroughly considering the offer, the Ontario housing corporation advised Central Park estates that it was not interested in purchasing the golf course and in consequence a second proposal was received from that organization offering a total of 59.22 acres for the development potential of 3,412 multiple dwelling units.

This offer was considered and approved by the board of directors of the Ontario housing corporation. Subsequently, the Ontario housing corporation entered into an agreement with Central Park estates to purchase the land. A second agreement was also executed providing for the engineering design and servicing of the lands by Central Park estates. The agreement also provided for Central Park

estates to act on behalf of Ontario housing corporation in all negotiations and other actions required to obtain the necessary rezoning of certain parts of the land in order to obtain the density of development proposed.

Ontario housing corporation was aware of a commitment given by the original developers of Flemingdon Park to provide a general community facility in that area. Accordingly it is a condition of the agreement between Ontario housing corporation and Central Park estates that Central Park estates will immediately construct a community centre which meets the requirements agreed upon between the organization and the borough of North York. In this regard, Ontario housing corporation will bear a proportionate amount of the cost of the community centre, related to the dwellings which it already owns in the Flemingdon Park development and the dwellings which will be constructed on the land it is now purchasing.

At the present time, installations of underground services in Flemingdon Park have been completed by Central Park estates on behalf of Ontario housing corporation. Work is now commencing on the construction of services above ground such as roads, curbs, and so on. It it anticipated that servicing will be fully completed in August of this year.

An application for the rezoning of the lands has been made by Central Park estates and this is currently being processed. Immediately the necessary rezoning has been obtained, the Ontario housing corporation will arrange for construction of dwellings to commence on a condominium basis. In view of the magnitude of the development, construction will be undertaken on a phase basis with completion anticipated in two to three years. However, the first dwellings will be available in 1969.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, did the Minister say that the rezoning application had actually been presented to the North York planning board or did he say it was in the process of preparation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are advised that they would go ahead with the rezoning because they have been working with North York.

Mr. Peacock: But it is undetermined at just what point the rezoning process for application is at this date.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would say, "yes" but it is all residential in there anyway so we do not anticipate any major difficulty.

Mr. Peacock: Right. One other question, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Minister's reply. He did not indicate the term of the agreement and I would like to ask him the closing date, and whether any extensions of that closing date, if they were prior to today, have already been granted?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The closing date for the actual transfer of ownership was June 26.

Mr. Peacock: Of this year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Peacock: Does the Minister expect that all of the conditions in the agreement will be met by June 26?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, we do.

Mr. Peacock: In light of the information which I believe is correct—that the application has not actually been presented—the application for rezoning has not actually yet been put before the North York planning board?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, that is not a condition of us buying the land because if by any chance the units are reduced, then the cost of the acreage is reduced accordingly. But we believe we are going to get the 3,412 units without any difficulty.

We have had some discussions with our people up there. I think their big difficulty in the past has been who is going to build this community centre. As you know, that property has been owned by four or five different people and, as we wind up being the final owner, we worked out an arrangement whereby the community centre would be assured. This is one of the difficulties that North York was concerned about. Now that all the—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): By whom? By you? OHC will accept the responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We will commence it. The cost will be partly borne by us and partly by the Central Park estates. I think we have 520 and odd units in there now and if we put in another 3,412, then we pay a proportion of that to the community centre. That is going to run about $500,000.

Mr. Singer: Is that not what is holding it up?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No.

Mr. Singer: The local councillor up there told me just a week or two ago that the

reason he was so unhappy about it was, despite all the promises about building a community centre, nobody had done anything to finalize the building of it at all.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is in the agreement. It will be finalized. It is in the agreement.

Mr. Singer: When is the community centre going to be built?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I told you the services were in. They are now putting in the curbs and it will be built at the same time as we call for proposals on the other buildings.

Mr. Singer: Have you talked to the local councillor up there? He is a supporter of yours, he should be talking to you.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I assume he knows that our word is as good as—

Mr. Singer: Yes, he is not very happy with you.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well we do not expect to win them all you know.

Mr. Singer: Very few of them are—

Mr. Peacock: I am still not clear as to what conditions have to be met by June 26, because if the rezoning is not one of them, I fail to see then how the corporation is committed to getting this development underway in the time that is left to it. What are the conditions if rezoning is not one of them?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are buying land. Clear title is what we require. If we get clear title on June 26, we figure we can solve any other problems that may be in offing. As far as I am concerned I do not see any major difficulties.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Could I ask the Minister what the present zoning—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I might add that it is only east of the Don Valley that has to be rezoned. The rest is already zoned.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, under this vote—

Mr. Young: What residential zoning is on it now?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Pardon?

Mr. Young: What class of residential zoning is on the land?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Same category as high-rise, town housing, condominium—multiple-family housing that is on there now. That has been zoned on the west side. But on the other side of the Donway, that is the part that will come up for rezoning.

Mr. Young: That residential is what—18 units per acre now?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sixty to the acre.

Mr. Young: Sixty? Well, that would not require much change.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, not multiple—family high-rise.

Mr. Singer: Are you going to take the golf course?

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could say, since we have experienced some difficulty in this, who the principals of Central Park are and where their business address is located?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Olympia and York have a building there as big as the Empire State building almost, at the corner of Eglinton Avenue and Don Mills Road. I think Mr. Wrightman is the president. He has a board of directors. I do not know who they are, but insofar as I am concerned we deal with the Wrightman brothers.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Chairman, just one question of the Minister before you close that up. Is Central Park estates, Mr. Chairman, part of Olympia and York? Or is this not, in fact, another company?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is part of the same group. It may be a separate company, but it is the same group.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some difficulty in locating the business address by some people of Central Park estates. I think it is very important that we ask the Minister if he can advise us for whom that land is actually being purchased—Olympia and York or Central Park estates, as the news releases said? If it is Central Park estates, where are they located? Who are they? Where are they located?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are dealing with Central Park estates and to the best of my knowledge their office is in that building next to the Foresters building. There are two buildings there. The Foresters building is on the south side of Eglinton Avenue and their building is the first one south of Eglinton Avenue. That is where I see them when I have been up there.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Just one short question, Mr. Chairman. Is this an American company or a Canadian company—Central Park estates?

Hon. Mr. Randall: To the best of my knowledge it is a Canadian company.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, under this vote. In the past, the central mortgage and housing corporation would not lend money to build homes in towns and villages that had no sewage system. Now at the present time there are a number of our towns and villages in the process or in negotiation for a sewer system, but this will take maybe two or three years. Would these towns and villages have to wait till that sewage system is completed before they would give consideration to give mortgages on new homes in these towns and villages?

Hon. Mr. Randall: In our discussions with these areas that would have to have septic tanks, we have been assured by central mortgage and housing corporation that where a municipality has made arrangements with OWRC to bring in services in the next three years, they are quite prepared to finance housing in that area, using the septic tank. In fact, we are doing that in some other parts of Ontario now. I think you brought up one to me the other day and I gave you the information that under the HOME plan we would be quite prepared to assist.

Mr. Spence: Would they have to prove, Mr. Chairman, that they could not get mortgage money from any other firm or bank before they could get it from central mortgage and housing corporation?

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is my understanding that if a man went to a bank or mortgage company and was turned down, then by law he has the right to go to a central mortgage and housing office and ask for mortgage money. If they have it, they will give it to him. If they have not got it—they ran out of money a few months ago in the HOME programme—then he has got to look around and either wait until they do have some money, or see if he can find somebody to finance him.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, the discussion this afternoon has largely centred around the question of the HOME plan and the matter of buying and selling land and the problems that arise with that. I suggest that it is an area that the housing corporation should stay out of and I think it should attack the problem in another way. I think the housing corporation has done an exceptionally good job in its project proposals where it has gone in and negotiated a deal for the construction of projects on land owned by others and just paid for a completed deal.

But as soon as they get out into this land business, they are getting into a field that I think they should leave alone. All they are doing is adding to the demand and aggravating the problem. I think the Minister, Mr. Chairman, understands well that market prices are a question of supply and demand. When the province is in the purchasing side along with speculators, all they are doing is aggravating the problem, a problem that should be attacked by the government by making more serviced land available on the market to home buyers.

There are three or four main problems that are blocking this availability of building lots and causing the market to rise. One of them is the reason given by the Minister the other day for not going ahead with the Malvern project. They felt that it was premature, and planning boards around this province have kept on saying—and so has the Minister of Municipal Affairs and others—that projects are premature. I think it is a matter for the market to decide when projects are premature or not. The problem that this government should address itself to is the provision of services and the alleviation of education and other financial burdens that go along with development of land and the provision of transportation so that these lands are feasible for development.

When so much land is available for development, and feasible for development, and the demand is much less than the supply, then we will see market prices go down and down quickly. We have seen evidence of this many times in the past in this country. One just has to go to Regina or to Winnipeg or to Calgary. Even today in Calgary I will show you lots that were put forward for development in 1910 and are still not built upon. There was over-optimistic speculation and once the price began to crack, the whole level of land prices cracked with it.

We have a problem now that the government, in getting into the land business, in buying land, is going to be faced with a conflict of interest. It is going to be worried whether land it purchases is sold for below its cost if it does pull the plug on the availability of services and on the burden of education and these other costs that are holding the prices up.

It is this control, this fear of having land going on the market prematurely that is causing these prices to stay up. Ancaster is a good case in point, as the member for Wentworth mentioned before. Because of the province going in, they are causing the same situation as Trans-Canada Pipe Lines or any other big buyer, any assembler of land causes. Immediately sellers decide they do not particularly want to sell, and they put the price up. It is not just the province that faces rising prices when they go into the market like this.

And all you would have to do—and certainly this Minister knows as well as anyone in this House—all you have to do to cause prices to drop is to get an oversupply on the market. And the Minister, in co-operation with the Minister of Energy and Resources Management and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, is the one who should be pulling the plug on these blockades that are causing these rising prices, and getting these services available, getting the burden of education and other burdens that go with development eased on the municipalities which are just not in a position to face them. We are held up time and time again. Scarborough is an example. In Malvern, you were held up for years because you could not get a service agreement worked out with the borough. The borough is holding it up because it cannot afford to put in services prematurely like that—if you say it is prematurely.

But if the province put the services into the areas, then it opens up a whole vast number of lots for the market and if people can get to them by transportation, if people can buy those lots because there is a good supply on the market and the sellers are endeavouring and striving to sell them, then we will see this question of need for the HOME plan greatly alleviated. Surely it is not a question of high interest rates that is necessarily holding it up.

Yes, there are extra costs today but they are not the real burden in housing. The real burden in housing is the cost of serviced land and the real culprit in this question is this government of Ontario failing to get these lands serviced, and relieving the burdens faced by municipalities that have these lands that are ripe for development, failing to alleviate the burden of development costs and providing access so people who want to get to centres such as Toronto or other areas where there is employment can buy lands in remote parts and be able to get to and from their work easily.

But these are the factors the government should be doing and not getting into the land purchasing business.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would like to have the same faith in a private developer that the hon. member has. If the Ontario housing corporation was to run the services through privately owned land, I can show you land that will double in price overnight and there would not be any cheap lots for the average fellow that we are talking about, the modest income families from $5,000 to $12,000 income.

I would like to think that perhaps the member is right, that if we put the services through the area that lots would come on the market in such a rush that they would reduce themselves in price. I do not think this is a remote possibility in any urban area in Ontario at least, that these lots will come down because we put services through and we put value on the lots and then we put the service through. If we were to announce today that the GO train was going to run in another direction—I will not mention a direction or it will be in the press today that that is where it is going to go—if we announced the GO train was going to take off in some direction, I can show you cow pastures that would triple in price overnight.

The only way, in my estimation, that the government is going to be of service to modest income families is to do exactly what we are doing, regardless of the criticism, and that is to go out and buy sufficient land such as we have done in Malvern and Saltfleet and what we are doing in other areas, so that when we get the land a number of things happen; we can sell off a portion of land like an ordinary developer for commercial and industrial purposes and, for example, high-rise apartments and high-priced homes. With the profit on that we can turn it into community centres and schools and lower the cost of lots for the HOME plan, public housing and senior citizens.

We have looked at it on the basis that if there were more lots available, would that bring down the price? And I cannot be persuaded at the moment, perhaps I could be wrong, but I cannot be persuaded that in any area in this province, if we put the services in, we are going to reduce the price of lots one five cent piece. In fact, I think we would find the lots would go up in price. I think all one would have to do is look at the many thousands of acres held within the metropolitan area of Toronto, what we call the

metropolitan area, and which has been cow pasture for many years.

It is all very well to say, "Well, if the services had gone through there, that land would have been on the market and there would have been a lot of people living there with modest incomes." I think from my experience and from what I have seen of the price of homes around Metropolitan Toronto that what you would be doing is making it possible for $35,000 and $40,000 homes to go up in even greater number than they have gone up in the past. And the only protection that I see for modest income families is for the government to go into that market, to compete for unserviced land at the best price possible and then put our services through so that when we put the services through, we get some of the benefit—all the benefit does not accrue to the private investor.

I am in a position to be persuaded otherwise if anybody else has any suggestions, but I think this is the only way we are going to get lots on the market for the HOME programme. And I might also say that there are very few builders I know of left on their own who would be building housing for $15,000 or less. If we had not introduced the HOME programme, I do not think you would have any housing selling around here for $15,000 or less. Again, if we do not have the serviced lots and make them available to the merchant builders, we will not have those homes selling in that price range.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I heartily disagree with the Minister's statement. The Minister well knows from his own background that if there was a sales market for 50,000 refrigerators in this country and 100,000 were manufactured, that he would have his refrigerators that he manufactured on that market and cleared out as fast as he could, because he knows what would happen to the prices. They would go down. And the same is true when it comes to land.

There is a lot of land in this province, especially around this city here, which is owned by people, not only those who are so-called speculators but those who have been farming the land for many years. They have seen these land prices rise steadily year after year and they say to themselves, "What have I got to lose if I keep on holding the land? It was $3,000 an acre ten years ago, it is now $12,000 an acre, I might as well keep on hanging on."

Two things cause him concern today: First of all, the taxes he is paying on those lands; and second, the interest on money if he is a person who has bought the land at a high price and he is having to pay the interest on money with which he has paid for that land. If he starts to see even the level of prices go static, he is going to become concerned. There is no question in my mind, and I cannot for the life of me understand why there is any question in the mind of this Minister, that the economics of refrigerators do apply to land, that if we get not one GO line and one little bit of a sewage development going, but really open the areas up where the demand for housing is great and ensure the availability of lots is well in excess of any potential demand, then I think you will see this price situation correct itself quickly.

There are very, very few owners of land who will hang on very long if they start to see these prices dip and they will only start to see them dip when this government makes these lots available in quantity by easing their restrictions on the services, and easing the restrictions on assessment which municipalities have to impose in order to afford housing developments.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I never counted myself much of a supporter of the free enterprise system when it comes to dealing with the socially created value in land, and I suppose anything I say in that regard will be so much wasted words for the time being. But eventually, I am hopeful in the long run that society will catch up with itself and will discover just how unjust it is, and that the few who, at the moment, own land where there is a pressure of ever-growing metropolitan areas upon it and thereby seek to derive the benefit of what is fundamentally a socially created value, ought to be required to contribute or plough back a goodly portion of that value into the society which created it.

I would not hesitate to advocate in that regard a capital gains tax. If we are going to have a capital gains tax in this country—and I expect we will—I would not hesitate to advocate the first place it be applied is on land. As a matter of philosophical premise, I am willing to state in 1968 that it is thoroughly unjust, absolutely against any sense of justice, that the few should hold the gun to the heads of the many, and hold it up for unconscionable, inequitable and oppressive prices for land that might be used to provide what is a fundamental right to the citizen—a decent roof over the heads of his family.

And we have seen in recent years an absolutely astonishing increase in land values

simply because of the pressure of population, the coming of age of a generation that was conceived during wartime and now, having left their father's house, they seek to provide one for their young wives and their children of tender age. It is ultimately disgraceful, truly ultimately disgraceful for government, which is the final power within the geographical limits, to be a party to what amounts to a conspiracy to derive unjust benefit from the sale of land.

Jefferson said a long time ago—and most of what Jefferson ever said, of course, has found its way in an eternal form on the printed pages of history—that the land belongs to the living and it is the living who ought to derive the benefit from its use. To me there is something absolutely, fundamentally repugnant to common and moral sense that any group of individuals can point to a portion of the earth's surface which, after all, is finite and measurable, and say, as against the rest of you, "This future is ours, to do with as we please". It will not surely be many generations, heaven help us, until mankind turns against that notion and demolishes it for the evil and vicious proposition that it is.

Mr. MacDonald: The member is certainly not giving the Liberal philosohpy.

Mr. Sopha: I am speaking the philosophy of Elmer Sopha, the member for Sudbury, who comes here with 10,000 votes behind him, that is whose philosophy I am stating. That philosophy, of course, if you had blown the dust off the book, was first conceived by Henry George three-quarters of a century ago and is eternal in its validity.

Mr. Gisborn: That is a long time ago.

Mr. Sopha: Well, three-quarters of a century ago.

Mr. Peacock: The member has talked about Henry George—

Mr. Sopha: All right, I talked about him, I have talked about him before.

Mr. Gisborn: Does the member for York Centre agree?

Mr. Sopha: I do not know who agrees with me or who does not, and that is the end of our private conversation for this afternoon. You wait until I am outside and address all those questions to me in rapid fire succession.

Now I stand here in my place and I am going to raise the housing problem, but I have listened all afternoon and I heard members from all the four corners of the province say they have a housing problem in their particular areas, so I said to myself before I got up that there is nothing unique about a housing problem in Sudbury. Apparently, the same symptoms and the same ills afflict the body politic wherever you find it in Ontario, because everybody seems to have a complaint, at least in the Opposition benches. If the government members but gave vent to their own feelings, they could probably fill the record with a good many more instances of inadequacy of housing in the areas they represent. And in that regard, one well remembers the oratory such as one never heard its like before in this House, of the member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton) a few years ago.

Mr. Nixon: That was a great speech.

Mr. Sopha: A pity such eloquence has been stilled in recent years.

The next proposition I seek to make is that in no area of the social environment has government and politicians failed the people more in the last generation than in the area of housing. And if I had but had it here, of course, I would refer to the document that launched this party on its 25 years, come August 4—is it, this year—its reign in Ontario, that document of 25 years ago that the Premier (Mr. Robarts) likes to forget.

He will not refer to it tonight at the coliseum, but that document, of course, advocated that this party, the Progressive Conservative Party, would build thousands of houses for the people of Ontario. They would have a great surge after the war of provision of shelter for our people. But 25 years later, the people of Ontario still face inadequacy in the fulfillment of that fundamental right.

The second proposition in that regard in saying that governments and politicians have failed the people, is to state bluntly that there are too many governments involved. Every level of government is involved in the provision of housing. Why is it in other areas, in a day and age when we are so jealous of constitutional jurisdiction, when an election campaign is being fought on the issue of who has jurisdiction over what, and they so jealously guard their perquisites and their areas of the division of power that they claim unto themselves, why is it in the provision of this social necessity that every level of government has to be involved, federal, provincial and municipal?

There is one level that could rapidly be eliminated and that is the level of government that is beholden to this Legislature, the level that is a creature of this Legislature. The Minister wants to be political. Well, I am going to entertain him with a little politics a little later on, but I said during the election campaign that I would not hesitate to see the municipal level eliminated from this field and direct intervention by the provincial government where the need is dire, where people are in misery. What is the extent of the misery?

I was going to save this phrase until later but I will put it in now: What is the extent of the misery? I can take you, Mr. Chairman, to areas in the city of Sudbury where people live in hovels and I would defy you and I, if we were junketeers like this Minister, to go into the heartland of Mississippi or Alabama and see worse.

Mr. MacDonald: You never said anything about those conditions until the election last year.

Mr. Sopha: I said that in Sudbury and I said it over the airwaves, I said it on television and I said it to the face of the council assembled, that we do not need to look down our nose at Americans and think we are superior. We do not have the race problems, we do not have the inbred poverty and all its manifestations, but we have conditions as bad as you can find in the worst part of the United States of America, in the deepest part of the black south.

Regarding the politicians, of course, one only has to keep a very tenuous interest and one sees that rather than build houses, the politicians squabble among themselves—they chart and they plan and they study and they form committees, and they do this and that. They have housing by headline invented by Robert Macaulay—was it not?—and brought to a high art of perfection by Stanley Randall, housing by headline.

Mr. Singer: Yes, it is the only place they build them.

Mr. Sopha: The only thing in all their eternal wranglings they do not appear to do —the politicians who have the authority—is build houses. What was it Laurier said about human misery? Some variation of something like this—evil is the man who sees wrong and having the power to right it and fails to do so.

Mr. Peacock: What did King do? He worked for Rockefeller.

Mr. Sopha: King who?

Mr. Peacock: Mackenzie King.

Mr. Sopha: That is the way Laurier put it and that is the extent of the failure of the politicians. All right, I will just get the election campaign out of the way—the one last October—by telling the Minister about the Tory candidate running against me—and this becomes germane, Mr. Chairman, to housing, because he was a great authority on housing. That fellow—a very frenetic, hyperthyroid, young individual, bent on becoming what he described himself to be as the burr under the saddle, which is a kind of a white knight, a combination of a white knight and that part of the horse disappearing last when the horse is going east, the western end of it—

Mr. MacDonald: I think we got you.

Mr. Sopha: He apparently canvassed all the Ministry, and one got the impression that many of the Ministers stopped talking to this candidate, but one fellow he conned was this Minister—he really conned him. As far as I could see, to the end of the election compaign they remained Damon and Pythias, David and Jonathan, and every other combination of eternal human brotherhood. That candidate went around Sudbury—I must have heard him make the speech 20 times—saying that he had been talking to Stan Randall; they were so close he abbreviated the Stanley to Stan. He had been talking to Stan Randall, and Stan had told him about some factory down in Indiana where they were putting out houses on an assembly line basis and all they had to do was elect him and he and Stan together were going to provide these assembly line houses in Sudbury.

It would be funny if it did not involve so much human misery, and the only thing he did not know about Stan in the con yarn that he was spinning the electorate was that the one thing that Stan does not do is build houses—the assembly line or any other kind.

Well, last July, just about the middle of the month after centennial celebrations were over, I went to the city council of Sudbury. I asked for an appointment, an opportunity to appear before them, and I went there and I pleaded with them to get ahead immediately with the building of low-cost housing units on the Borgia Street land, which now forms part of the urban renewal. I reminded them, that is all I had to do, of some of the absolutely disgraceful housing conditions we had in the city and here was an apparently large acreage of land which did not at that time belong to the public authority though it does now, but certainly was available from

the Canadian National Railways, and which could form the environment in which housing could be built without the dislocation of any person; they would not have to remove anybody from it in order to sell it. I do not exaggerate when I say that I pleaded with the city council to get ahead with it.

Sadly, during the election campaign, I undertook to my constituents that I would do everything I could within my power to forward the development of that area for low-cost housing and as I stand here today in the middle of June, I must confess to a sense of utter futility about it, as I have observed the procrastination of this department in respect of developing that land for tenant-occupied, low-rental housing units. Now this department owns the land, and has owned it these several months. Last Tuesday, June 11, the Sudbury *Star* as it is wont to do—and if the Minister has not been paying any attention to what I have said up to this point, I would ask him to harken to this portion of it—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am listening very closely.

Mr. Sopha: As the Sudbury *Star* is wont to do, last Tuesday it published a headline, "Builder Selected for 177 Units—Low Rent Housing Going Ahead." That, of course, was the leading headline in the paper of that day. There is a news story, of course, connected with that headline and I do not know whether the news story is written with guile, or whether it is deliberately disingenuous; I do not make that allegation. But in paraphrasing the news story I can say accurately that it does not support the headline, and nowhere in the news story, though OHC is referred to countless times, does it say that the announcement of any such launching of 177 units, as proclaimed, is authorized in any way by the Ontario housing corporation.

It says that OHC has selected a builder; it gives no authority for making that statement. It says that a meeting with the council is necessary in order to take the necessary steps to embark on the project; it does not say when the council meeting will be held. It quotes the mayor, and the mayor is certainly less than certain or emphatic or committed to the project.

I will just read into the record a portion of what the mayor is reported to have said:

> Mayor Fabbro said today that if there appears to be no question about the technical aspects of OHC's selection, "I will have no alternative but to call a special council meeting in order to send the city's approval of the scheme back to OHC for an early start on construction."

That statement from the mayor certainly is not unequivocal, it is conditioned, and I must say that I do not fully understand what the paper is purporting to say that his worship said in that connection. I do not know what they mean by the quotation, "if there appears to be no question about the technical aspects of OHC's selection." As I understand it, the selection of the developer is a matter within the jurisdiction of OHC, and once OHC has selected, I would think, upon the proper basis, of course, all other things being equal and in order, that the city's approval, if it is necessary, certainly ought to come merely as a matter of course.

I invite the Minister to use a moderate amount of time to tell the citizens of Sudbury —they will be vitally interested—just what stage this project has reached. Certainly, there is not much argument needed to be mustered to show that there has been a terrible delay in the development of this land, and incidentally I want to repeat what I have said in Sudbury. This, as I outlined earlier, is part of the urban renewal scheme, the Borgia Street area. I must go out of my way to commend the *Golden Mile* for the excellent articles it did a month or so ago on Sudbury and in which it described the Borgia urban area in considerable detail and indeed invited a lot of enquiries and comments about that exciting scheme.

But urban renewal is one thing, and the building of low-rental housing is another. I have said, and I await argument to show that I am wrong, and I am one who will change his mind if on reason and commonsense I am shown to be wrong, but I await argument to show me that the two need go ahead together. Urban renewal is not an end in itself. It is not a sacred cow. It is not a be-all and an end-all.

And the building of housing on part of lands set aside for urban renewal need not await the development of the master plan for the commercial section of an urban renewal area. The vital need is for housing now, and here is the opportunity to build 177 units and start to move people in them.

One other comment: When I was home over the weekend, there was another piece in the Sudbury *Star* about this matter. And the lord knows, he is my witness, that all I need to do is to sit in my office any afternoon and I can anticipate at least one phone call, probably three or four, from people who

would like to get into the low-rental housing units; would like accommodation in the low-rental housing.

I think that I do not use the right jargon. In the affluent society, we must not refer to anything in the nasty pejorative sense. We have got to dress it up, so that it is obscure and unrecognizable. I think they are called rent-geared-to-income in the argot of the trade.

Well, people want to move in there, and I can anticipate three or four phone calls, and indeed visits, a week from mothers or fathers who desperately need accommodation, and I do not keep records. Perhaps I should. I do what I can, and may heaven prosper Mr. MacKenzie, the local manager; he is so kind to an errant politician, and so helpful on occasion. And Mr. MacKenzie, unlike the Minister here, has not been before the House to make long statements about the intervention of politicians, but justice is done. I am satisfied, because the people are certainly worthy of the consideration.

All right now, last weekend, knowing that as I do, and knowing *a priori* and *a fortiori*, indeed, of the demands for housing, I pick up the paper and I read where OHC is making another study. They are going to send out thousands of questionnaires in the city to tenant-occupied premises, to people who are now tenants. I guess they will use the federal voters' list to single them out and get their names and addresses. That would be a good way for them to do it. They are going to ask who needs low cost housing. Well that must be the 65th study that they have made in the last few years.

Mr. Peacock: It is at least an improvement in the way the studies used to be carried out.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. They have made many a study. And I am prepared to say at this time, and especially in respect of the 177 units about which I plead with the Minister to make some definitive statement to the people of Sudbury, enough of the studies. A study never helped any person who had to live in cockroach-infested quarters, overcrowded, filthy, to describe the worst. No study devised by any government ever helped a person in that quandary.

Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, I saw just about the most dreadful sight that my eyes had ever fixed upon during that election campaign, when I was canvassing in an area of the city. I trudged up three flights of stairs, I shall never forget it. Three flights of stairs, and here was a family in two rooms—a kitchen, and one bedroom—seven members of the family—living in one room. The tiered bunkbeds for the younger ones, the mother lying on the bed, and the father was out. I subsequently discovered where he was, and you can guess it. He was slurping down the suds at the local you know what.

Here was the mother lying on the mattress, one sheet on the bed, a number of children running around, and the mother looked ill. I inquired of her if she was ill, and she said that she had ptomaine poisoning. And I asked her if she had had medical attention, and she said they told the doctor and they expected the doctor but one had not arrived as yet.

Well that sight, as I told my constituents subsequently over the airwaves, I did not describe it in the detail I have described it here, but I told them that sight was unworthy of a civilization that calls itself civilized. Just absolutely unworthy and as Bobby Kennedy has said in a word that I hope to use more and more; he said it is "unacceptable". That is unacceptable in a society that calls itself civilized and indeed likes to refer to itself as being Christian.

I make no comment on that latter adjective, but I am one that is fed up with studies, and I am fed up with the passing of the buck between politicians, one level of government to the other, and if the politicians want to evade their responsibility in this area, they have got it set up so that it is an unbeatable combination.

When you have three levels of government responsible for housing, as we have in this country, then the buck passing can be carried on to the highest development of the art, because there are always two other levels of government to blame for it. Finally, the last thing that I advocate so that the people of this country would get some housing—and you see the politicans of all parties running across the land, back and forth from Newfoundland to Vancouver, talking 200,000 a year. A nice round ball park figure. They are all going to build 200,000 units a year, though I think Douglas is going to build more. He will never have the responsibility, so he can really go all out.

If they meant what they said, and said what they meant, then the way out of the mess, is for all the governments to come to a common resolution bent on the ultimate goal—the provision of decent housing for our people—and give to a body of some kind, the

final decision-making power to make the decisions to build the houses.

So that you would not have the municipal councillors wrangling among themselves. You would not have the manager of the OHC running to his Minister every time a decision on policy is made. You would not have the manager of CMHC running to the appropriate Minister in Ottawa to get his authority, and the interminable delays that follow from the resorts to higher authority.

Some kind of plenipotentiary body in this country is required which would have the power by co-operation between governments to build the houses that are so desperately needed. Now, as one who has seen how democracy can marshal its resources and its energies in times of national crisis, it makes one wonder in times of peace how powerless democracy is to remove human suffering in such a fundamental manifestation. To see the futility, and how badly democracy works when the Canadian people, those of our numbers who live in poverty stricken conditions —inadequate housing—how they have to be victimized by procrastination and red tape and finally all the pompous patronizing, large oval, adjectival, superlative statements of this Minister which will not eradicate one iota, the responsibility of the blame, or the shame that attends this blot on our society.

And one can only wish, when one sees these conditions, that some means could be found that someone could come forward and that some magical marshalling of the forces of democracy could be arrived at so that society together, collectively, could make an assault on this blight and eradicate all the talk and all the ball park figures, and finally do what is absolutely necessary—build some houses for our people.

Not only the 177 that I have been pleading for in Sudbury, but tens of thousands more and in the process, let me eliminate the figures, the necessary number to provide adequate housing, which I would describe as a fundamental right to the individual. At least, he ought to derive that from the society in which he lives.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What about the 9.25 per cent interest rate on mortgage money?

Mr. Sopha: Well, that is another field and I am not going to get into that. That is another subject in itself and I have some pretty strong views on that. All the views that I express here are personal, and I am not going to stand here long enough to wrangle with the fringe here, that after June 25 will not really count in the affairs of the country.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the Minister is going to reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury.

Could the Minister tell the House just how much money taxpayers in Ontario pay toward actual subsidization of housing in the province; that is, public housing, Mr. Chairman?

The latest information in print appears, I believe, in the public accounts for the province for 1966-67. I see there only several items of expense that could not be considered overhead but could be considered direct subsidization. These are the interest paid on the advances to the corporation for federal-provincial projects and Ontario housing projects, which in 1966-67 amounted to $1.4 million. But the interest that the corporation earned on projects, both federal-provincial and Ontario housing, totalled $1.6 million, which left the corporation only $200,000 behind. The loss on operations, which I assume is the total of the costs of administering and maintaining federal and provincial projects, amounted to $412,000.

Excluding the overhead expenses, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that just short of $700,000 was spent in 1966-67 by the taxpayers of Ontario on the subsidization of public housing. That was all that was spent that could not be recovered from rents and interest on the projects.

I wonder if the Minister could tell me if I am correct in making that assumption? Would he bring me a little more up to date on the amounts of money that are being put into subsidies for the so-called low income units in later years?

Hon. Mr. Randall: While my associates are looking up that figure, I will say a word to my friend from Sudbury.

He talked about the 177 units approved by the board on June 5 after discussion with the authorities in Sudbury. They will be meeting with the Sudbury officials for the approval of the plan next week. If they approve the plans, they will get underway.

Now as you know, they can reject the plans if they do not want the buildings, but I do not think that we are going to have any difficulty along these lines.

Mr. Sopha: Well the problem is this: There has always been a matter—your Mr. Suters

will tell you I am sure—there has been a matter about the provision of services that has been a stumbling block to agreement. The city feels it is being heisted on the stopping-up of streets, the provision of streets and the services. They feel that the burden on them is just too great to bear. I hope this will not be fatal to the actual sound of the hammers and saws in that area, I hope—and I say this seriously—this summer or early fall at the latest.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the Minister was giving any consideration to change of policy in treatment of tenants, first in the payment of rents.

In the various speeches that have been made on this estimate there have been complaints about tenant treatment. I am among those complaining, and the member for Windsor West set out what he considered a bill of rights for tenants. Certainly the bill of rights for the tenant is needed not only for OHC but for tenants throughout the province. I would like especially to draw to the attention of the Minister the matter of how the rents are set.

I know they have been geared to income, but of course rather stupid and ridiculous situations arise. I pointed out one instance of which I knew where a teenager, when she finished high school and started work, left home because the rent would go up too much; it was cheaper for her to leave home.

I have a number of questions on this, but so that we do not wander too far from the point, has the Minister any intention of changing the present programme on the way the rents are set?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would like first to answer the question from the hon. member for Windsor West. The subsidy in 1967 was $1,050,000, the net subsidy; and it is anticipated that this year the subsidy will be $1,586,000.

In reply to the hon. member for Parkdale, who said because the income of a child who starts work is added to the family income OHC is forcing children to leave home because the parents cannot afford higher rental rates; is this what you are referring to?

Mr. Trotter: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The first $75 of a working child's income was taken into account in calculating rentals. Assuming the child earns $75 per month or more this would have the effect of increasing the rental of a unit by an amount ranging from $22 to $32 per month, depending upon the tenant's position on the rent scale. It does not seem unreasonable that a working child should contribute between $5 and $7 per week toward the rental of accommodation which may well be subsidized by a taxpayer.

Now our feelings there are that if they have got that kind of income a child could not live away from home for $5 or $7 a week. So I do not think it is a—

Mr. Singer: How heartless can you get?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are not heartless; we deal with the taxpayers' money. What do you want to do?

Mr. Trotter: Here is the principle behind this, Mr. Chairman; and I think it is what the Ontario housing corporation had in mind and it is a principle with which I agree.

The idea was that public housing was to be a temporary gap, an opportunity for people to save money and then move out into the market to buy a home. Because the general market has become so overpriced it is difficult for people to move. The average tenant in your public housing stays there seven years, and yet the average family in Ontario moves once every five years. You are obviously failing in your purpose. And again I emphasize that one of the reasons why you fail is because the system, the present system of setting rents, is out of date.

I think when it was originally put into effect the system for setting rents geared to income was a good idea. But you have got to change your system. I think it is heartless, though, with regards to a child. But there a number of examples where men refuse to work overtime—not because they do not want to work, but because the increase in income will raise their rent. Some women could go to work part-time, but under the present system they can actually end up losing money. By the time they pay the income tax and the increased rent, they can actually lose money.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask another question. Has the Minister given any consideration to a scheme that has been suggested from many sources? That is if people are paying an increased amount of rent as a result of the money they make—and in some cases it goes to a high as 30 per cent of their income—is there any possibility of a certain proportion of the increased rent being put into a fund then refunded if they wanted to move out and buy a home?

In other words, I am asking for a progressive policy where people are encouraged to save, encouraged to work and to get out in the private market. Is there any indication that such an idea would be acceptable to the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, there is no plan at the present time. But as you know, we have discussed with central mortgage and housing, the freezing of the present ceiling. There will be no increase until we can get a programme worked out with central mortgage and housing after June 25. It is a difficult question to answer, because the people living in public housing are already being subsidized. The original idea was that they go into public housing in order to have decent accommodation. If they are in public housing and somebody else is footing the bill—maybe the neighbour next door—and they say: "Well, I would like to stay here at a reduced rent so I can save up for a down payment"—what is the attitude of the fellow across the road? I think it is a reasonable assumption that the man across the road would say: "Look, I earn the same kind of money. I have got two youngsters and he has four. Because he has four, I am having to subsidize him so he can save for a down payment."

One of the things we would like to see done, of course, is a ceiling placed on rents so that they are not paying more than market price. As I told our friend from Windsor West and some others who met with me, we are working with central mortgage and housing corporation to provide a ceiling which would be, perhaps, 5 per cent under market.

There has been a great deal said about this 30 per cent that people have to pay. We have heard it in Windsor, we have heard it in Lawrence Heights—we have heard it all over the place.

Let me give you some factors here. In O'Connor Drive, for instance, 73.4 per cent of the families pay less than 25 per cent of their gross income for shelter; 25.4 per cent pay between 25 and 27 per cent of their gross income; and 7.2 pay over 27 per cent of their gross income. But none of them pay 30 per cent.

Now in Lawrence Heights, which my friend from Downsview got so excited about the other day, 78.1 per cent of the families pay less than 25 per cent of their gross income for shelter; 19.2 per cent pay between 25 and 27 per cent; and 2.7 per cent pay over 27. There is only one, I believe, in there paying 30 per cent. Alexandra Park is another good example; 65.2 pay less than 25 per cent; 29 per cent between 25 and 27 and 5.8 pay over 27 per cent.

I think the rental scales are very fair and a reasonable scale for people today, regardless of whether they have some other income through overtime or the wife goes to work. I can appreciate that if they increase their income, it seems like we are penalizing them. But on the other hand, look at the other taxpayers' position. There are many thousands of people in this country earning the same kind of money who do not depend on the state for subsidies.

Now it is all very well to say the state should look after everybody that wants to get into public housing. As far as I am concerned, we have got to continue to provide public housing and housing for senior citizens, but I would hope that we would place more emphasis on providing a means whereby these people can buy public housing. This is what we are trying to do by placing the emphasis on the HOME programme so that with the kind of incomes they have and the mortgage arrangements we can make, these people should be able to look after themselves.

I do not think we are helping these people or helping the economy by continuing to say that, if their incomes are at such a level, they should automatically go into public housing. From my experience, most people want a home of their own. They want a fix on their rent and the only way they are going to get a fix, in my estimation, is to buy a home of their own and we would make it possible through the HOME programme. I think there are many of these people now living in public housing that are quite capable—

Mr. Trotter: How in the world are they going to get—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, they are quite capable of doing it.

Mr. Peacock: Who? The Minister just said—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, no. I think you are wrong. I think you just have to have a little more faith, a little more confidence. I have got complete faith that we can work out a programme where many people earning between $5,000 and $9,000 can eventually own a home of their own. If we continue with condiminium—

Mr. Trotter: Is it $9,000?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I said between—

Mr. Peacock: You said at $6,800 they could not afford it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I said between $5,000 and $9,000 can eventually own a home of their own.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now, just a minute. Do not get excited. Do not have a hemorrhage. Do not get excited.

I have also suggested in Ottawa that the mortgage terms should be 45 years and automatically everybody says: "Well, look at the interest you are paying." I suggest that if you are going to rent for 45 years, you are going to pay more out in rent, and at least you have got something for the amount of interest you pay if the terms are extended for 45 years.

I have also suggested that the interest payments on mortgages should be tax deductible. These are some of the things that should be done and can be done to house the lower-income families. If we can finance some of these people in public housing now that they have reached the economic rent, it means we have got to look at the down-payment factor. We have got to look at the length of time they have to carry that, in order to take care of the income they now have. I think it was in 1965 when they said that over 13,000 people who took out NHA mortgages were earning $5,000 or close to it.

Mr. Peacock: Or more!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, maybe more. Sure, maybe up to $6,000. But today you see figures that say even at $6,000 you cannot afford to buy a home. Well, I was in Bramalea the other day. I was up there one Saturday afternoon and the man selling homes up there said: "I had a couple in here the other night. They walked in and they were $300 shy of meeting the 27 per cent that NHA requires for the man to get a mortgage. They went away and he ambled back in on the Wednesday night: 'I got it, I got it, I got a job at a store downtown that pays me $26 more a week for overtime and now I qualify for an NHA mortgage'."

Again, I suggest that, if these were lengthened and the down payments under the HOME programme were set, people could make a down payment on a $15,000-or-less home or condiminium apartment. There are many of these people who can be housed. They do not have to be in the public housing.

Mr. Trotter: Who can buy a house with an income of $5,000 today? You said from $5,000 to $9,000. Well I can agree from between $8,000 to $9,000 it is possible to carry a small house today. But can the Minister give me any circumstances where anyone making $5,000 a year could buy a home?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I cannot give the member any definite cases. I just simply say that I recognize there are many people who will never get a home if they have to qualify on a 27 per cent basis. So what do we do? We have to find some way to stretch the mortgage so that their down payments are less. We have to find some way of building cheaper homes, which we are already doing.

I can give you an instance up in Arnprior, Ontario. We have lots up there worth $5,000 apiece, but the people could not afford to rent the lot. We convinced the township of Arnprior that we should build multiple-family housing there, row housing. Those houses now are $12,700 and the lot cost us $1,500. There are people in that area who are making $85 or $90 a week and will be able to get a home, whereas before on the $5,000 single lot basis, they could never get housing.

We do not have all the answers, but we hope to recognize the fact that if you do not want people with an income of between $5,000 and $9,000 in public housing, you have to find some way to give them the kind of home they can afford to carry—either rent or buy.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I think the thing we should be sure of here is that public housing is really a last resort. The main problem is providing homes through such banking set-ups as central mortgage and housing corporation. This only provides for a small amount so far as interest is concerned. I am not for a moment suggesting that public housing should become the major effort of government. There are going to be certain proportions of our population who have such a low income that public housing is the only answer. But I think that we should make every effort to assist people in public housing to help themselves. That is the major role—to help people help themselves, and not have them trying to live off the taxpayer for the rest of their lives. Despite what people would say about those who are in public housing or on welfare living off the fat of the land, I feel they are a very small minority.

I know there a number of people in public housing today who are concerned because

they feel they are in a ghetto. They do not like it for their children. Their children do not like it. And it is unfortunate that the policies of government today under the present economic circumstances encourage people to get into the private market, because they simply cannot afford it. Unfortunately, the Minister gives no indication of making any changes.

I want to make one suggestion insofar as the tenants in the Ontario housing corporation are concerned. We have heard much about this lease that the Ontario housing corporation has. This is a disgrace for a government that should be leading the way. The member for Downsview pointed out a number of the items in this lease that simply should not be there. There are a number of things that should be changed. But there are two I would like to ask the Minister about to see if there is any indication of changes being made.

The one thing will not cost the government money, but it is almost a matter of principle. Why would they allow section 13 of a government lease, whereby a tenant virtually waives any right he has to any legislation passed by this government or any other government to protect the tenant?

In other words, I think the wording ends up: "—notwithstanding any present or future Act of the Legislature, the Parliament of Canada." Even if we in this Legislature tried to protect tenants, Ontario housing corporation has done its best to see that the tenant is under the thumb. I do not think a section like that should be in any lease in Ontario, I do not think it should be allowed. And we as a government simply should not tolerate it when it has to do with any government agency. So I would ask the Minister in the hope that we might have that removed.

The second thing is that the tenant can be turfed out of his apartment on very short notice for many reasons. The notice is usually about 30 days. And one of the stupidest reasons is the matter of reporting the amount of income that the tenant has. I realize when the rent is gauged to income you have to keep track of the income. But it would be far better if the income was set as the last six months or for that year. To have a situation where you can literally move in on a tenant in 30 days is wrong.

A lot of people say that it is not enforced, the Ontario housing corporation is an easy landlord and really does not enforce these sections as they could have. But if that is the case, I think you should have a lease that has some common sense to it, because Simon Legree could not have drawn up a better lease than Ontario housing corporation has. And if you do not enforce it, then by all means make one that meets common sense that you can enforce.

I would like to know if the Minister has any intentions of changing the lease they have now?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would be delighted to answer that question because the member is a lawyer, and my hon. friend who conned the House into agreeing with him a month or two ago, did an excellent job. Forunately, I was not here so I did not agree with him because I was not sold at the time, not being in the House. But let me just point out to the member—and he would know more about it than I do because he is a lawyer—the present OHC lease is based on The Short Form Leases Act and you can go down to any stationery store and buy one. But what happens—

Mr. Singer: Not one of those, you cannot.

Hon. Mr. Randall: After you get it, when the lawyers get through writing it up, even a Philadelphia lawyer would not understand it. Now, the majority of the clauses are standard ones and a lease of this nature can be purchased in any legal stationery store, as I said. As a matter of interest—

Mr. Singer: Terrible, terrible!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now, just a minute, be careful. I may be conning you here and you may be on the wrong side of the fence. As a matter of interest, the OHC lease was used before by the Metropolitan Toronto housing authority, which was ours, and incidentally is used by the housing authority of Toronto. It was drawn up many years ago under the wartime housing czar Mr. C. D. Howe, so it is time for a change—I agree with the members 100 per cent.

I am not suggesting the lease is perfect. The lease today is presently under review by the Ontario law reform commission and we have submitted a new lease to the law reform commission and have asked them to approve this for OHC. And again I say to the member, he mentioned it himself, we have not enforced that lease.

I know my hon. friend over here may take exception to this, but I would like to make him a deal. They tell me that Singer, Singer and Cork draw up the toughest leases in the city of Toronto. Now, if they do not perhaps

my hon. friend would allow me to send a legal eagle from that side of the House to this side of the House to look at some of his leases—

Mr. Singer: Any time!

Hon. Mr. Randall: And I think he will find they are no different from the lease operated by OHC.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Having said that, I commend him because if he was working for me, I would expect him to draw up a tough lease also. But let us not assume that the Ontario housing corporation is using anything different from anybody else because you will find that most of the standard leases have these onerous clauses in them.

Mr. Trotter: But they are wrong.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I know, we agree. Our hon. friend brought it to our attention and we are checking it out.

Mr. MacDonald: Do not try to bring in the law reforms committee. Our action forced you to do something.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, no. The law reform society will bring in one that I think even the member will be satisfied with.

Mrs. M. Renwick: When are we going to change it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Right away, they are working on it now. The member does not have to worry about it, we have not exercised it, nobody is thrown out on the basis of that lease; they never have been.

My hon. friend did a good job in pointing out the difficulties in the lease and we have taken notice of what he said. The law reform society is working around the clock, and all of the departments are making submissions, and it goes to show that we do get a good idea once in a while from the other side of the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Downsview asked me if I would table the agreement between ourselves and Trent Park development, and I will. I just want to suggest that these are the terms of the agreement in essence:

> This offer is conditional upon Ontario housing corporation obtaining the necessary federal, provincial and municipal approvals and/or consents which may be required for it, to consummate its intended use of the said lands as a land assembly project. This offer is further conditional upon Ontario housing corporation obtaining from central mortgage and housing corporation the necessary financing for its purposes on the sale lands. If either of the above-mentioned conditions is not satisfied on or before the date fixed here for closing, and any mutually-agreed upon extension thereof, and the purchaser is unwilling to waive the unsatisfied conditions, then this offer to sell is null and void and the deposit money shall be returned to the purchaser without interest. Ontario housing corporation reserves the right to enter on the said lands prior to the date fixing for closing for the purpose of making a survey and of taking soil tests, and borings, provided that any debris from such borings is moved from the site and test holes refilled.

In essence they are the conditions. Now, Mr. Chairman, the land was offered to us by a Mr. Hardy. This is the chap you asked me about. I understand he is a real estate agent in Peterborough. OHC entered into a conditional offer to sell on July 6, 1967, at an amount of $500,800. A deposit of $100 was paid by OHC. The conditional offer to sell was extended at the request of OHC to expire October 31, 1967, and an additional deposit of $50,000 was paid by OHC. On October 31, 1967, the corporate secretary of OHC advised the vendors that OHC had not received the necessary approvals required under the agreement to sell and accordingly the agreement was null and void.

Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to table this for the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: I will have some comment on that after I have had a chance to review it.

I did want to ask the Minister a number of questions. He said something about the subsidy for assisted housing this year being $1.5 million. Then he went on at considerable length to say that we really had to look after the public money and this was why we were being so strict. I think his word was strict. I would say mean, Scrooge-like, unconscionable. I do not know whether the Minister would agree with me or not.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I will not agree with you. I would expect you to say that sitting on that side of the House.

Mr. Singer: All right, but the Minister seemed to think that the $1.5 million was a very substantial contribution out of the public purse for these purposes. I draw to the Minister's attention vote 2312. This is a vote under The Treasury Department and the item there is "grants and expenses for encouraging and improvement of horse racing in Ontario" including research into equine medicine, and so on. The figure there, Mr. Chairman, is $1.8 million.

Is it not surprising that the Minister is so concerned about the safety of public money when it comes to helping people who need homes and his government, yet his Cabinet associate, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), is quite prepared to come to us and ask for $1.8 million to help horse racing? I think it is shocking and I think it speaks well for the philosophy of this government. The government obviously thinks more of horse racing than it does of people who need homes. This brings me, sir, to my very grave concern about the whole rental formula as it applies to the Lawrence Heights area.

I am not happy at all with the Minister's explanation to my colleague here from Scarborough about the way that you assess and penalize. I have a brief here—the Minister has had it for a few days, he gave it back to me this afternoon—but I am going to read it in full. I think the brief is important enough to read it in full into the record, and I think it should be there. We are seeking a meeting with the Minister. The Minister has not had too much notice, and he has not been able to give us a date yet, but I hope the Minister will be able to see the people from Lawrence Heights very shortly and explain to them why their rents are fixed in the present manner. The brief reads this way:

> The Lawrence Heights neighbourhood association was inaugurated one year ago. Our main purpose is for better living conditions in our own community, and to assist the people there in any way assistance is required and asked for. Our interest in rentals comes from complaints of a number of people in our own immediate community.

The Minister may well know—certainly I know, and certainly many other people know that there is a real concern and from this area come a great number of complaints about the ability to pay rental at the present rates.

> The main basis of this brief will deal with the rent scale and its effect on our way of living. It is a known and proven fact that the cost of living has risen 4 per cent in 1967 across Canada, and in 1968 is rising steadily. Our cost of living has risen with it and so have the rents. The present rent scale is not geared to present day living costs. This scale was drawn up for use a year ago May, and was three years in being prepared. The cost of living three years ago compared with the present income would enable people to save and to move out of public housing but not present income and present cost of living.

Now there is the whole point, Mr. Chairman. The income is so geared that most tenants who move into publicly-assisted housing—publicly-assisted, I repeat again, to the extent of $1.5 million this year, while horses are assisted for racing to the extent of $1.8 million—the whole effect of this so-called geared-to-income rental is to lock these people into this kind of accommodation and almost completely prevent them from ever getting out.

This will unfold a little more fully as I go on with the contents of this brief and interpolate my own remarks: "The system as it now is leads to deceit and cheating on the part of the householder". I say, Mr. Chairman, you cannot really blame the householder when he is trying just a little bit to better himself, to provide a few more amenities and maybe to put a few dollars away in the bank in the hope that there will be enough in the bank some day to have a down payment which will allow him to get out of public housing.

The labour force suffers also, as many women cannot go out to work because of an increase in rent. Women go to work and do not report this to their area supervisor. I suppose it is unfair to call the system of supervision in there the Gastapo, but often it is made to me to appear as though you have all sorts of snoopers around there who are trying to find out if and when Mrs. Jones was seen working in the supermarket for a few hours so that somebody can descend upon her and say, "Ho, ho, we caught you. You were out working in the supermarket. You were being a cashier, or you were helping there. You must have made an income and the records show you did not report it. So not only are we going to put up your rent, but we are going to give you a penalty on top of that—and you cannot stay unless you pay the penalty and the increase in rent."

So what do you do? You discourage that sort of an ambition. "There is always someone in the area ready to lend a helping hand and be happy to be of some assistance and report these women." In this—it is not too veiled—the suggestion is that there is the occasional tenant who will inform on his neighbour and in this way the whole procedure gets into high gear and you investigate and you find that Mrs. Jones has been working for a few hours in the supermarket. She must have added to her income. Or that Willie has a paper route and he must have had an extra income—so up goes the rent.

And if it has not been reported, there is a penalty added on top of it: "Immediately there is an increase in rent and a penalty rent is assessed also". Could there be anything more heartless, Mr. Chairman? Could there be anything more cruel? Could there be anything that illustrates less real concern about people than this kind of a system of enforcement? Even if the woman quit working so that the rent would not increase, the penalty rent is assessed nevertheless and must be paid. There is no hope of the family being able to save enough money for the down payment on their home elsewhere, or even saving enough to go into the open market with sufficient funds for the two or three months' advance rent asked for in a private apartment dwelling.

Adding the fee of $75 to the family income for a working child is a real hardship in many cases and my colleague from Parkdale touched on this earlier. What happens? Johnnie goes out and gets a newspaper route, or Johnnie goes out and he goes to the supermarket and becomes a parcel boy on Saturdays. As soon as it is discovered by the housing authority that he is making some extra money, up goes the rent.

What happens to the parents who are really living in difficult circumstances in any event—otherwise they would not have been in public housing in the first place? They are forced to go to Johnnie and say: "Too bad, Johnnie, you are making some money, and we know you are saving it up for your education." Or, "We know you are saving it up for a vacation trip, we are going to have to take a pretty good chunk of that from you for room and board." Then what happens? Johnnie gets unhappy. He is perhaps not happy at school. He is perhaps not happy in the crowded circumstances under which he is forced to live. He has gone out to work for the first time in his life and is earning an extra few dollars. It is an awful job keeping him at home any longer. He says: "If I am going to have to stay here I am going to have to pay a fair sum of money for room and board."

So he moves out. You have perhaps helped to make him a school dropout and you have added to the kind of difficulty that we have in our community about keeping youngsters in school. But this is what your system encourages, Mr. Chairman. This is what the system of fixing rents in OHC and adding to rents in this way actually does. This is the point that my colleague from Parkdale and I are so concerned about.

You have no real feeling for people. You say: "Well, we are giving them $1.5 million, what more can they ask? You have got to expect they are going to be policed. $1.8 million for horse racing is all right, but $1.5 million for people—we are doing them a big favour and let them all be grateful and bow down six times to the great white father who sits in the front benches of the Tory government."

This, in many cases, leaves a child to becoming a burden on the government—or an unwed mother. This happens, not only with Johnnie—it happens with Susie; a juvenile delinquent becoming a ward in a detention home and generally becoming a burden on society.

Mr. Chairman, I can give you documented instances of a number of children who live in places like Lawrence Heights who become this kind of problem and I suggest that the Ontario housing corporation scale of rental is a substantial cause of these unfortunate instances. The basis of rent, as it now is, is defeating the purpose that it was originally intended for.

Public housing, as originally started out, was for emergency use. Therefore, hopefully there would only be transient occupancy. As it is now, emergency housing has become permanent housing. The feeling of being locked in, Mr. Chairman, is the feeling that bothers so many of these people because as soon as their income goes up a little bit—and maybe they are in a position to put away a few dollars—you penalize them, and you destroy any initiative that they might possibly have.

Their recommendations are these: Because of the cost of living rise in the last year and because it appears to be rising again, the rent scale based on present percentage system is outmoded. Income should be higher before the percentages apply—that is, a rate of income of $490 per month, presently 30

per cent of the income, is applied to rent. They suggest an increase of gross income to $690 before you get to the 30 per cent and that the other rents be geared down accordingly.

The figures that the Minister read us a few minutes ago really are not that significant. He says only one person in Lawrence Heights was paying the 30 per cent but he read his figures too quickly. There are certainly a substantial number or proportion of the people who live in Lawrence Heights who are paying between 25 and 30 per cent of their income. I had always understood that a reasonable economic rent stopped being reasonable when it exceeded 25 per cent. As I say, I missed those figures and I would think there are 30 per cent to 40 per cent of the people in Lawrence Heights, which the Minister gave us, who are paying about or more than 25 per cent. I would say that whatever that percentage was, it is unreasonable and you are unreasonably locking these people into that type of housing accommodation.

They recommend that a man's regular pay be the criterion for rent and that any overtime or bonus should not be calculated in the rent structure. This is more incentive to save and there is also more incentive to work harder and to try and get out of there.

Mr. Peacock: The date of that brief?

Mr. Singer: No, the date is quite recent. It has not as yet been presented. It has been written in the last two weeks. The complaints are long-standing but the brief is quite current.

The fixing of rent on overtime pay or on bonuses and so on—could there be anything more unfair, Mr. Chairman? I do not think so because here is a man who has a job. He has an opportunity to work overtime. He is ambitious. He wants to make as much money as he can to put some aside to put it in the bank, to get a down payment for his house and what do you do—you find out about it and you grab it for rent and if by any chance he has neglected to tell you about it, you add a penalty on in addition to the extra rent.

The gross income of a working wife, here is another penalty that you add. The man is working and occasionally the wife is able to go out and work. As soon as she goes out to work, you add her income on too, on top, so you penalize again. Now the suggestions in the brief are quite modest. They are far more modest than I would have made had I written the brief.

They suggested the income of the working wife should be increased to more than the present rate of $250 a year. They want an earning power of $3,000 gross income per year before the rent becomes applicable and surely, Mr. Chairman, in a home where both the husband and the wife go out to work, they are doing it not because they enjoy it, they are doing it to get a few extra amenities for their family. When you look at the difficulties that so many of the people in Lawrence Heights have, they are large families, the great incidence of one parent families, when recognizing the desire that these people have to look after their children, one would think that we would lean over backwards not to penalize or to discourage. This is what our rent structure is geared to do. Then I have already dealt with the penalizing to the extent of $75 per month in relation to the working children.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to be able to present himself to this House and to the people of the province not as a Scrooge, as he appears to be. He is not a bad fellow but I would like him to explain why he is so concerned about the keeping of this subsidy down to the $1.5 million figure that he talked about when his colleague in Treasury is quite prepared to come blithely in and say we will give $1.8 million to horse racing.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, the $1.5 million I am talking about this year is the net. The gross is $2.8 million and that represents 42.5 per cent, the provincial share, and as you understand, our friends at Ottawa stand 50 per cent also of the losses—so theirs would be greater than that—and there is 7.5 per cent borne by the municipality. The losses shared by the three levels of government could be roughly $7 million last year so it is not—

Mr. Singer: We are just talking about your figure.

Hon. Mr. Randall:—it is not a niggardly amount I can assure you, and it is not our intention to penalize anybody in public housing. You wrestled off these percentages very nicely but you overlooked the fact that for a rent that geared-to-income scale, they get heat, hot water, stove and a refrigerator. Now, if they were living on their own, they would have to go out and buy these. They would probably be paying some finance

company 12 or 15 per cent interest on these appliances. Now they are all included and when you talk so goodly about people paying no more than 25 per cent of their income, I think you will find most of these people, 99 per cent of them in public housing, are within the 25 per cent.

Mr. Singer: Not according to figures.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well we are very close to it.

Mr. Singer: No.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sure.

Mr. Singer: No. For 25 per cent and up—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will give you the per centages again. Sure. On O'Connor Drive, 73.4 per cent pay less than 25 per cent, 25.4 pay between 25 and 27, and this includes all their facilities, and 7.2 pay over 27 per cent but none are paying 30.

Mr. Singer: All right, so you have got 32.6 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Let us get into Lawrence Heights; 78.1 per cent paying less than 25, 19.2 paying between 25 and 27 and 2.7 paying 27 per cent. You get into Alexandra Park; 65.2 less than 25, 29 per cent between 25 and 27, and 5.8 over 27 per cent. Only one family in Alexandra Park is paying 30 per cent. Now I think—

Mr. Singer: All right. Well, in one case you have got 32.6, the other case you have 22—

Hon. Mr. Randall: It depends on the people.

Mr. Singer: Bearing in mind that you have got a great number of people in there who are on welfare and who cannot pay a nickel, bearing in mind that you have got a whole bunch of old age pensioners in there who swell up your figures and who cannot pay a nickel, bearing those things in mind, you have got to—

Hon. Mr. Randall: The city pays their rent. That is all taken into account. It is no burden on them.

Mr. Singer: No?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No. The city pays it. It is in their welfare payments. Their rent is deducted from the welfare payments before it goes to them so that there is not an increase in their rents. If they are on welfare, the welfare stays the same. That is where the subsidy comes in. Let me answer these other questions if I may?

I pointed out the difference in the subsidy rates—50, 42.5 and 7.5, the first $250 of part-time earnings of a wife are not included. Now I admit $250, perhaps, is not a major figure but if a woman is going out, as you said, working in a shopping store for Saturday afternoon, the chances are that the kind of money she would earn for doing that would not be included in the rent. Earnings of children still at school are not included. You talk about us driving the kid out of kindergarten and he has got to go on the streets because he has got to make a contribution. Whatever a working child's earnings are, the most it will add to the rent is from $6 to $7 a week. We say a working child, but bear this in mind, if a couple are 60 years of age and they have got a youngster who is 35 and he earns $500 a month, they only pay $6 or $7 more for rent, so I do not think that the scale does. Now, regarding the brief that you just read a few minutes ago, and which pointed out that people say they had to do a little deceiving or cheating. I think that most people are honest but you have got to have some kind of regulation. You cannot just run it—

Mr. Singer: Now you forced them into it—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Oh, no. We did not force anybody. When they are not paying—this brief says that they are paying 30 per cent of $490, every week, it is a mistake. They are not paying that. They do not start to pay 30 per cent until they make $561 per month and as I have told you, we have frozen that for the time being to see if we can work out a new deal. Now, when you talk about the funds, and the amount of money that the province is contributing to housing, I think that you should realize what we have done. In 1965-66 the capital budget was $9.75 million; in 1966-67 it was $14.25 million, and in 1967-68 it is $47.5 million. In 1968-69 it is $62,374,000, and at the present time that $62 million represents 10 per cent of what the federal authorities are prepared to put in.

I have already said that they are putting in over $400 million this year, and this represents a 700 per cent increase in the last three years. I do not think that we have been difficult to get along with, or that the Provincial Treasurer has been difficult to get

along with when it comes to getting money for housing.

Mr. Peacock: Is not your increase this year $8 million?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, it is a $15 million increase, and that means that we get the $62 million, and the federal authorities put up 90 per cent. How much more do you want? I do not think that you can use that kind of money in one year.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, is not this year's increase for the OHC $8 million compared to $24 million in 1967-68?

Hon. Mr. Randall: No! It has gone from $47.5 million to $62,374,000.

Mr. Peacock: The Minister is talking about the total—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Only one member can have the floor at one time. Does the member have a point of order?

Mr. Peacock: No; I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Keep in mind that every time that this government puts up $1, we get $9 more from the banker in Ottawa; and keep it also in mind that we have to pay it back.

We are the best credit risk in the country. We pay it back and the federal government takes their 50 per cent of any losses and we take 42.5 per cent and the municipality takes 7.5 per cent; so I do not think that the province is doing too badly in putting up the money for housing.

I just want to say to you again that money is not always the answer to get housing started today. It takes time to start and time to get them completed. But the funds are there. We are putting the money where I think that it does the most good.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister when this rental-geared-to-income chart was made up and on what basis these percentages were figured?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The last changes were made in May of 1967 when we lowered the rent income schedule.

Mrs. M. Renwick: By what means was it lowered?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am informed that we went up to Ottawa with a rental scale we thought would be acceptable. It was graduated slightly upwards by CMHC. We finally both agreed on it and it was put into effect in May, 1967.

Mrs. M. Renwick: On April 23 a representative group from the Green Meadows tenants' association in Guelph, Ontario, visited the Minister. The purpose of their visit was to request that the rent-geared-to-income be figured on a more realistic basis than it is at the present time.

I am wondering if the Minister has any idea of the budgets of the people in Green Meadows, to know if this was a warranted request? We seem to have a lot of research coming out in this particular vote. I think that it is quite fair to ask if there is any being done to determine if this was in fact a necessary measure?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am informed that the average rent at Green Meadows was $86 a month. We did meet with the people from Guelph. At that time there were two considerations with reference to the purchasing of the rented accommodation and the geared-to-income scale. As a result of that, we have already stated that we have frozen the rents as they are at the present. There are no further increases at the 30 per cent level and we are hoping to get a new adjustment out of Ottawa when the election is over.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to the Minister, very clearly, that in my travels canvassing and my knowledge of ridings that have OHC projects in them, the tenants are in fact having a very difficult time managing on the percentage of rent based on the gross income; which is first of all very unrealistic.

I think the important thing is that the Minister determined this fact when the Green Meadows group came here. I asked for some sample budgets to learn for my own use what the problem is. I would like to read into the record about three sample budgets of the many that are here, just to ask the Minister if it is not unacceptable to continue on the present percentage basis?

Exhibit A: Gross pay, $477.91; net pay, $398.32; rent, $143.00.

Now you see, Mr. Chairman, that the average of $83 is not anything but a red herring. It is not a realistic answer to the problem or the question.

Hydro $12, telephone $5, groceries $200; a total of $360. And a note was added at the

end: "Plus $12 per month for bus fare, $5 for cable"; and I presume that that is cable TV.

Now that total family budget is $377 of the $398.32 net income, leaving the family $21.30 a month. The family consists of six children; one in university, one in high school, one looking for work and three in the ages of 10 to 15 years.

I think that this is a very important type of research, Mr. Chairman, that must be carried out by the Minister's department in order to realistically review the percentages.

Family two: Three children in the age group 10 to 16, and a six-year-old and a daughter age five. Gross wages $458.78; net wages $388.70. Expenses: Rent, $101; gas—this is rental of a gas burner in one of these units where the tenant rents it—$2.95 per month.

I would like to raise with the Minister later how they have worked out this particular arrangement and the deductions for burners that are rented sometimes or sometimes supplied by tenants and sometimes by the corporation; but the balance shows a budget for heating over a ten-month period and the gas item was $17.95; not an unrealistic figure when you take off approximately $3 for the burner.

To continue: hydro and water, $14; groceries, including milk and bread, $203.50—approximately $47.50 a week for 4.5 weeks, based reasonably accurately.

Now the balance of pay left after expenses is $52.55 per month. This does not allow anything for drugs and any other necessities of life whatsoever.

The third one is a two-bedroom home. This one has five children. Rent, $111 per month; oil, $20; phone, $5; cable TV, $5; milk, $25; hydro and water, $10; oil burner, $2.50; groceries, $140; total, $318.50. This family allowed $20 off some current debt. The total here was $338.50, from a budget of $381.50, leaving $43 per month for clothing, dentist, and so on, for two adults and five children.

The last one, Mr. Chairman: One month's earnings $379; net income $343. Budget: Rent, $88—now this is closer to the Minister's average figure but we cannot be unrealistic about these things and we must look at the fact that $86 is not an overall figure; heat, $15; light and water, $12; food, $180; family plan life insurance, $16; telephone, $4.50; for a total of $315.50, leaving $27.50.

This family writes:

> This balance has to cover clothing, drugs and other expenses that will come from it. We also try and run a 1960 car for my husband's transportation to his job. This has to support two adults and six children.

This is just the beginning, Mr. Chairman. I might say that what has passed in the two days previous is merely scratching the surface of the real housing problem. I submit these budgets because I feel it is time that someone came to grips with reality in the Ontario housing corporation as to the percentage of rents.

I understand these people have various heating arrangements, and I think that there was a letter went into Mr. Whaley regarding this. I would appreciate it if the Minister could comment sometime on their action or reaction to the letter to Mr. Whaley asking about the burners and the oil, the methods of heating and the deductions from the rent for that type of service, which was sometimes supplied by the tenant.

I had one other budget in which the family figured on a three-month basis and I think—

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the member would keep the remarks until after we convene again.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: It is now 6 o'clock. I do now leave the chair and we will resume at 8 p.m.

It being 6:00 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 122



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, June 17, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Monday, June 17, 1968

Estimates, Department of Trade and Development, Mr. Randall, continued 4569

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 4602

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, JUNE 17, 1968

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

(Continued)

Mr. Chairman: We are still considering votes 407, 408, 409 and 410 together, for purposes of debate.

The member for Windsor West.

On vote 407:

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, at adjournment when we rose at 6 o'clock, we were talking about the amount of subsidization that the taxpayer of Ontario puts into the Ontario housing family and senior citizen units.

The amount for 1968-1969 was $1.5 million and the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer), I think, very effectively pointed out the relative commitment of this government to the provision of housing at a cost that people can afford.

I want to remind the Minister that, in his meeting with tenants of Windsor housing authority on May 29, he told them flatly that though they were earning better than average incomes for people in Ontario housing—upwards of $6,885—they could not possibly hope to afford to purchase those same units that they were occupying under the HOME plan or under any other programme; that they were just too expensive for them; that the monthly carrying charges would be too high; and the budgets of these families inadequate to support those kind of carrying charges.

Yet he told them in the same breath, he reminded them rather firmly I think, that they were being subsidized to the extent of $73 a month on the average in those same units in the Fontainbleau development in Windsor.

I say to the Minister that he cannot dwell as much as he does on the extent to which the corporation is subsidizing tenants, and at the same time tell them that they have no hope of becoming homeowners themselves. He has got to accept finally that the housing corporation has got to—

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): I do not think I told them they could not become homeowners. I said they would probably have to go into multiple family living to become homeowners in an urban area.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, what I said was that they could not hope to become homeowners in those units they were occupying. I think that statement is correct.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not say that.

Mr. Peacock: Well, my recollection, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister told the delegation they could not become owners of those Windsor housing authority units in the Fontainbleau subdivision that they were then occupying, and that their only hope of home ownership would be in some kind of multiple.

Yet over a year prior to their meeting with the Minister, they had been told that one of the reasons for their selection as tenants in that subdivision was their interest in home ownership, because those same units would ultimately become available for sale to the tenants occupying them.

What I want to say to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is this. He cannot both dwell as much as he does on the extent—and I think it is a very small extent—to which the taxpayers in Ontario are subsidizing accommodation for families and senior citizens, and at the same time put his home ownership programme so far beyond the reach of families like these in Fontainbleau. He has got to accept the necessity for the corporation not becoming a supplier of last resort.

As the member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) has suggested, public housing should be, or once might have been, an integral part of our current housing stock and one which will be occupied for a much longer period of time than the member for Parkdale says is the average period of occupancy of public housing in Ontario now.

I think on both sides of the House, Mr. Chairman, we have heard this afternoon statements of reluctance by members on both sides—by the Minister speaking for the government, by the member for Parkdale, and

the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon)—to commit either of their parties to the principle that public housing ought to be an integral part of our housing stock.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh, nonsense!

Mr. Peacock: Yes, they did. The member for Parkdale in his opening remarks on this vote said that there still remained a kind of stigma around public housing. He pointed out how the housing corporation had designated public housing units in a mixed or integrated subdivision by planting maple trees in front of those units.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): I was opposed to it.

Mr. Peacock: Well, I think that is going a bit far, Mr. Chairman. I think the member for York Centre was going a bit far too, when he suggested that the private market ought to be left to measure the need for housing. I think that neither the members to my right nor the members opposite are really fully committed to policies to provide the quantity of public housing that we need at the moment.

Mr. Singer: That is nonsense!

Mr. Peacock: Well, Mr. Chairman, I ask the members why the federal administration, which is being run by their party at the moment, has allowed interest rates on conventional and NHA mortgages to climb as high as they have. I asked the Minister on Thursday evening why the corporation was building only another 400 units for family and senior citizens this year compared with last.

The House leader says it is a ridiculous suggestion that I am making—that they are not committed to a policy of providing the public housing that is needed when only 7,500 family and senior citizen units are going to be built this year, 400 more than last.

Mr. Chairman, the ridiculousness of the situation is found opposite in the offering of the people of Ontario such an abysmal policy, and I have dwelt on that before.

I want to ask the Minister to revise downward the rent geared-to-income scales that have been proposed to him earlier this afternoon, Mr. Chairman. Before we adjourned on Friday, I discussed a number of ways in which I thought the corporation could improve its landlord-tenant relationship. I just want to return to those for a few moments.

The member for Parkdale and the member for Downview have already dealt thoroughly with the nature of the present lease that the corporation is using, but I just want to give you an instance of the powers of the local housing authorities under this lease, Mr. Chairman.

One of my constituents on January 30 received this letter, and I will not read it in full, but it refers to sections of the lease, and says later:

> Pursuant to the above—

that is the quotation of the relevant section of the lease,

> —we hereby terminate and cancel your lease as of the 29th day of February, 1968. On or before such date you will deliver up vacant possession of the premises at Bloomfield Road, Windsor. Your liability for payment of rent to the date of vacating is not in any way affected by this notice or your compliance therewith.

Nowhere in that letter, Mr. Chairman, is there any suggestion whatsoever of the cause for which the tenant is to be evicted, none whatsoever. No reasons need be given, Mr. Chairman, and none were offered in the letter by the local housing authority.

Another tenant who was similarly affected—he was laid off from his job and there was a strike at the same company which came on the heels of the layoff—received this letter about the same time. It is a form letter and the spaces are filled in:

> Your rent is now 12 days past due.

Then in capital letters

> THIS IS MOST UNSATISFACTORY.
>
> If these arrears are not paid in full by February 16—

four days after the date of the letter—

> —we shall turn your account over to the bailiff for collection. His minimum fee for rental collection is $25. Further difficulty in rental collection will result in a notice to quit. Yours very truly,
>
> Project manager.

This particular tenant, Mr. Chairman, had gone to the Windsor housing authority office on a number of occasions, he had also telephoned to explain the situation that he found himself in, that he had been laid off for a number of weeks and at the time of his visits to the housing authority he was on strike and his income considerably reduced. But because of the policy of the corporation no rent reductions are put into effect because

somehow the corporation would see that as a partisan act on its part, the taking of sides with the people on strike. But it does not see at all that it is not taking sides when it refuses to change the rent it is entitled to.

Leaving that aside for the moment. Just before receiving this letter, this particular tenant had discussed the situation with the housing authority and had gotten a verbal agreement from the staff of the housing authority that he could make up the arrears of rent in small pieces over the coming month. Yet within a matter of days following that conversation with the authority, he gets this notice that he is going to face a $25 collection fee and will face eviction if he does not pay up by February 16, four days after the letter is received.

Mr. Chairman, constituents of mine have come to me and said: "My application has been filed with the Windsor housing authority for one year, two years, three years. Every time I call up I cannot get any answer as to why my application has not been processed. I see one family after another go in ahead of me and I cannot find out why. I keep the housing authority informed of any change in my circumstances for the worse or for the better, and yet I am still no further ahead than when I first applied. Is there any way I can find out where I stand?"

And there is not, Mr. Chairman. The housing authority officials do not have to give reasons to applicants why other applicants are moved in ahead of them. The housing authority does not go out of its way to determine from the applicant whether there is any other information that the applicant might put on the application that would assist him, or her, in getting accommodation more quickly.

The housing authority does not send out its staff to interview prospective applicants until there is some possibility of that applicant being housed. And very frequently, Mr. Chairman, I have found that tenants who do not think to put down full information on their application, virtually every detail of their circumstances that they can think of—medical evidence, income situation, division of the family, or sharing accommodation with others, any factor at all, Mr. Chairman, that might assist them—are simply out in limbo until a unit that will be adequate for their size of family happens to become vacant and the housing authority sifts through its applications and happens to spot that one.

Mr. Chairman, the member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) says that justice is served by a housing authority applicant coming to him and pointing out the situation, and he in turn relates it to the housing authority and manages to get that applicant housed. When a tenant comes to me and does it, Mr. Chairman, it certainly gives me a great deal of pleasure, but not for long. I am reminded that justice is not served, because for every person that comes to me, Mr. Chairman, there must be countless others who never reach me or the member for Sudbury, or any other member of the Legislature, when it comes to getting their applications processed.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Well, what would you have us do? Should we unite?

Mr. Peacock: We should not do nothing, Mr. Chairman. Of course we should take this up with the housing authority, but I say it is not a just way of treating applications from people.

Hon. Mr. Randall: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, would you suggest we abolish the housing authorities completely?

Mr. Peacock: I think we should make some radical changes, Mr. Chairman, in the way the housing authorities are constituted and in the way in which they operate.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Tell us about the people that are happy with the housing authorities. You must have a few of those.

Mr. Peacock: Many of those who perhaps have obtained accommodation are happy. I want to talk a little bit further on—I will not do it all at once Mr. Chairman, about how unhappy some of the tenants successful enough to get into housing find themselves. For the moment just let me say a few more words about the manner in which the housing authority admits tenants to its units.

I think it is a most unjust thing, Mr. Chairman, that some tenants should find their way to their members, bring their story out that way, and perhaps the member can be successful in having them housed. But very often he cannot, because there simply is not enough accommodation, or the member, perhaps has not had the same relationship with the housing authority that other members, or federal members of Parliament, have had.

It is not an open proposition, Mr. Chairman. There is no way the applicant can tell

why he was admitted, why he was not admitted, why he has to wait such a long period of time when other families can move in ahead of him. I think the point system that the corporation uses, and under which certain number of points are assigned to family applicants depending on their application, is much too secretive.

I think that in the point system much too much weight is given to the suitability of the tenant, and not to the need of the tenant for housing. I think in many projects, Mr. Chairman, that housing authorities very carefully screen out certain tenants, and for certain other projects, Mr. Chairman, they very carefully select what they think are the most suitable tenants.

I think the Minister's statistics this afternoon gave us some indication. He spoke of the Alexandra project when he was talking about the proportions who were paying up to the 30 per cent of their income, and I thought it was significant that the largest proportion of those paying under 25 per cent were in that downtown project. In the city of Windsor similarly I believe that the highest proportion of low income families find themselves placed in the downtown project. I find that the families with higher incomes are not placed in the downtown project, they are placed in other areas of the city and in scattered units. I think that there is much too much arbitrary decision-making on the part of the housing authority staffs.

I think there is a demonstrative housing need for a process of appeal by applicants as to why they are not admitted. They can be told extremely curtly that there is no place for them, there is no place for them in an Ontario housing project. They have absolutely no way of finding out why there is no place for them, and they have no way whatever of challenging the decision of the local authority manager or his staff. We would like the Minister to comment on that point. I put it to him last Friday and put it to him again in some further detail tonight.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am just waiting to see what the Chairman wants to do here. Do you want me to—

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the Minister should reply to these questions because they are ranging all over the place.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, the questions from the hon. member for Windsor West are ranging too.

First of all, let me make it clearly understood that in a meeting we had with your people from Windsor, we pointed out to them that they were up to discuss the difference in the increase in the rents because of the increases they had got through wage parity. That was the reason why we were there.

When they came in we pointed out to them that we did not discuss the fact that they could buy their homes right there and then. We did not promise them anything. They were not selected as people that could buy their homes. They came in to discuss the rent scale, and during the course of the rent scale discussion we said if their rents had reached such a figure, perhaps they could buy their homes, and we outlined what we were trying to do with central mortgage and housing corporation.

Now, insofar as the authorities are concerned, we admit that there are 41 authorities. You are bound to get the odd person who will perhaps have difficulty with a tenant—but I can assure you that there are a good many tenants who are difficult to deal with too.

I think you mentioned Alexandra Park a few minutes ago. The tenant relation officer of the city of Toronto had something to do with selecting those tenants. It was not entirely the Ontario housing corporation. If we have an authority down in Windsor, we hope that the authorities will use their good judgment, based on the information they have. As far as the individual you were talking about who got notice to get out or pay his rent—if he reads the book, a lot has been written and said about rental. All you have to remember is: Pay your rent on or before the day it is due, and if for any reason you cannot pay, contact your housing manager immediately. Now, if they do not go to the housing manager and they are in default with the rent, then naturally they are going to get a notice. It is a standard procedure used by anybody who is collecting rents. Why should the people in public housing be any different?

Now, insofar as the open registry, I think we had better put that to bed right now. All applications for family housing in Metropolitan Toronto, and elsewhere, are filed with the housing registry of Metropolitan Toronto or the local housing authority and the cost of operating the registry is borne by the municipality—in this case, Metropolitan Toronto and the Ontario housing corporation.

All applications for family housing are passed to OHC. If an applicant has resided in the city of Toronto proper for not less than one year—and thus meets the Toronto hous-

ing authority's residence requirements, the application is forwarded by the registry to the housing authority of Toronto. Applications filed with OHC are first classified as to bedroom requirements, allowing no more than two persons to a bedroom—with segregation of the sexes at the age of six. Within these bedroom classifications, applications are point-rated with points being allocated for factors such as: inadequacy of present accommodation, total income, rent paid as a percentage of income, notice to vacate for reasons other than cause, members of the family living apart through lack of accommodation and health conditions aggravated by present accommodation. Now, if you have got any others let us have them.

Applicants state a preferred location, which is usually dictated by the area of employment, type of transportation used to get to work, or other considerations such as special educational needs of the children and proximity of the development to a hospital or clinic, where there are particular health factors.

In view of the large number of developments which the corporation administers in all parts of Metropolitan Toronto—and this again applies to Windsor—this is a prime consideration in selecting tenants as vacancies occur. It is impractical to operate the waiting list on an open register basis or on a numbering system. Insofar as an open registry is concerned, applications contain a considerable amount of confidential information concerning the applicant families, and this should not be made public knowledge.

The system of allocating, on a number waiting list basis, is not the proper criterion for allocating housing. It may be perfectly in order for persons standing in line in a supermarket to be dealt with on a first-come, first-served basis. But it is the policy of this government to allocate accommodation on the basis of need on the part of the applicant, rather than on the basis of the date on which the application was made. I said that here the other day.

To demonstrate the impracticability of allocating on a number basis, applicant Number 501 may, because of his family circumstances, require a four-bedroom house—and he has requested a location in northeast Scarborough. Conversely the 501st unit available could be a two-bedroom unit in a high-rise apartment in southwest Etobicoke. In other words, the applicant and the unit just do not match. A numbering system would also mitigate against the OHC providing houses in cases of unseen emergencies. Again, in the case of applicant Number 501—who may be within 20 places of receiving accommodation when he last checked the registry, the incidence of three or four emergency families, who must be housed immediately, would have the effect of changing his position three or four places in the line.

This would undoubtedly cause resentment. Apart from emergency cases, the circumstances of applicants are constantly changing in terms of income, size of family, and place of employment. Their point rating is thus being constantly changed to reflect their current status, and their position on the waiting list changes accordingly. It all boils down to a measurement of need, and this is the only measurement that makes sense. If anybody has a better idea, submit it to us and we will look at it. But so far, we think that this is the only system that can work here or in Windsor.

Mr. Peacock: I would like to think that the system worked on the basis of need, but in my own experience in Windsor, it does not. There are too many cases of applications, that have been brought to my attention, where the need was obvious. It was not just because of a lack of accommodation that the applicant did not obtain a unit from the Windsor authority. I could suggest some other reasons, Mr. Chairman, and I wonder if the Minister would comment on them?

The member for Parkdale referred on Friday to this 20 per cent rule under which 20 per cent of the units and no more are made available to public assistance applicants. Mr. Chairman, I think that this is one reason why many people who come to me do not get housing in Windsor, or other Ontario housing, because by the time that they come to me, or by the time their application is on file, the 20 per cent share of the units has already been filled up for public assistance tenants.

I would like to suggest to the Minister another reason why some of the people who come to me do not get into the Windsor housing, even after a long wait, and that is that they are female heads of families. They have great difficulty, Mr. Chairman, in getting into Ontario housing.

I want to suggest that if there is any suspicion—and it does not need to be more than suspicion—in the minds of the staff of the housing authority about the morals of an applicant, that applicant is not given housing in Ontario housing units.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that there are just too many areas of discretionary authority in

the hands of the staff of the Ontario housing local offices for us to let this situation continue without placing over it some kind of public scrutiny. One of the ways, and it does not need to interfere with the confidentiality of some of the information on the application, is to tell the tenant clearly, simply and courteously—I want to stress—that the circumstances in which that family finds itself awards it so many points, and that there a certain number of families in the same point category ahead of the family.

But there always must be a certain number of units withheld for emergency cases. Of course, these days virtually every tenant who approaches a member falls into an emergency category, so it is really a meaningless reservation.

No unit in today's market should be going to a family unless it is an emergency circumstance. I do not find the Minister's explanation of the reasons against eliminating some of the secrecy about the way that applications are handled, very, very convincing, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Why do you not let us have the specific cases? It is all very well to talk hearsay.

I have a pile of folders here a mile long about the compliments of how these people are handled by the OHC. I could stand here until 11 o'clock and read off all the compliments that we get from people who are happy with the service from the OHC. If you have a specific complaint, send it in and we will take a look at it.

Mr. Singer: I can match each compliment with a complaint!

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is all very well to criticize, but let us be specific. Send it in and let us look at it. Now, before I sit down, maybe I can cover this point about the single parent families. The member asked a question and I have the answer here.

OHC does not have a hard and fast regulation concerning the number of single parent families being allowed in any one development. The corporation in the same manner as the metropolitan Toronto housing authority before it has a yardstick of roughly 15 per cent. We cannot control the 15 per cent because after the people get in there the husband may desert the wife and children and she becomes a welfare case. They do not throw her out because the husband left.

It should be obvious that the OHC has no rigid control over the number of single parent families in any one development, and the status of a whole family may change to that of a single parent family at one time, which it often does. The yardstick is merely a guideline which the corporation endeavours to adhere to in the interest of good management.

We are sometimes accused of putting too much public housing in one particular area. We are also accused of putting too many welfare families in a public housing project. So we try to balance it out, and in the main I think we are successful. But if we are not we will take a look at it. Just make a suggestion, we are willing to sit down and discuss it.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, the Minister asks for suggestions as to how we might assist in relieving the problem. Perhaps if we built more public housing we would relieve the problem to a great extent. This might just help somehow.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for Wentworth has the floor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to go back for a moment to the problem of purchasing the house owned by OHC. The reason most of these people are in these houses is because they did not or do not earn enough money to buy a home. They go in there and the rent is geared to income, it is geared in such a fashion that they are unable to save any money.

Then you propose to sell these homes, but in the main the people who are living in them will not qualify to purchase them because they will not earn sufficient money, they will not have had the opportunity to save the down payment. What they do earn will not be enough to pay the payments at the inflated prices for which you are going to sell the homes.

The first question I want to ask of the Minister is this. Why is it necessary to sell these homes at the market value? Why can the homes not be sold to the people at the price they were built at? Why must they be sold in competition with all the others? Why can they not be sold at the price they were built for at a time the homes were placed there?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, it is very simple. People have been in these homes, they have been subsidized for many years at the expense of the taxpayers. Now, if you sell them a home today at the book value, what is to prevent them tomorrow turning around and selling it at the market price and walking away with a capital gain? I think it is a very simple procedure. We are looking after the taxpayers' interest as well as looking after those who need subsidization, but I do not think that anybody in his right mind would sell these houses at book value.

Mr. Deans: Can I ask the Minister a question that is not related to housing just at the moment, but it ties in somewere along the way? I heard the Minister speaking not too long ago about the money made available to industry which needs it, and over five years you can give it to them and write it off. Why can this not be done for homeowners? Why cannot the people of this province benefit from some of this money that you are giving away? The one problem here is that you are not assisting in any way to reduce the cost of homes. You are doing nothing to bring down the price of land. Just what are you doing?

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): The member has a one-track mind.

Mr. Deans: I have a one-track mind? I agree with the member, if I may say so, a one-track mind—to help the people of this province. I may be one of the few people who has that one-track mind, there appears to be about 20 of us.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Why do you not give the Minister a chance to speak? You are repeating yourself over there.

Mr. Deans: I will repeat myself as often as I have to in order to get it through your thick skull.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Deans: The housing programme in this province is doing nothing to assist the problem. You are not building enough homes to make any difference. Those that you do build you gear to the cost of the private market.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): What about Quebec?

Mr. Deans: My friend from Hamilton Mountain says "what about Quebec?" Perhaps he ought to go and live in Quebec.

Mr. Singer: That is very relevant to this debate.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Maybe that is where you should go.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth has the floor. Would he please address his remarks through the chair.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I will.

I would ask, those people who are living in the homes I discussed this afternoon will not qualify to purchase them; they have been unable to save the money because the rents are too high, and even if they were able to borrow the money they would not be able to pay the inflated value of the home; what does the Minister intend to do to bring about a reduction in the cost of homes in this province?

Hon. Mr. Randall: If the member had been listening to the presentation I made the other day with reference to the public housing programme, senior citizens, and the HOME programme, he would know what we are trying to do. We are not spending $400 million just to go through the exercise. Here is a press release from the member's own newspaper. Maybe he will believe this if he will not believe me, this is the Hamilton *Spectator*, February 17, 1968, by Mr. George Farquharson:

> The Ontario housing corporation is Canada's only big league provincial agency waging an all-out attack on the housing shortage. It has made greater use of federal funds for the poor, the aged and the student than all the other provinces combined. It has pioneered with its own land rental scheme designed to reduce housing down payments for lower middle income families.

Now, I think the member's question is like "When did you stop beating your wife?" There is no answer to that question.

Mr. Deans: What has that done to reduce the price of homes in this province? What has it done to make accommodation available that will enable people to buy?

Hon. Mr. Randall: What would the member do?

Mr. Deans: If the Minister had listened, I offered it to him.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, there was a point in the letter read by the hon. member for Windsor West that makes me wonder a bit. This is a letter written by the project manager of the Windsor housing authority, and I presume he comes under the jurisdiction of the hon. Minister and/or the Ontario housing corporation.

He says: "If these arrears are not fully paid we shall turn your account over to the bailiff for collection."

I hope the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree) is listening, because this part of it comes under this authority as well. His minimum fee for collection is $25.

Now, I have had occasion, Mr. Chairman, on a couple of instances recently to investigate bailiffs' fees, and I can tell you with some substantial authority—and I have checked with the officials belonging to the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs—that the minimum fee is less than half of the $25.

I would like to know on what basis an official of the government of Ontario writes a letter, a threatening letter, to a tenant who is in arrears of rent and tells him that he is going to be charged double what the bailiff's minimum fee is unless he pays up.

When the Minister's estimates come before us I am going to have several suggestions to him about the use of private bailiffs. But for some time, bailiffs in this province—private bailiffs in this province—have been abusing to a tragic extent the statute under which they work and the tariff of fees which is set down for them.

I am just shocked and dismayed, Mr. Chairman, that bailiff, apparently employed by the Windsor housing authority—or someone purporting to speak for the Windsor housing authority—would suggest that the minimum fees of the bailiff are going to be $25 when the minimum fees are less than half, if you look at the tariff of fees.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, I think I should point out to the hon. members that at no time has the member for Downsview ever brought any of this information to my attention. I have had no communication from him whatsoever, and if there is any wrongdoing in the area of bailiffs, which are licensed by the government through my department, I would be glad to hear about it, and the complaints will be investigated and acted upon by my office.

Never once have I had any communication from the member for Downsview about any of these matters.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, let me suggest to the Minister that he talk to his registrars and he will find out.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I am talking to the member as a member of this House who stands up and talks about it now. He has kept it to himself and then he raises it when the House is sitting.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would listen, as he so seldom does, he would have heard me say I had brought these matters to the attention of his department.

Mr. Trotter: That is what he said.

Mr. Singer: That is exactly what I said. Now if the Minister would just sit—Mr. Chairman, he is out of order again; just let him sit down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister had listened he would have heard me say that I had brought the matter to the attention of his officials. If he wants, we can bring those officials here and ask them. If the Minister is suggesting this is not so, the Minister is suggesting an untruth. And I say that definitely, and absolutely, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: On a point of order. I am not suggesting any untruth. I heard the hon. member say he had dealt with junior officials in my department. My point was that he has had this information in his hands, and has never communicated with me as the Minister in any respect to my department.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, all I can say to that foolish nonsense is this. Surely one can expect that when one has an official in charge of bailiffs, and when you bring a matter to the attention of the official who is supposedly in charge of the bailiffs, that he has certain responsibilities. It is not really necessary to take everything to the Minister in charge. I say that if the Minister was on

top of his department he would have found out, as I repeat tonight. Here is another example of it, the bailiffs are badly abusing the right that they are given under the statutes of the province of Ontario. It is just as simple as that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Get back to the matter of housing.

Mr. Singer: I would like to know from him the basis on which one of his officials sends out a letter saying the minimum bailiff fees are going to be $25 when the tariff of fees calls for less than half of that? On what basis is this being done? And why should not the Minister in charge of housing have spoken to the Minister in charge of bailiffs, and why should not the two of them met together and acted within the law?

Mr. Sopha: A modern Simon Legree.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Snapping at our heels over the ice cubes. Well, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member for Downsview. I do not know anything about bailiffs' fees. It is the first I have heard of it tonight. I will be very happy to have an enquiry made by the housing authorities, to find out whether it was a $25 charge, and why it was $25. If there is a case, I will send a copy to the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, and a copy to you, sir.

Mr. Sopha: You should take that act down to the Coliseum, it would be more entertaining.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if at the same time the Minister is making the enquiry, he would also enquire as to the necessity for this kind of action on the part of the housing authority. Now, I know that the staff at the housing authority—who dealt with the particular tenant that the member for Downsview has just referred to—reached an agreement with that tenant over the phone, or in their office. They deserve to be recognized for that kind of flexibility. But I see no reason—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Could you provide us with the name of the tenant?

Mr. Peacock: There were a number of tenants.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, give us the name of the one specific tenant that you talk about.

Mr. Peacock: All of these persons were put in touch with me following this occurrence with the housing authority. What I do want to stress to the Minister, again, is that there should be absolutely no need for this kind of precipitate and arbitrary action on the part of the housing authority. It appears to me that—

Hon. Mr. Randall: If I may catch the names and addresses. Give me the names and addresses, and I will check them out.

Mr. Peacock: If the Minister will check *Hansard*, he will note that I have inadvertently put the address of this particular tenant—that both the member for Downsview and myself referred to—into the record. I can give the Minister, outside the Legislature, the names and addresses of the other tenants involved. There are a large number of them — a large number of them. I again repeat that there should be no necessity for the housing authority to act in this manner. And I raise the matter, Mr. Chairman, not to work through a particular case in these estimates with the Minister, but to illustrate for the Minister how indicative this is of the attitude on the part of many of the staff in the housing authorities toward their tenants.

That is the point, Mr. Chairman—not the amount of the bailiffs' fees. I appreciate the member for Downsview raising that matter though, because it does add something to the case. The actions of the housing authorities, in many respects, take absolutely no account of the tenants' right to dignity and some sensitivity of feeling and privacy.

I want to raise another instance with the Minister while I am on my feet. Recently, a young man who is the head of a family of five came to me, or rather contacted me by telephone, from the psychiatric ward of a hospital where he was receiving treatment. His children were in the hands of the children's aid. His wife was in the psychiatric ward of another hospital receiving treatment. The housing authority had learned of the medical condition of the mother and father, and the removal of the children by the children's aid. When the mother returned to the house, after the father had reached a point of nervous collapse—and throw up his hands—she also threw up her hands, and in effect both

parents abandoned the children. The children's aid came and removed the children. Now, the stay of both parents in the hospital was anticipated by their doctor to be rather short. They would reach recovery after a relatively short period of time in the local psychiatric ward, without having to be sent to an Ontario Hospital for further treatment. Yet, once the housing authority had learned of the medical condition of both parents—and the removal of the children—the parents were asked immediately to give vacant possession to the housing authority. I pointed out to the tenant that he should have his doctor write to the housing authority, and tell the housing authority that he expected the patient would be released from the hospital shortly, that he would be returning home, and that he would like to get his family back together again in the home that they had occupied for several years.

But the housing authority said: "No, you are not going to be using the home for the space of a month or so, and we have need of that unit, so therefore we are going to ask you to give us vacant possession as soon as you can possibly move out your furnishings." And this from the hospital, Mr. Chairman, "When you are released from the hospital, and your family is once again united, we will put you at the top of the list and give you priority for a unit, as soon as one becomes available."

Well, Mr. Chairman, if I were in that person's position—on the point of being released from hospital, and going out to face the prospect of not having shelter for my family—I certainly would not feel very bold stepping out into the everyday world again. I think that that kind of action by the housing authority—although it took some account of the family's needs by promising an alternative unit as soon as one was available—again points up the shortsightedness of administrative staffs with no social service background whatever. These people could not see that this was the very time that that family had to be assured of accommodation that it could move right back into, and that there was never any need to have them removed and their furnishings stored. A homemaker or some other kind of service could have been provided for the care of the children.

The Minister, to the extent that he does, sees housing only as a matter of bricks and mortar. Perhaps, rather than affirming it myself, I will ask him how many persons on his staff have any kind of social service or sociological background, who are familiar with the field of social services and the integration of social services into a public housing project—who can provide the kind of assistance that this family needs or any other problem-family needs? And in line with that, Mr. Chairman, has he any plans—as I asked him on Friday, but there was not time for him to answer—to associate such social services, or at least train some of his staff in the local housing authorities on how to use community resources, such as the social service agencies, to put tenants who have problems in touch with those agencies. And is he prepared to undertake, in association directly with his projects, such services as day care centres for the children of mothers who are working, and children of mothers who are the heads of the families—the mothers who so desperately need a little bit of that kind of support.

Mr. R. Johnston: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Are we discussing The Department of Social and Family Services or housing?

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): That is housing.

Mr. Chairman: We are discussing housing.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: It just sounds like The Department of Social and Family Services.

Mr. Chairman: The member has no point of order. The member for Windsor West has the floor.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: If I may say this, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Is the member on the point of order?

Mr. R. M. Johnston: Still on a point of order!

Mr. Chairman: What is the point of order?

Mr. R. M. Johnston: If we are going to talk about building houses, then we had better get off the sociability.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

The member for Windsor West has related his remarks to housing, and I must rule the member for St. Catharines out of order.

Mr. R. M. Johnston: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: This Chairman is staying right here.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could comment on the question posed by the hon. member for Windsor West. In the first place, I recognize that my responsibility is to provide housing. This is what you have been talking about for the last hour or two—we are not doing it enough, we are not doing it fast enough, we are not getting up the bricks and mortar fast enough—so my first responsibility is to get housing built. And I think we are doing an excellent job regardless of what the Opposition may think.

Insofar as that gentleman you talked about—whose wife is having psychiatric treatment and who is going to go in for psychiatric treatment, I think there are three stories here. There is yours, what I would think, and the truth. I think, if you talk to the medical authorities, you may find that he is not coming back in that house as quickly as he probably thinks.

Now, the housing authority, I think, took the steps that it should have taken. The authority told him he would be number one on the priority list when he needed his house, and when his family was gathered together. What the circumstances are, with reference to getting his family back, I do not know. Perhaps, in the minds of the people down there, the family may be some time before they are back as a family.

Mr. Peacock: Why does the family not know that?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I do not know. Maybe they have talked to doctors. How do you know?

Mr. Peacock: I talked to the doctor.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know. You have one story, I have got another, perhaps.

But I would say this. You asked how many in the housing authority have any background of social work. We have Dr. Albert Rose on the board—

Mr. Peacock: He is on the board.

Hon. Mr. Randall: He is on the board. He knows something about housing. Surely you would give him credit for that. You have Mr. Brady, Mr. Whaley, Mr. Suters, they have all had 25 years' experience in dealing with these kinds of problems. We have eight or nine members of the board who have had a great deal of experience in these matters that you referred to. We are not entirely dumbwits when it comes to handling people, believe me; we have had a lot of experience. I do not like to think because you can bring in the individual case here that this is the run of the mill problems that they have with the housing authorities.

It is not because we are going to have people in housing authorities that naturally people in public housing do not get along with. I can assure you in most cases that the matters are brought to our attention through the housing authorities. We will take a look at it. If it is wrong we will correct it, but lots of these things we do not know anything about. If you knew about this some time ago, you should have come to us. Bring it to us.

If you do not get any satisfaction in Windsor, come to us. I want to say this, that there is an appeal board. If people do not get satisfaction through the housing authority they can write directly to the Ontario housing corporation. We have had people go down and investigate all these situations.

You sat in my office the other day and Mr. Suters offered to go down and talk to some of your tenants down there that you brought in. We make visits to the areas where there are difficulties of any kind. We are not ducking the problems. We are working on them as fast as they come to our attention. But we do not know anything about lots of things you bring in the House. I do not know how we can solve them if we do not know about them.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, if I might pursue the Minister's answer for just another moment. I know the member for Sudbury will appreciate having a chance to sit.

I would like to say to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that it just is not possible that he himself or his board of directors of Ontario housing corporation deal with every appeal from every tenant who feels his application—or his eviction—has not been handled properly by the local housing authority. It just is not possible to say that there is an appeal procedure, that the tenant or the applicant can always write to the Minister or write to the Ontario housing corporation.

The Minister knows, or he ought to know, there is not the kind of equity in this province that is supposed to exist. I am sure the member for Sudbury can elaborate in much greater detail than I can about the kind of appeal procedures we would have if everyone appealed to the Minister, a political

officer of the Crown, instead of an administrative tribunal set up by law as an appeal board.

Now the housing corporation board of directors is not an appeals board, Mr. Chairman, and should not even be represented as one by the Minister.

I suggest to the Minister that what I have related to him tonight, has been put before the local housing authority, has been raised in some instances with his staff in Toronto but that these examples are in fact representatives of a situation. If the Minister would like, I will take him to one other area, it is the matter of maintenance. How can a tenant, who feels that the maintenance of a unit that he occupies has not been undertaken as it is supposed to be undertaken by the housing authority, get redress?

Here is an example.

> Twice in the last three years, I have gone to the Windsor housing office to apply for a paint voucher and I was told that my husband was earning too much money now to live in one of these houses and that we might be told to vacate at any time or these houses might be geared to income and we could not possibly afford to pay the geared-to-income scale.
>
> And I would only be able to get this voucher by signing a statement saying that they would not be held responsible [I believe that is by Windsor housing] if I was asked to move after the paint had been applied.

The letter does not have a date on it, but my reply is in mid-March so I assume it was written to me early in March.

This tenant was put off by the authority from obtaining the paint voucher because again, Mr. Chairman, and this all ties in again, she was informed of the possibility of sale of these units over the previous two or three years, and there is still no word. There is still no word as to when those units in Bridgeview will be sold and I find that this kind of reason offered by the authority just does not stand up.

Mr. Chairman: Votes 407, 408, 409 and 410.

The member for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, looking at an OHC survey result, the survey which went out towards the latter part of last year reduced the number of applicants on file considerably. The implication was that the need was nearly as great as reported because from 10,150 applicants there were returns from only 48.5 per cent.

Now in the first three months of this year, Mr. Chairman, applications flowed to the amount of 3,235 which pretty well has brought this figure up again. I think it is very wrong for us to assume that the old applications simply were non-existent when they did not have a return because 10 per cent of these applications had been on file since 1965 or earlier and 30 per cent of the applications had been on file since 1965. It is not much wonder, Mr. Chairman, that they had given up hope and had, perhaps, not answered because of the long delay in any sort of action of any kind.

I think from the new figure, which must be roving between 9,000 and 10,000, if not higher by now, that perhaps it is worthwhile to draw once again to the attention of the Minister that this has become so unwieldy now that something must be done, Mr. Chairman, to cut down the number of applications in the beginning. I drew to the attention of the Assembly and to the Minister, I believe on March 18, that flagrant rent increases in my own particular riding, Scarborough Centre, were accounting for a great number of OHC applications that I was aware of.

I am now travelling around that riding again and finding that the same sort of thing is prevalent. One-third of my riding, Mr. Chairman, is apartment dwellers, about 6,000 families, so I know of what I speak when I say that surely we could begin to cut down the number of applicants to OHC by having a rental review board, where the people could take the problem which is facing them, thus forcing them out of the apartment into the files of OHC.

We are not asking for rental control, Mr. Chairman, which is quite a different thing. But the number of cases that would come to a rental review board would, in fact, build public pressure which would insist on action from this government.

One of my most recent canvassing trips around Scarborough Centre produced the fact that the apartments are not being operated necessarily on a good business-like basis. This does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that all landlords are vicious or dishonest. It simply means that a lot of people on the files at OHC do not have to be there, and are there because we do not have any sort of place where we can examine the kind of operation that the apartment is flagrantly profiteering on, from the shortage of housing. When we have a place where this can be examined,

I am sure that the legislation will flow.

This particular case that I am going to isolate tonight—and I would just like to reiterate, Mr. Chairman, that on March 18 I expressly isolated three specific cases showing flagrant rent increases in my riding, to the tune of $35 to $40 a year over an 18-month to two-year period, whereas in a first-class operated apartment complex, such as the City Park apartments, the rent increase in the same period was just $20.

I present, Mr. Chairman, that this is an abuse; it is a merciless thing which is happening to the tenants because they have no place to go, they have no place to expose the flagrant profiteering in apartment rentals and they, in turn, become applicants to OHC. Now, the flagrant profiteering is usually written off to tax increases. In my maiden speech I carefully pointed out that none of the buildings had any noticeable tax increase. They had $400 to $500 a year. In fact, one year of the three years for those purposes of that study, the tax rate had actually gone down. The mill rate had gone up, but the assessment had gone down, so they are flagrant increases that the people have the right to come and expose to government; at present they have no rental review board, they have nowhere to go.

In Scarborough, at 35 Trudell Street, one of five low-dividend housing units are called Chelsandy Developments Limited — and I would just like to point out, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister why these two people are in need of housing and one of the two ended up on the file of OHC. The other one did not know about OHC.

Chelsandy Developments Limited—I would like to read into the record two notices to vacate. These were two of approximately six or eight in this particular building. The notice to vacate has no address at the top of it, Mr. Chairman, it has no telephone number. The address and telephone number on the letterhead has carefully been x'd out by a typewriter, so there is no reason to believe that they were not well aware when they sent this notice that there was no place for the tenant to turn to. It reads:

Without Prejudice.

Mr. Thomas Cribbon, 35 Trudell Street, Apartment 207, Scarborough, Ontario.

Notice to Vacate.

Dear Sir: This is to inform you that your lease will not be renewed, and you are hereby requested to give up vacant possession of apartment 207, located at 35 Trudell Street, in the Township of Scarborough, Ontario, now occupied by you, on or before the 30th day of June, 1968.

Yours truly,

Chelsandy Developments Ltd.

Per M. Wayne, Property Manager.

Now, the only person that this tenant has contact with is the superintendent and the superintendent just pretends he knows nothing about the notice.

I would like to describe this family, Mr. Chairman, because I think it is very important. This is a man and a wife who emigrated here from Ireland. They sat on deck chairs in their living room until they earned enough money to buy furniture. The father works at the Dominion Stores. They have two small children, born in our country. This has been their home and for no reason on this earth they are asked to vacate, the only reason perhaps being that they do have two small children, and in this housing crisis the landlord can put them out and put in a family that has no children.

Where do they turn to?

I have had Chelsandy Developments searched downstairs for another case earlier in the year, and from this I have some knowledge of where to find Mr. Wayne. But the tenant has no recourse about this problem, has no knowledge of from whence came the notice, and certainly is not a sophisticated enough person to come down and have Chelsandy Developments searched here in this building.

The next notice is dated May 30, 1968.

Without Prejudice.

Mr. Robert C. Burns, 35 Trudell Street, Apartment 308, Scarborough, Ontario.

Excuse me just a moment, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that the OHC file number for Mr. Burns is D9896.

Notice to Vacate.

Dear Sir: This is to inform you that your lease expires June 30, 1968, and there will be no renewal on a new lease. You are hereby requested to give up vacant possession of apartment 308, located at 35 Trudell Street, in the Township of Scarborough, Ontario, now occupied by you, on or before the 30th day of June, 1968.

Yours very truly,

Chelsandy Developments Limited.

Per M. Wayne, Property Manager.

Once again the address is x'd out and the phone number.

The Cribbon family, when I was canvassing this apartment two days ago, told me where

to find the Burns family to whom the same thing has happened, and a lady answered the door. Mrs. Burns was in bed, advised by a doctor, from a possible miscarriage. She has had two children by perfectly normal births, but she spent every day since May 30 going out looking for a place to live.

She finally had just overdone it and is now lying at this time in her bed trying to save their third child and absolutely frustrated beyond anybody's imagination with the problem.

I think that two cases are enough. There are many more cases from Chelsandy Developments and the rest of the Trudell Court buildings to warrant a rental review board for the tenants who live in those five or six buildings in that area alone, Mr. Chairman.

These people have never complained to the landlord. There is no reason given to vacate as you can see. They are both Irish immigrant families and I hope with Mr. Patrick Brady over there that might appeal to his heart. They have come to our country. They refer to this little two-bedroom apartment as their home.

I think it is time, Mr. Chairman, that we recognize that we have to give the citizens of this province a place to come with this kind of frustration before they do things which are not so pleasant. I do not want to think of people having to batter down the doors of this building to get attention about these problems.

When an apartment dweller complains, Mr. Chairman, I have an example of what happens. She wanted something done, the windows washed or the halls cleaned or something of this sort. This one is 1 Brimley Road, Scarborough, Ontario, Barlyn Investments Limited.

> Mr. Wilhelm Blankmeyer, 1 Brimley Road, Apartment 210, Scarborough, Ontario.
>
> Re: Lease of apartment 210, 1 Brimley Road, Scarborough, Ontario.
>
> Dear Sir: In reviewing your tenancy of apartment 210, at 1 Brimley Road, Scarborough, Ontario, and taking into consideration the numerous complaints you have about the management of this building and the rent we are asking for your apartment, we feel that you are not satisfied with conditions here. Therefore, your lease will not be renewed for the coming year and you are herewith given notice to vacate the above premises on or before April 30, 1968.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> Barlyn Investments.
>
> Per A. D. Brazier.

Well, Mr. Chairman, all I am trying to communicate to the Minister is that these are people who then turn to OHC, and if a rental review board would prevent 50 per cent of your applicants turning to you, or even 25 per cent, surely it would be a worthwhile operation. Surely it is possible to look into the flagrant rent increases.

The taxes on number one Brimley road had not changed noticeably in three years. Mrs. Blankmeyer dared to think that the place should be cleaned, that the sand in the playground should be clean—a child had been infected from the sand. She spoke about these things, and if one speaks about them one is at the mercy of the landlord in this crisis.

I think that it is very important that a rental review board be established firmly, hopefully to prevent the additional 3,000 cases as an example, in the first three months of this year, and to cut down some of the applications.

I would like to make a few comments with regard to the need for an open public housing registry, and that also is in the record, Mr. Chairman. I am not talking of a first-come-first-serve basis as the Minister described earlier. I am talking about a place where the people can come and go as anyone in this room who had an application in the Ontario housing corporation would want to come and know where am I on your waiting list, do I have a chance, and am I three-quarters of the way down on the list of the particular classification that I fall into in your point system?

The point system, Mr. Chairman, is the only way to judge cases for this particular need. It must be based on need. But I say to be based on need, and have the people never know how their need is in relation to any other person or persons on the list is a ridiculous situation.

Hopefully, I presented this in a maiden speech, rather than to criticize some of the operations that I felt should be criticized in OHC. I took a copy of that speech to Mr. Suters, to Mr. Whaley, to Mrs. Meredith—and the Minister of course was, I believe, in the House that day—hopefully, that someone would realize that there is no real waiting list at OHC.

There is a filing system and there is a waiting list for priority, no doubt, concerning the urgent cases. But there is no real waiting list. You do not know when you have filed an application with OHC, whether you are 500th with 12 points or 100th. I asked when

I went there with two families, one of which was Mrs. Blankmeyer, and I asked where her particular application stood on the waiting list. Mrs. Meredith produced the corresponding file of the corporation and said, "Well, you have 12 points." The client asked, 'What does that mean?" Mrs. Meredith replied, "Well, it is not very good." I said, "Where is the client on the waiting list?" "Well, she is way down." We do not really know what way down means. We do not really know what not very good means.

If they want to say that Mrs. Blankmeyer is one of 200 cases with 12 points, then she will know that she should not be hammering at the doors of OHC today at all.

So that is all I think is important about an open housing register—so that the people can come and see where they stand on the list. It is not to make their personal files, as the Minister said earlier, open for anyone to come and see. It is so the applicant—any of us in this room, if we had to apply—could go and see where we stand.

That is all. I do not want to lose track of that one need, throughout all that I am going to say, that open public housing registries are a necessity.

What is in fact happening now, at OHC—or at least until December of last year—all placements went through the hands of one person. As recently as March, it was my understanding that there were three telephone lines to that placement person on the switchboard, and the practice of the switchboard was to handle the three calls, and hold three in reserve.

I say to you, Mr. Minister, for an office that has between 9,000 and 10,000 clients, three telephone lines to the placement officer is ridiculous. I understand that the officer now has an assistant in the person of a Mrs. Taylor, or had at the time that I checked last —since March. But surely it does not take too much imagination, Mr. Chairman, to realize that this would be a suitable operation for a very small business; three telephone lines, three calls in reserve and one person handling all of the placements. I would say very definitely that it is not geared to the 9,000 or 10,000 applications that are on file, though it may be geared to the number of units that are, in fact, available.

It is only about two weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, that I asked the Minister what units were available in Metropolitan Toronto, and he said that there was none. So therefore, if we are only looking at the number of apartments we have for people, three telephone lines are fine. But we are not. We have 9,000 or 10,000 files of people who are checking—and some people have checked for as long as every day for a week. I would say that it is wrong to operate a $4-million housing corporation with three telephone lines to placement, handling three calls, and reserving three.

I have listened to the Minister give out the red herring that OHC has received 38,000 calls in the last year. It does not take much imagination to realize that 38,000 calls were not handled on those three telephone lines, and therefore a lot of them never got through to placement. I had many complaints from constituents that they could never get through to OHC placements. They have no interest in any other section. They are only calling OHC for placement, these people. They can get to the switchboard, but they cannot get through to placement.

I instructed the young lady in our research department, Miss MacDonald, to check and advise me if this was in fact correct. So she ran surveys where she called every ten minutes—and some of these are every 15 minutes. She ran a survey on April 19, 1968, of 30 calls between 9:15 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. and, again, of 30 calls on April 22, 1968, between 9:30 in the morning, and 4:45 in the evening.

Many of the calls are marked "busy switchboard," I see—I would say at least 50 per cent on that particular sheet.

On April 23 she made a total of 40 calls between 9:10 and 3:50 and by now we were getting concerned. It was in March that she began the first check for me. I gave her an actual case and asked her to telephone about this actual case. I would like to read into the record what happened with that case, because it was what happened that prompted all this other testing of people trying to get through to placement.

The research lady writes, on Thursday, March 21:

> This morning I became the friend of Mrs. Marilyn Lund, of 495 Lauder Avenue, to get some idea of how long the average person would have to wait to get through to the placement service of OHC by telephone. This was done with Mrs. Lund's permission because, if the call got through, I was going to check on her file, which is in our office, on her behalf.
>
> Mrs. Lund and her two-year-old daughter are presently living with her sister, and

they have one bedroom, and they pay $15 a month. Mrs. Lund earns $85 a week. She took a day off work to go down to OHC.

If I might interrupt, Mr. Chairman, you see that people want to go to an open housing registry. In a quiet half-hour after the House rose one afternoon I talked to the Minister about the problem of placement and telephones, and he said that a lady came with a broken pop bottle to OHC offices one day. Out of thousands of applicants, they are bound to get that sort of thing. But the majority of these people are not so inclined, and an open public housing registry would give them a chance to go and see where they stand:

She took a day off work to go down to OHC. She was told that a home visitor would be sent to see her and that she would be notified so that she would not have to take another day off work. This was March 4, and this is filed March 24, and she has not heard anything further and cannot get in touch with tenant placement.

Although the period of time that she has had to wait is not long compared with some other cases, there is an urgency involved because she has to move at the end of March and she is trying on her own to find a one-bedroom apartment, but on her salary this is very difficult.

The first call on her behalf was made at 11 a.m. I asked for tenant placement and was told, "The lines are busy, dear, try again." "When?" "Every ten minutes, dear".

Variations on the same theme were heard for the next six hours. I telephoned every 15 minutes from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. When I was not in the office, Liz Marchand took over and on one occasion she was asked to hold, but had to hang up after ten minutes. This is a total of 24 calls and not once could either of us get past the main OHC switchboard to tenant placement.

So that is away back in March, Mr. Chairman, which, although I was shocked at reading it, resulted in some constructive tests—the ones in April and May.

I read the results from the tests in April. I hope the Minister will come back and say, "Well, we now have 12 lines to placement and we now have six placement officers, or 12 placement officers, not one."

On March 29 the report from research says:

With the assistance of the office staff, 97 calls were made to Ontario housing in the past three days. We were unable to get through to tenant placement on 96 of these calls. The one exception was on March 27 at 8:30 a.m.

On March 26 and 27, I was told not to call back that day because it would be impossible to get through. This was at 4:45 p.m. On one occasion I was told to write a letter because they do answer their mail.

The calls were again made at 15-minute intervals, starting at 9:30 on March 26, 8:30 on March 27, and 10:00 a.m. on March 28.

Now, the last report, Mr. Chairman, for April, says:

During the past three weeks the research department of the Ontario New Democratic Party caucus conducted three separate surveys to determine the efficiency of the Ontario housing corporation tenant placement service. Telephone calls were placed at 15-minute intervals to OHC; specifically, to tenant placement.

During the last three days' survey, 100 calls were made. On none of these occasions was the caller able to get through to tenant placement. This indicates the plight of the average person who is trying to find out where his name is on the waiting list. He just cannot get through to ask. There are only three lines to tenant placement and an undetermined number of calls coming in per minute.

When questioned, the switchboard operator suggested writing a letter because all letters are answered. This is small comfort to a person facing imminent eviction with no hope other than what will be provided by OHC.

Mr. Chairman, remember away back in March I did not dig out anything like this. I was trying very hard to convince the people who have such a difficult task at OHC and there is no question it is a difficult task; any business which has 9,000 applicants and has a relatively small number of units has an unbelievable task. But the thing that would make it easier on the people who are waiting outside would be if they come and go from an open registry or, if they are dependent on the telephone—as this system

is—they must have more lines to a placement section, to a placement person of some authority who can review their case and advise them about it.

I presented this, Mr. Chairman, hopefully, that it might urge the Minister to take the bold and exciting steps to make the operation of this business the way he would make it if he wanted to streamline it, and if he wanted to attract clients and not let it continue as it is. As it is, it is frustrating and aggravating and it virtually beats down anyone who offers any criticism of the simple handling of placement at OHC.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is wrong in this enlightened day of improved civil rights and it is a disgrace to have placement of thousands of units in the hands of one placement officer, where it can be easily operated in a discriminating fashion. Oftimes it is unfair, not always, Mr. Chairman—by a long, long way, not always—but so much so that on occasion one would wonder what the real philosophy is of placement in OHC.

It is an impossible job for the person in placement in the first place, so the quality of the job suffers when there is no answer to the turmoil of the 9,000 or 10,000 applications which are outside. Handling what becomes available has to be done with a very fine expertise.

The Gray case, Mr. Chairman, is symptomatic of what is wrong with placement at OHC. The Minister is totally misinformed as to what actually happened in the Gray case. The reason why Mrs. Nancy Gray's accommodation was changed, forcing her illegally to enter a unit, it would seem, was because someone in placement, a placement officer, decided to play God and not move Mrs. Gray where her social worker had been assured she would go because of another family, a nearby family.

I do not want to detract, Mr. Chairman, from the need of an open public housing registry and the need of improved numbers of lines of telephones to placement and a greater number of placement officers. Those are the three things that I think the public of this province is entitled to. In this metropolitan area they are at seething point of disgruntled fervor and must have some sort of alleviation on these things at OHC.

To show what can happen, I would like to isolate two or three cases which I do not need any notes for, Mr. Chairman, I have them clearly in my head because I handled anything that happened with them myself.

The first one I would like to point out were two families, one-parent families, large families, one with five children and one, seven; the Elbers and Massey families. They were to be evicted from Morningside Drive when they first contacted me at my home. Mrs. Massey spoke because Mrs. Elbers is Dutch, and does not speak as well for herself. This was in the late winter. The two families were to be evicted.

Another operation just like Chelsandy.

The lawyer, bookkeeper—I believe in this case it was a lawyer—for the Morningside apartments, when I contacted him made it very clear to me. "Look, Mrs. Renwick, I am going to get those families out; they are large families, I do not want them. They are not trying to find a place to live, I am going to get them out."

I pleaded with him on the grounds, "Well, look, OHC just cannot take two families of this size and, bingo, have places for them. Give them three months." He was putting the bailiff in as of January at this point, after Christmas, after New Years.

I said, "Give them three months and I will talk to OHC and I will explain the situation and they are trying to find places to live."

In a letter to Mr. Whaley, I outlined these two cases and it was received well, I am sure, because the reply understood what I was trying to say—"I know this will not be easy, but, look, we have three months instead of one month, is not that better?" I pointed out that the facilities, perhaps, in a garden home type of accommodation might be better than a high-rise for these families.

Mr. Whaley agreed that everything could or should be done, but I guess they did not get anything because three months later, roughly, I learned through my secretary, they were both being evicted. The story that came to my secretary and to me, which I got a little annoyed at, to say the least, when I heard, is that the two ladies from the court took their blue slips to OHC and asked to see Mrs. Meredith, the placement officer. They were told she was not there that day and was unwell. They came back, they got a stay of an extra day; they came back the next day and Mrs. Massey, who was the one who spoke for the two, intimated to the girl at the desk, "Well, it is too bad that the lady is not here today for me to see because I am going to have to give the story to the newspapers."

These ladies have children, they have no father. I know it is not easy to place large families, but they had paid their rent every

month—in the one case in that building, for five years—either Mrs. Massey or Mrs. Elbers —and the other had paid her rent every month for two to three years.

This goes back, Mr. Chairman, to the rental review board. Perhaps it should have been questioned whether they should ever have been evicted from Morningside if we had a rental review board to go to; they might never have ended up on the files at OHC. But the man, being determined to evict them—and their leases had run out—legally was quite right. My understanding is that Mrs. Massey was given a place to live out in the Finch-Albion Road area. She was given it after she had mentioned the newspapers. According to Mrs. Massey, she was shown into an office where the placement officer who gave her a place to live was and asked her on her way out, would she tell Mrs. Elbers that she did not have a place for her.

This is just poor business, Mr. Chairman. The least courtesy anybody could have afforded would be to go out and speak to the other lady and say, "I am sorry we are able to accommodate this lady but we cannot accommodate you."

My problem became a very simple one. I wondered what had happened to the other family since they had been in my file and so on my way back from a housing meeting I was requested to attend in Guelph, Ontario, I went into the Albion and Finch area and I found Mrs. Massey. That is how I first found this whole area, I might say, Mr. Chairman, I never knew existed in the west end of the city. Mrs. Massey said that Mrs. Elbers was in the shelter and that also, Mr. Chairman, is how I found the shelters and what was happening at the shelters.

None of this need have happened if they had a place to present their problem and they would never have been evicted or, if when they had gone to OHC, they had both been dealt with equally. Mind you, there is a difference in the size of families. One had five children, one had seven.

I do not understand why Mrs. Massey was given a place and why Mrs. Elbers was sent to the shelter but I asked my secretary, because I was busy here in the House that day, to call placement at OHC and ask where Mrs. Elbers was. They did not know and Mrs. Meredith said, "I assume she is still on Morningside Drive." Now she could not be if she was evicted and people at OHC knew she was going to be evicted. So my secretary called the two shelters and found Mrs. Elbers down in the Dundas Street shelter. She called back OHC because it was a Friday afternoon and advised them right away where Mrs. Elbers was because she is still looking for a place to live, Mr. Chairman. I asked the shelter for a list three days ago and they have not sent it yet.

This was way before I raised the question of communication between OHC and the shelters, so I think this was a bit of a red herring. Obviously there had not been any list being checked or forthcoming from communication to the shelters.

I think it is the sort of treatment that makes members like myself doubt the real intent of placement at University Avenue, to pretend that the list had been requested, when it was not. The lady in charge of the shelter at Dundas Street said she certainly had not been requested for a list in the last three days, and it is very bad to me. It would be much better if they simply said we will try to accommodate her, let us know where she is.

I do not want to take as long as this, Mr. Chairman, to isolate the second case because I do not want to get off the needs of the open housing registry, the telephone lines and more placement officers but to show what happens, what brings someone like myself to the point of now and to the point of frustration for the Minister and myself in the many questions in the past week.

On Markham Road a lady in a condemned house, we will call her Mrs. B. Last December I heard of a condemned house on Markham Road I wanted very much to do something about, but it was a Friday when I heard about it and I was going to get there sometime before Monday. I received a call on Sunday morning from a journalist, called Brian Dexter, with the Toronto *Daily Star.*

He said: "I have been sent out to do a story on a condemned house and I have talked to OHC. I am advised by Mrs. Meredith that the woman involved is emotionally disturbed." He said: "Mrs. Renwick, what bothers me is that I have spent two hours with this lady and I do not think she is emotionally disturbed."

Mr. Chairman, I submit that whether the lady is or is not or was not emotionally disturbed was not the question. She was a lady

with an application to OHC. She has five children, a husband who is a waiter, a condemned house with a cesspool problem in the back and permeating through the house and Dr. Bull in the area had almost hesitated to condemn the house as quickly as he should have knowing there were no places for the family.

Now, this was in the month of December and I went to the family in the afternoon. The journalist was still there because his car would not start and I met the lady, Mrs. B. of Markham Road. I would be glad to give the Minister this name, but because of this emotionally disturbed reference I hesitate to use it publicly.

I sat and talked with the family. The wage earner earns $90 a week. He has five children and the price of apartments has just gone out of his reach. This was the real problem, but it was accentuated by not being able to get through on the telephone to OHC. In this lady's disappointment or wrath, whichever it happened to be, she wrote the mayor of the city of Toronto.

In writing the mayor of the city of Toronto she did not know that she was bringing down upon her head the wrath of OHC, because three months later OHC were to be presenting to the Toronto housing authority films, slides, brochures to take over the Toronto housing authority. Even I, Mr. Chairman, did not understand the placement officer's vendetta on Mrs. B. I do understand it fully now.

Mrs. B. was referred to in Mr. Randall's statement in my last question about the Gray family, and is referred to as being a difficult family. I present very clearly, Mr. Chairman, the only difficulty this family presented to OHC was that the lady wrote a letter to the mayor of Toronto complaining about OHC. She also, as the Minister has outlined, refused a place to live. She refused the 11th floor of Shuter Street with her five children. She refused going to the west end of the city because her husband is a waiter in the extreme east end of Toronto, but when she saw there was nothing else she did in fact take the unit in the west end and her husband is now driving an old car, which he says will give out, taking it 13 miles to and from work. Nevertheless, she did recognize the problem that there were no east end units; that she had a choice between downtown Toronto and the west end, and she went to the west end.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you would think and I would think that this would be the end of that story. But when I was checking to see where this lady was on the waiting list, I was told by Mrs. Meredith the lady Mrs B. was emotionally disturbed. I am afraid that I resented it, to put it mildly, and claimed this was not what I was telephoning OHC for. I was telephoning to find where Mrs. B. is on the waiting list.

I refused to let the placement officer finish describing Mrs. B. to me because it is irrelevant. Whether she is or is not emotionally disturbed is not my problem, and it is not Mrs. Meredith's problem. Now, this would have been fine. I once smoothed that particular problem over as Mr. Suters knows. I blew my top, as the saying goes, on the telephone to Mr. Suters. I said I was going to make a formal complaint in writing and I never did, Mr. Chairman.

I came back into the House and asked constructive questions I felt, until one day I got a call from a Mrs. Gray, Mrs. Nancy Gray, in a condemned house right across the street from Mrs. B. Mrs. Gray's reason for calling me was that she felt somebody should know what had happened to her.

What had, in fact, happened to her, according to what Mrs. Gray stated, was that her social worker in North York, Mr. Bellatuzzi had found for her a place through OHC way out in the west end, but it would be fine because her child could be transferred from the emotionally disturbed care she was getting daily in school in the east end to the Thistletown school. Mrs. Gray made the mistake of saying to the placement officer that will be lovely, I will be out where Mrs. B. is, who used to live across the street.

Once again, the placement officer, according to Mrs. Gray, came back in on the emotional condition of Mrs. B. Mrs. Gray's understanding of why she was not allowed to be sent to Thistletown development, after a social worker had been assured before Easter she would, was that she made the mistake of saying how nice it would be to be out there where Mrs. B. is. Mrs. B., whose husband is with her—Mrs. Gray's is not—used to give clothing from her five children to Mrs. Gray with her—I have forgotten how many children—I never did know Mrs. Gray that well.

What I would like to get across very clearly, Mr. Chairman, is that we cannot operate a large corporation with this kind of discrimination. What Mrs. Gray says Mrs. Meredith said to her was: "If I put you in

Thistletown near Mrs. B. you will be in a mental institution in six months." Now, this is the third time and I say, Mr. Chairman, I did not do anything about it the second time, I did not do anything about it when the journalist drew it to my attention, but how can anybody expect a member to hear this kind of thing coming out of a corporation and do nothing about it?

If I have to document it with documents, I will do so. I do not think that this is necessary. I think that the philosophy for placement can be changed and taken out of the hands of one or two people, put on a larger businesslike basis where this sort of thing does not happen.

Mrs. Gray said to me: "I intend to move into the units out there, because there are several empty."

On April 26 I tried to interest the TV station CFTO, or any station where I knew someone, in fi'ming the units at the corner of Finch—the San Francisco development, the one that Mrs. Gray finally moved into, whatever that development is called. When I drove in there from Guelph to see Mrs. Massey, I was astounded to see 20 empty housing units at least, with the papers still flapping on the windows that had never been occupied from the time that they had been built.

The red herring that comes out of OHC is that these are all assigned, or they are leased. They cover up and stick together. It cannot go on forever.

I did not know the names of those units—the first question that I sent to the Minister even had the wrong name on it—let alone know that these were the units into which Mrs. Gray would move.

The point is that the units were sitting there and Mrs. Gray was supposed to get into one.

Once again we get this personal decision of what the Action Line of the Toronto *Telegram* calls the miracle worker at OHC, Mrs. Meredith, and I say she has a lot of nerve to play God and interfere with the care of emotionally disturbed children by saying: "Yes, we will drive the child from the other development," to keep the one family away from the other and they were not even that close friends, Mr. Chairman. Mrs. B and Mrs. Gray.

With this pushed into the lap of the Minister, perhaps he will comment on why this happens. I think that one reason is the people at OHC having to make decisions as to where they are going to put people, and it is not done on an open public housing registry basis. I think that it is time that it was, and it is time that anyone making statements from December to April about a person being emotionally disturbed was stopped. Especially when they are not emotionally disturbed.

Writing two letters to the mayor complaining about the service of OHC does not, surely, constitute emotional illness? I would urge the Minister to look seriously at what he would do about that business on University Avenue—as if he wanted to attract clients to it. I can assure you, for one thing, that people would come and go on the main floor. We are not asking for anything more than a fair, well-run, sophisticated waiting-list system for OHC—an open public housing system of registry.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Now, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could speak on some of the matters raised by the hon. member for Scarborough Centre. Let me say first that it is obvious, with the type of telephone canvassing that your party has had on the telephone system at University Avenue, that it is difficult for customers to get in. I pointed out to you some time ago that we took something like 35,000 calls last year from members of Parliament, and social agencies, to say nothing of the people that called in. Now, so that you will realize that we have done something about your complaints, I am delighted to tell you that as I talked to you six weeks ago, we had a system we were looking at, which has since been approved. It is being put into 188 University Avenue and is called Centric. It is an automatic filing system. Eight telephone operators will handle calls direct from *bona fide* applicants, and not from people calling up to say: "I represent Mrs. Brown, tell me all about her case."

We will find out who is going to make the calls and we will give the information to the applicants. We can handle one call every 60 seconds with this system. Now, if we are going to get these telephone blitz' from the NDP office, there is not an office in this government that can handle them and operate. As far as the point system is concerned, we intend to continue this system and we are not going to go onto a time system as you suggest. Because, if we do, we throw away the emergency system of housing for these people.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The Minister listened very patiently and carefully and

surely you can let him reply. He is replying to the questions put to him.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I listened very carefully, and I think that you should listen to me and let me rebut some of these statements. I have accepted some of the things that the hon. member stated, but there are others that I just cannot accept. For instance, last year, as I pointed out some time ago, there were 2,025 families housed in Metro Toronto. And 1,014 of these, or 50.1 per cent, were under notice to be evicted immediately. So we are handling emergency cases.

Now, let me also cover some of the other people whom you talked about. I think that in one of the cases, you were referring to the emotionally disturbed, and that perhaps all of the people at OHC are not as bright as they should be. But, believe me, I think that you would have to go an awful long way to get a better staff than we have down there. If there is a personal vendetta going on, as far as I am concerned, it does not get anywhere with me. This Mrs. Benadetto that you are talking about, she originally registered in January of 1967, and was first offered accommodation at 918 Fir Valley Avenue Courts, Warden Woods, in Scarborough, during March 1967. This accommodation was refused. Our second offer was on January 4, 1968, and this was a new house at 128 Jamestown Crescent, Etobicoke. This was also refused. On February 15, 1968, we made a third offer—on this occasion at 14 Leavens Place, South Regent Park. This was also refused.

Mr. Sopha: She was choosy!

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sure she was choosy. We were aware that eventually she had to be housed, and eventually she wound up at 30 Orpingdon Crescent, in the Thistletown development. We have received notice today that she has given us two weeks notice. She is going to vacate again. Now, I do not know how you can deal with the kind of people who jump from one house to another, and will not take any kind of accommodation because they are that choosy.

Let me also point out that some of the information that we get is not entirely correct, so if we make a mistake once in a while, perhaps it is the member's fault. I have her letter here written to Mr. Suters:

> I am writing in regard to a family that has come to my attention and has requested assistance. The name of the family is—such and such—and they live on the third concession, RR 1, Pickering — telephone such and such. The Howsons have eight children ranging in age from 6 to 18 years, and the family lives in an old farmhouse which is also occupied by another family of four. Their drinking water facilities are not sufficient, and I would appreciate your help.

Well, we went out to investigate, and we wrote back saying:

> On May 23, 1968, you wrote me concerning this family. One of my staff phoned this house and spoke to Mrs. Howson, who advised them that she has four children, not eight, and they are buying their house and do not share it with another family. In addition, it is not an old farmhouse.

So there appears to be some conflict of information. Now, this is only one of many hundreds that we get with the wrong information. I do not think that it is done on purpose, but these things should be checked out. So, we cannot be right all the time.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. May I just ask if that is supposed to have been a case of mine?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Well, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You wrote the letter. The letter is from you. It is signed by Margaret Renwick. I would be glad to let you have it.

Mrs. M. Renwick: No, Mr. Chairman, what has happend—what is the date of the letter, please?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The date is May 23, 1968, from 351 Parliament Buildings, signed by Mrs. Margaret Renwick, NDP for Scarborough Centre.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly apologize for what I presume was misinformation. During a day or two, when I was ill this month, I had my secretary handle whatever mail came in. I believe that I was absent from the House on Thursday, Wednesday, and Tuesday, for three days. When I was away I asked my secretary to handle the mail. I will take a look at it if the Minister would like to send it to me. I would like to take it up immediately. That is the sort of thing that I like to get at right away. And may I say that if I got that sort of confirmation from the other side when I had something that has gone wrong, I

could go home and sleep—knowing that I did not have to get up and handle 15 more cases tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will be glad to send the letter over. I would just like to point out that this is one of many thousands that we get with incorrect information—plus the phone calls that are incorrect. I do not think that it is done on purpose, because I do not think that people realize how much checking has to be done to get the facts. Now, I am trying to answer all the questions, and I do not think that I wrote them all down. But let me discuss the number of applications that I said we had at December 31, 1967. Family housing was 10,247. And you are right, the applications received in the first months up to March 31, was another 3,235—that is 13,482. Included in the number that we made the survey on were a number of people who did not answer, and some had other types of accommodation. We took off 5,434 people so that the list is down to 8,048 at the end of March 31, 1968. This does not include senior citizens, because we do not house senior citizens in Metro, as you know.

Now, the point that I want to make here is that over 50 per cent of the 8,048 are people that require one and two bedrooms—that is, either single persons, childless couples, or couples with one child. So, you can see that we are down to about 3,518 family cases —what we would call real family cases. During the last month or two we have had a survey going on with the Metro planning board. They are carrying out a survey of housing needs along with us. We have hired a company called Patterson consultants. This is financed by central mortgage and housing corporation, the Ontario housing corporation and Metro, and we expect this report will be available at the end of June. Metro council will, by that time, we believe, request additional housing. At the present time we think they are well covered, but if this new survey indicates that there should be more housing, Metro will meet and ask for more housing, and we will see that they get it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that some comments were made with reference to the Ontario housing corporation making a presentation to the city of Toronto to take over the Toronto housing authority. I can assure you we did no such thing. We made no slide presentations, no brochures. We were approached by the mayor, and his council, some time ago—last fall—and asked if we would take it over. We said we would be glad to take it over, if it could be arranged, and we finally worked out the details. But we made no pitch to take over the Toronto housing authority. If they want to carry on on their own they are perfectly welcome to it, but as you know if we do take them over, they save something like $1 million a year in subsidies that they are now paying, so the taxpayer in Toronto will get a break when that is taken care of.

With regard to these personal cases, I have said before, I will say again, if you will let me have them and you do not get satisfaction, I will see that you get satisfaction, but I want to make sure that both sides of the story are told. Because so often you get a story that probably does not let you get the applicant's story. By the time we check out the facts you may have been conned also. Now these people are honest in the main; they will tell you the facts of life. But there are a lot who will not, and we deal with a lot of people who will tell us anything to get into housing. They will blame the housing corporation, they will blame their member, and what we are prepared to do is check out any case that would indicate that they are not getting service.

I can say this, as far as the housing people are concerned at 188 University, I do not know of any unit in this government or any other government that is perfect. We may have the odd person who assumes that they get the wrong kind of treatment; usually people get exactly what they ask for. I find if I go in and ask for information in a pleasant manner, I get it, but if I go in pushing my weight around, and trying to dictate to people they reply in kind.

If there is anybody not getting the kind of treatment they want, I hope they will get in touch with me or Mr. Suters. We will check it out for them. But as far as I am concerned, I think the housing corporation are well versed in dealing with the public at large, and with the kind of people who sometimes are typical. Because they are, as you know, people who are maybe having financial problems, or physical problems, or mental problems, and we have to deal with them.

You mentioned the lady who came into the office down there the other day—she was mentally deranged, and broke a bottle on the counter. She went after the girl behind the counter, and had never seen the girl before in her life. We had another fellow walk in and punch a girl in the stomach. Now we

have a retired policeman down there and I hope he is big enough to punch somebody else back if he lays a hand on the staff, and he has my instructions to do so.

I think that we have covered the most of the questions that you ask. I can only say that if there are any other matters that you want to discuss with me at the housing corporation I would be glad to sit down with you any time. But I do not think we are going to get anywhere making a blitz on the telephone. You have proven one point, that if you put enough telephone calls in there, nobody gets through.

We have improved the telephone system. We put in a new system to talk to the people directly, to get them the information they want, and we recognize we are going to have calls from other social agencies, and other people. But in the main, I think that the system we are going to put in will handle most of the work. We have had it analyzed by experts, and I mean experts. I am talking about the Bell Telephone Company. They know what the workload is down there, and it is my opinion that when we get the system in, some of the difficulties and the frustrations you bring up will be taken care of.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I thought the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs is—

Mrs. M. Renwick: I am sorry, I had the floor, did I not?

Mr. Chairman: I must point out to the member that no member has a monopoly on the floor; the member for Downsview was on his feet first. If the member for Downsview will yield to the member for Scarborough Centre?

The member for Downsview had the floor.

Mr. Singer: If the young lady will sit down, I will gladly now sit down and yield to her.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the member for Downsview for the opportunity to ask two or three pertinent questions. I would like to ask if I am correct in understanding that what the Minister said was that there are now eight lines to placement?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not yet. They are being put in now.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Eight?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Secondly, is the placement still being handled by one person or one with an assistant, because this will be the same bottleneck; if you have got eight lines going in, there will be a wait for one person, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It was never handled by one person. There are 12 people in that department; they can get any one of 12. Mrs. Meredith is the lady in charge of that department.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, am I correct in understanding that there are 12 people who can, in fact, release suites to people? Mrs. Meredith has in the past made the statement to the secretary of our leader that all apartment releases go through her, and this seems to me a severely small bottleneck at the top of this large corporation.

Hon. Mr. Randall: There are three that release the equipment. There are 12 in the department. There are three who can assign housing accommodation.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am not all that familiar with anyone beyond Mrs. Meredith, because that is the only person I have dealt with so far in placement. But are the other two Mrs. Taylor, and perhaps Mrs. Schipper?

Mr. Sopha: I would like to know what does it matter?

Mrs. M. Renwick: It matters because they operate in a different way.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mrs. Taylor and Mrs. Lang are the two senior people in that department, as well as Mrs. Meredith.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to put on the record that any people with whom I have talked, and who have dealt through a lady called Mrs. Schipper, whom I have never met, have felt they had very careful courteous service. I would like to ask a couple of questions now about the operation of the housing units themselves.

I went out to attend a brief meeting this evening, and I was presented with a small signature list of approximately 40 families at 3190 Kingston Road, and it reads this way:

June 16, 1968

The parents of 3190 Kingston Road are concerned over the dangerous situation of

the cement flower containers and of the hazards they bring to the many young children in this area. The flower pots, which were originally designed to beautify the area, have had no flowers for quite some time, and are now left filled with dirt. Because there are little or no playground facilities, the children often amuse themselves by climbing the containers.

There is a 15 foot drop on to concrete from the container adjacent to unit number 25; the other is not quite so dangerous, but already this year there have been several accidents, one which left a child unconscious.

We are hoping for improvements to eliminate this very dangerous situation and furthermore a safe playground to ensure that the children will be kept away from any other hazards which may be present.

Thanking you, the tenants of 3190 Kingston Road.

I would go on record as saying there are 60 signatures on that small petition. Now, Mr. Chairman, all I hope to draw to the Minister's attention is that—

Mr. Peacock: Is that an OHC project?

Mrs. M. Renwick: That is an OHC project. One can feel pretty isolated out in an OHC project if there is no one to turn to. Would it be sensible to make certain that superintendents are in charge or on the grounds? This is a 90 suite unit; it is a small unit compared to some, easily managed compared to some. They are all garden homes south of where I live. And I know that in Flemingdon Park there are large windows—four by three feet, roughly—and that the pliofilm and the wood have been kicked out and the small children, if they go through there, will drop down in front of the cars in the underground.

I think that these things are hazardous and you are going to have headache after headache, no doubt, as you multiply the number of units. But could we ask, is there someone on these units to whom the tenants can turn, who has the power to do something about these problems; or even could relate to an individual at University Avenue to come out quickly?

The problem of the open four or five foot by three foot air vent drops into the garages at Flemingdon Park have been there off and on all spring. It is just by luck that no small child has gone down there in front of a car. They are big enough for a three- or four-year-old child to fall into. So I ask, since we are going to have more and more of these, Mr. Chairman, that we try to operate them in an efficient way, particularly where the safety of children is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would just say, Mr. Chairman, in answer to that; for instance, the one that you are referring to, we have a good Dutch superintendent in that building, a unionized superintendent of that building, and we have never had any complaints from him. As I understand it from Mr. Whaley he is one of our better superintendents, and if we get into smaller units it is obvious that we do not have managers on the property, if we want to get smaller units broken up in public housing units around the city. In Flemingdon Park, of course, as you know, we have an office up there and if there are difficulties, such as you described, if the manager does not see this, I am sure Mr. Whaley and his staff on their occasional checks will run into it and correct it.

I know you would not mind me reading tonight one compliment we got—the housing corporation—we have not had many compliments tonight so here is one that I think you will appreciate. This is a note from a satisfied tenant.

Will you please convey my gratitude to all who were so kind during our move to our new home in Regent Park South. We owe so many so much and the only payment we are able to make is our heartfelt and deepest thanks.

Our home is one to be proud of. When we work we can see what we have done and we do not fear opening windows any more for fresh air. The air may be as polluted as before but at least it is not as unhealthy as it was on Trefann Street.

Another thing we are thoroughly enjoying is the inexhaustible supply of hot water. The quick heating of water for coffee and tea and the lack of dampness in the building. I find that I do not curl up like something from Frankenstein's lab when it rains or when the basement gets clogged with water. I also find myself with more time than ever before. I no longer have to replenish a wood box to light a stove, or stoke a coal furnace for warmth. The worst thing that

will happen to me here is that I will get callouses from all the push buttons on our electric stove. What has the Queen got now that Sissons have not got? Very damn little and you had better believe it.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I enjoyed that letter as much as the Minister. I think it is very important that the Minister understand very clearly that we do, too, have letters of compliment. It is simply that if we bring all those as well as what we have already brought, you will be here much longer. We do have letters of compliment.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Bring the compliments, will you?

Mrs. M. Renwick: And they are the most grateful people in the world who finally get a self-contained housing unit very often after waiting some long time. So I do not wish to imply to the Minister that it is all the way this is.

I simply think that if the talent in the department were directed to making this a more realistic operation where people can come and go, where it is not bottled up on to a switchboard, or letters—and the talent that is there can do it, Mr. Chairman, and that is what I think is important—if they can deal with it, come to a more realistic operation, there will be no more problems of our bringing all these dark stories.

I turn to what seems almost an irrelevancy in comparison, and ask, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister ever saw fit to answer my question—or do I have to put it on the order paper?—about the moneys and the time that is spent producing the magazine known as *The Ontario Housing Corporation?* Then I think I am pretty well—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, I have that answer in the Legislature. When the member was not here I did not read it off, waiting for the member to be in the House. Here is a copy of it.

The salary of the editor of *Ontario Housing* is $140.50 per week. As well as editing, writing, and dealing with the printer in regard to the magazine, this employee is also responsible for arranging corporation displays for use at the CNE, trade fairs, conferences and conventions. Other duties include writing of press releases and feature material for other corporation publications, and the preparing and placing of advertisements for personnel and property management. This employee is a permanent civil servant. His position is classified as public relations officer 2 by the civil service commission and their rate of pay falls within the established salary range of $130.50 to $152 per week.

Second question: the magazine is distributed to approximately 5,000 individuals per issue. It is circulated across Canada and 22 other countries with the bulk of the circulation in Ontario being to elected representatives—members of the 41 housing authorities, planning boards, educational institutions and libraries.

Question 3: Six issues of the *Ontario Housing* are published each year and the approximate cost per issue, including mailing and tax, is $3,800, and this is broken down as follows: printing, $2,800; mailing, $210; tax, $784; for a total of $3,794.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I was talking quite some time ago about bailiffs and the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs was complaining a bit that I had not advised him. I would refer him to page 1038 of *Hansard*, March 20, and about halfway down the page there appears these remarks which I made. I thought I might read them because I have not heard from the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, could we not deal with this under his vote rather than on the housing vote?

Mr. Singer: No, this relates to bailiffs, Mr. Chairman, in relation to housing. Bailiffs in housing and their unreasonableness; my concern about them; housing corporation's concern about them. Had the member for Eglinton been in earlier, he would have noted the connection.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): I was in earlier and I noted it.

Mr. Singer: Yes. That is why it is relevant, Mr. Chairman. The unreasonableness of the landlord speaks for itself. The fact that he broke the law and the fact that he evicted and distrained persons speaks for itself, too, but was this lady going to take him to court and ask for damages and what would the measure of damages be, I do not know. The bailiff's fee puzzled me, so I attended the following morning on the bailiff and I will tell the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) his name—neither the Attorney General nor this Minister asked me his name, I can still tell them—I think something should be done about it. I said, "Mr. Bailiff,

I would like to know how you arrived at the $32 figure [that was his charge] would you show me your tariff and show me how you calculated it?" He pulled out his tariff and he looked up and down and he said, "I guess we made a mistake, the fee should have been $12." Within an hour of that interview the bailiff had despatched somebody back to the lady concerned and refunded the balance.

Now this happens frequently and I would have thought that mentioning it in the Legislature—and the second case was the one I discussed that took place in Ottawa with the Minister's officials that by now, perhaps, we would have had some indication of government concern. We will pursue this further on the Minister's estimates.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We will pursue it and you will find that I do not tolerate or believe in that kind of conduct any more than you do.

Mr. Singer: I was particularly incensed about the wrong figure being quoted by the Windsor housing authority because the $25, I am satisfied, is just over double the minimum tariff for ordinary bailiff's functions in serving a notice or in collecting rent. Had they done a number of things they could build up the fee that high or perhaps a little higher, but minimum fees certainly are not $25 on that tariff.

Now the second point that I wanted to deal with is this, Mr. Chairman. I noticed in the newspaper the other day that one of the federal candidates had been complaining at some length about the housekeeping done by the authority in the housing development in Etobicoke. As a matter of fact, the complaint ran at some length and was featured in the newspaper concerning the height of the grass and the uncut grass and the weeds and so on.

The newspaper story went on to say that within a short time after that a great number of men with mowers and scythes descended on that development and the grass in the public areas of that development in Etobicoke were cut down and a little housekeeping was done.

In Lawrence Heights—and let me return again to that one—in Lawrence Heights, if the Minister has had occasion to walk around as I do on frequent occasions, he would notice that the housekeeping in the public areas in that development is very, very badly done. There are holes in the pathways. There are holes in the public areas. The grass in the public areas is not properly cut.

By and large, if the Minister wanted to compare bad housekeeping with good housekeeping, he could compare some of the residences of the tenants who have homes in there, rather than apartment units, with the kind of housekeeping that is done by the authority and by the authority's maintenance people.

This is not just a tiny development. This is the largest public housing development in Canada and, by and large, the maintenance of the outdoor areas is disgraceful.

It is some substantial wonder to me, Mr. Chairman, that people have not broken their legs on frequent occasions, falling into the holes or tripping over some of the raised water main covers, the little things that stick out of the ground, and that those people who suffer from hayfever do not have it aggravated to a very substantial extent because of the proliferation of weeds.

By and large, Mr. Chairman, if a private landlord did his housekeeping the way this public landlord does, there would be all sorts of complaints made to municipal authorities, made in this House and made in other places.

I would ask the Minister—urge him—to walk around Lawrence Heights, perhaps tomorrow morning and order a little housekeeping; fill in a few of the holes and patch up a few of the sidewalks and so on. He could see just how bad it really is.

I wonder why, in Etobicoke, nothing was done until one of the federal candidates complained about it?

Hon. Mr. Randall: How long has this condition existed, do you know?

Mr. Singer: In Lawrence Heights?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Singer: Oh, months.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Why did you not bring it to our attention? You kept it a secret.

Mr. Singer: Oh dear, oh dear, Mr. Chairman. Surely—

Hon. Mr. Randall: You are not on the job. You are not looking after your constituents.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Do not use the telephone because you will block it for applicants.

An hon member: Send carrier pigeons.

Mr. Singer: I do not know, Mr. Chairman. I really do not know.

Here we have a Minister with a large staff—with all sorts of maintenance people he can send out in task forces, provided some federal candidate has complained about lack of maintenance—suddenly the group descends. He says, "Why do you not bring it to our—" Surely the Minister, if he is doing his job, would look after these things without any urging and instead of reading all these complimentary letters, which say, "We have a nicely landscaped area. We cut down the weeds, fill in the potholes—"

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have only read one. You get off easy tonight.

Mr. Singer: It is a disgrace, Mr. Chairman, that is all. It is a disgrace and it should not be necessary for a member to keep on bringing these things to the Minister's attention publicly. They should be done automatically.

One would think that the Minister and his staff—

Mr. Reilly: Should it not be done by the municipality?

Mr. Singer: Pardon?

Mr. Reilly: Should it not be done by the municipality?

Mr. Singer: It is not the municipality's land. It is Ontario housing corporation's land.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Point of order, Mr. Chairman, they are municipal roads and sidewalks. Being an ex-member of North York you ought to know this.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is again, I am sorry, misinformed.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I am not.

Mr. Singer: The internal paths, in the courts, in the internal landscaping, and so on, are not the municipality's property. The ones I am complaining about are owned by the Ontario housing corporation.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You said the sidewalks a minute or two ago.

Mr. Singer: I say they are the property of the housing corporation. If the Minister wants to meet me at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning I will go over the area with him and show him.

There you are. The Minister complains first of all, I did not bring it to his attention—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will be up in dry gulch—Owen Sound—tomorrow morning.

Mr. Singer: That is a pity. When I do bring it to his attention he says it is not his. I invite him to come with me and look at it and he says he is not going to be available.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will join—

Mr. Singer: Now what can you expect—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will join you at the first opportunity.

Mr. Singer: When will that be?

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, there is one matter that I wanted to draw to the attention of the Minister, in addition to what I had to say this afternoon. I do so in the hope that the Minister is able to assure us of some amelioration of the circumstances that attended this matter.

Last autumn I wrote him a letter as a result of a visit by four ladies—housewives who occupied on a rental basis houses owned by this corporation. In that letter, which was quite a lengthy one—it took a great deal of time to compose and assemble a lot of statistics. Basically, it drew to the attention of the Minister that, from the point of view of the income of their husbands, the rent was far too high.

Someone has mentioned here today—of this formula that is adopted by this corporation—unlike anyone else in the income earning stream, these people are apparently not permitted to save any money. These figures were acquired—very legitimate and realistic, these people being the sincere type of people that they were.

The real point of the letter was to enquire of the Minister whether it would be possible to buy the houses. The Minister's reply—I have not got it with me—rather the reply of the manager of Ontario housing corporation, to whom the Minister properly turned the letter over, indicated that there was some difficulty with the central mortgage and housing corporation who had a piece of these houses. Because of their regulations, sale of these houses was not permitted.

I very vividly remember one of the more —what is the word I seek?—one of the more

glaring election gimmicks of the Speech from the Throne last year was the coining of the HOME appellation for the new housing outburst of this government. I say the new—when anything is regenerated, of course, with the greatest public relations technique it has to be given the façade of being a new creation.

I do not wonder that the Minister reads categories of public relations people. He identified some individual—I was not following that, but he identified him as PR2 and I have no doubt that that initial goes right through the government service.

Certainly this government has assembled unto its breast the greatest expertise in public relations gimmickry and excellence since Charlemagne grabbed the crown of the Holy Roman Empire, in the year 800. One of the outstanding productions of that Speech from the Throne, in addition to the wild rivers—I think that was the most captivating one.

Mr. Singer: We have not heard much about them lately.

Mr. Sopha: They disappeared. They have dried up. But that was the HOME programme and, if I remember correctly, that means home ownership made easy. It was one of their gimmicks upon which the government breezed in to another triumph at the polls. No matter how you get those ballots in the box, the mere fact they are there, of course, justifies all past sins of omission, commission, malfeasance, misfeasance, nonfeasance, and everything else.

But here—in spite of those ringing declarations in the Speech from the Throne about home ownership—here were four ladies who came forward *bona fide* apparently with the authority of their husbands, the income-earners. They put the cards on the table with the Minister and said, "We are sick and tired of paying you rent"—and the rent, let me inform the House—I am speaking from memory—went as high as $170, I believe, in one case. The figures were approaching that very respectable amount. They said, "Rather than continue to pay this type of rent we want to own the house."

But, no, it seems to be impossible by reason of some convolution of relationship with CMHC in Ottawa. If that be so, this government has been less than forthright in its dealings with the Ottawa government. I do not think it is any excuse on the part of this Minister of the Crown to say we are inhibited from selling a house because of the activities of another government, or the conditions they superimpose. Retrospectively that should have been thought of before the speech writers, before Rathbun was let loose on the Speech from the Throne last year.

Mr. Peacock: Or by the Prime Minister before he called the election?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed.

Mr. Peacock: That is the only block.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed, and these bars to ownership ought to have been eliminated from it. So that the Minister, when I, acting as agent for these ladies, their political agent, when I write to him, he ought to be in a position to write back and say, "Fine, let us cement the deal as quickly as possible and transfer the title."

But, you see, the whole point is when he is not able to do that, that brings discredit on the bona fides of the government.

In other words, you have a government saying, "We are going to do everything we can to promote home ownership among our people" and when called upon to produce, the government is found wanting. During the election campaign, of course, every Minister of the Crown led by the first citizen himself, swept about this province, east, west, north and south, raving about the HOME plan. It was at least the greatest discovery since Coca Cola and Georgia two generations ago, and it cannot help but add to the cynicism generated among people when they are caught in the snare of seeing their income vanish and paying what they consider to be very high rents.

In all four cases indeed they were very high rents to pay and anyone with an ordinary ration of economic sense had to look at that and say, "It is in our interest to buy these houses, to make a deal whereby we can become the owners." In each of the four cases—I did not put it in the letter—but in each of the four cases, they were willing to put themselves in hock in order to come up with a down payment if some equity were required, had the government reciprocally demonstrated its bona fides to transfer the title to them.

Surely this government cannot be committed to renting accommodation out of pure enjoyment. It does not want to be a landlord for the sake of being a landlord and one would think that it ought to order its affairs so that given the slightest reasonable—no, not the slightest, any—reasonable opportunity, it will get out of the landlord business and trans-

fer ownership to people who demonstrate bona fides.

The really cynical thing about it is that this government in such a vital, basic, fundamental need of our people will act so cynically; that is the heartbreaking thing about it —that it will be so cynical as to actively go out with these public relations people, whatever grade or category they are in and generate emotionalism among the people by very expensive advertising campaigns paid for at high public cost. They will use the lips of the Lieutenant-Governor—I sometimes think I am the only true monarchist in the House—but they will use his lips and his voice from that chair to engage in their Madison Avenue hucksterism as they did a year ago in the Speech from the Throne.

Then, when called upon to produce, they are just not able to and they seize an excuse that another level of government prohibits them. They do business with CMHC all the time; they are like the Bobbsey twins. In every deal that is going in the province, OHC is there with CMHC, they are blood brothers, kith and kin, hand-in-hand partners all the way in housing. I refuse to believe that CMHC is so cold-hearted that they would impose unreasonable restrictions on the government of Ontario.

We are led to believe that the relations of these two governments are always in tip-top shape; they are deteriorating now when the Premier is playing the dangerous game he is playing down at the Coliseum. That will not make for good relations after next Tuesday, but they like us to believe that they have good relations with those Ministers of the Crown.

So this supersalesman who heads this department, if he can sell ice boxes to Eskimos as he likes us to believe, he can never persuade me that he cannot go down to Ottawa and talk business with the appropriate official down there to get these restrictions removed. Having said all that, perhaps he is going to get up and tell me that they have been removed. If that is the case, then again he is wanting because the letters are on file from me—the names and addresses, location of the houses in Sudbury, Madison Heights. I ought to have been the first to be informed, so that like the fellow in Browning's poem, I can be the first to carry the good news from Ghent to Aix and tell these people that all you have to do is come up with some cash and tell them that they can look forward to being owners. The fact is, finally I say, the fact is I have had numerous inquiries from tenants who want to buy the premises in which they are located. But I felt so discouraged about the five—there were four in that letter and another one, and that fellow is still paying rent although I wrote a couple of years ago about him, though I was promised that the angels would descend upon him right away to complete the deal, to consummate the deal; he is still a tenant out in the Donlita apartments area.

I have become so discouraged by the activity and the apparent lack of interest in these problems that people encounter. I daresay that Canadians feel so fiercely independent they do not particularly like being tenants of the government. I know I should not like to be a tenant of the government, I would want almost anybody else to be my landlord, other than the government.

I daresay that most people, who are in these houses that were bought up and assembled for OHC for rental given the opportunity which, of course, should flow from the government, should not have to write and ask "Can we buy the house?" The emissaries of OHC should be knocking at their door inquiring into their financial circumstances to determine if they are in a position to buy the fee simple back from the government. That is the way I would think it ought to work, if the phrase "home ownership made easy" is genuine, but I question its genuine quality. You can tell whether a thing is bona fide by its antecedents, its birth, its genesis. In this House, coming in such a plausible and yet phony way from the government, through the use of the Lieutenant-Governor, you had to question it from the very outset.

It has not worked out and home ownership has not become easy. But to be fair about that, it is not entirely the fault of this government. It is the fault of interest rates to a large extent, which is a large subject which we will all try to take up with the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs when we reach his estimates.

The point is that notwithstanding all the bombast that comes from that side, and putting aside all the letters that are read and the complimentary nature, and looking through to the real heart of the thing, the evidence is overwhelming that the programme has not met the expectations, or the hucksterism that attended its introduction. The cynical thing about it is that the moment its bona fides are tested, head-on to resort to vernacular—the put-up or shut-up technique —the government is the first to cave in when

they are asked how, when and where do we meet you to produce *quid pro quo* by which we become the owners?

That is the phrase "home ownership made easy." It is not easy at all, and the home ownership is not even consummated if it is difficult; in the two contracting parties, the purchaser is the willing one, and the government is the unwilling.

One could go into the vacant lots that the government has assembled and I fail to see any alacrity of the public to take them up and build on them, but to be fair one must consider the Shylock interest rates under which the economy suffers right now. That is not entirely the fault of the government, although the government is not doing anything in consonance with the other government about it.

I am prepared to say, and I have said it publicly, that any society—I hope that this is too late for anyone to publish—but any society that imposes a 9.25 per cent on a person who wants to build a home has got to examine itself in respect of its philosophy of human values, whatever government is at fault. And I do not want to get into the election campaign, which is reaching a height; I did not say any party, I said any society, that does that. Let me just add this comment.

I took the opportunity to ask Walter Gordon—and I rely on his word as a man who knows whereof he speaks when it comes to financial affairs—and I asked him point blank if there was a money shortage in this country. He told me that there is lots of money in the country, but there is a conspiracy on the part of the owners of capital to impose high interest rates on those who have to borrow, be they governments, private borrowers extending capital plants, or for any other reason. And I very much suspect that is so, that interest rates are high because the large financial institutions want them to be high.

I am not so naive after 44 years not to believe that when it comes to making major economical decisions in this country, such as the interest rate, that any one president of the five big chartered banks just needs to make four phone calls, and the agreement can be made. But the America that the Minister loves so much, and whose enthusiasm is only shared to a high degree by his deputy, the Americans, of course, are way ahead of us in doing something about the combines and the anti-trust actions of large institutions. We are still in the stone age in that regard because we tolerate the insitutions making major economic decisions. Home ownership is never going to be encouraged in this country until interest rates come back.

If I may make one additional comment: just recently, I sold my house and bought another one, and I had to assume the mortgage on the one that I bought, so I went up to look at the mortgage, and I see that it now takes six pages to set out the rights. They used to do it in three, but now they need six finely printed, closely knit pages to set out the rights that the mortgage company has. It carries very little in the way of rights of the mortgagor like myself and they need six pages. We will draw that to the attention of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. If somebody wants a really effective Royal commission in this country, they might have one to examine all aspects of the housing business and particularly the financial aspects.

Now that Mr. Justice Hall has finished the education report, he might be persuaded to make an examination of that, to see what really ails it. So that when we find out what really ails house-building in this country, we can get on with the job of clearing things. It is quite reasonable, and intelligent, rather than having politicians running back and forth across this country trying to outdo each other in the number of homes that they say they are going to build in one year; and however grandiose the figures, they are meaningless, and people are denied shelter.

That is all I wanted to say about that. But these four ladies—Mr. Suters wrote to each of them individually and sent me a copy of the letters. And they called me up and informed me of their despair about it. I said that the only thing I could do in relation to that is to raise it in the Minister's estimates. And how lucky I am, having given my word to do so, that this vote did not slide by when I was away. I will be able to point to the remarks and perhaps it will contribute in some small measure.

It is easy as this. If it is CMHC, then next Wednesday, the 25th, when the smoke of battle clears, whoever is in power in Ottawa, the Minister can start with a new broom, with the victor next Wednesday morning. He can call up and say, "There are a few difficulties with CMHC here and let us start the procedure to sweep them away.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Do that right after he pays his election bets?

Mr. Sopha: Yes. That would assist these

four families of which I speak, but it also would contribute a good deal to restore confidence in the genuineness of that home programme that was announced with such fanfare a year ago, by PR people grades 1 to 32, or however many different they have over there. I expect it might go to about 75 grades, having been exposed to their publicity for a number of years, and seeing that the type of reports that come out are evermore expensive; all the publications that one never gets time to read. You would never attend here if you tried to keep up with what all those the PR people put out.

But, there it is and really, the burden ultimately lies upon the Minister, and no one else.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Chairman, just to comment for a second on the home ownership. I do not believe anybody in this country believes more in home ownership than I do, and I have worked since I got into this job to create home ownership in every way I possibly can. The yellow book that we put out a year ago February, at the meeting we had with Mr. Nicholson downtown, included a number of programmes for home ownership and we said that just as fast as we could get the legislation changed at Ottawa, The National Housing Act changed so that our other partner could give free title to the homes, we would get into checking—

Mr. Sopha: Has it been changed?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Not yet, no. The government has folded two or three times, gone on vacation, had too much other work to do, and Christmas holidays, and what have you, and they have not got around to it yet. Now you are in the legal profession, and I think you would not have bought this house this week if you had not got free title to it. This government, through OHC is not in the position to give free title to any one of these units until The National Housing Act is changed. Now, just as soon as it is changed, we have a list of people who are in the category where they can be offered their homes. We will move just as speedily as we can get a change, but this was, I think, regarded by the federal government as one of the minor changes in legislation. They had many other problems.

We do not kick a gift horse in the face. CMHC have had their troubles; they have done what they can to help us, and I think they have done an excellent job. We are grateful for it, but when it comes to changing federal legislation I think the hon. member recognizes—

Mr. Sopha: What does the legislation say? What does it say?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The legislation means that the NHA has to give permission for these houses to be sold. Right now they are set up to be rented only on the subsidized basis.

Mr. Peacock: It does not apply to the full recovery.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It had nothing to do with it. But the NHA as I told you the other day, we are checking the full recovery units now, we are having them estimated. Some of those estimates have already gone to central mortgage and housing corporation putting a market price on the unit; it comes back to us. We are quite prepared to make a deal with the applicant, but on the housing that is on the 90/10 basis we cannot operate until The National Housing Act is changed. Otherwise we cannot get free title.

Mr. Peacock: Have the Guelph-unit sales been approved?

Mr. Sopha: What you are obliged to do? I would think what you are obliged to do, unless you doubt the bona fides of the federal government in this regard, is say to these people, "Look, you make your payments of rent to us on time, and we shall put those payments aside and when that legislation is changed we shall credit those payments against the purchase price, as in an agreement for sale."

The only bond to you then doing what you undertook to do in the Speech from the Throne is some impossible attitude by the federal government that would preclude them from changing their legislation. But, if on the other hand, the federal government has indicated to you that it is only a matter of getting it before the House of Commons, and that is a technicality only, eventually a day will be found when that amendment can be put through. Accordingly, I do not see why you do not, why you cannot, start on an immediate programme of selling by agreement for sale subject to the change in the federal legislation that would facilitate the transfer in fee simple to be made to these prospective purchasers.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, earlier this evening the member for Windsor West questioned the views of a couple of members of our party on public housing. I want to make it very clear what my own personal views are, and I believe they coincide with those of my colleague from Parkdale.

I am fully in accord with the need and the role being played in public housing by this province and its importance in supplying subsidized houses for those that need it. I also have been, in the past, associated with one of the first companies that did, in fact, bring public housing units or develop public housing in an integrated fashion adjacent to private housing. We felt that this was a very important way for it to be developed where it was not segregated, but it was an integral part of a development.

My problem and my opposition to the present programme of the Ontario housing corporation is in regard to failing to persuade the government to provide services and other assistance required to enable the private sector to fill the need for low-cost housing in a way they can fill it. And they can fill it if they are not forced by municipalities to have high assessed homes in order to have a level of taxation from those homes that will not burden the existing taxpayers with regard to education and other costs. I am very opposed to the present lack of an integrated programme to provide services for the private sector. If they can be provided for the Ontario housing corporation, as they are going to be in Malvern and other areas, they should be doing it in other areas for the private sector as well, and let them show what they can do, which I am sure they can do better.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I have a feeling that you and some of the members across the way feel that this vote has had more than adequate discussion.

Mr. Chairman: Is the member directing his remarks to the chair or to the Minister through the Chairman?

Mr. Gisborn: To you, sir.

Mr. Chairman: To me personally as Chairman?

Mr. Sopha: He never in any way intended that.

Mr. Gisborn: Let us not kid ourselves. If there is any affront to the Chairman, I apologize. What I said was I have a feeling that you, sir, and all the members on the other side of the House have felt that there has been adequate discussion on this vote.

Mr. Chairman: In no way.

Mr. Gisborn: I have a feeling that you feel this way; if you have not, then you have not. But nevertheless I want to say that the discussion—two full sessions on this vote—has been most enlightening in regards to the most serious problem of providing low-cost public housing for the peoples of the province of Ontario.

No one will forget that in the House for the last 10 years I have had a running controversy and conflict with the department and with the administrator of housing. The low-cost housing project in Hamilton, and the problems that arose, are similar to some of the problems that I have listened to in the last five or six hours—the sort of arrogant approach of the administrators, and the administration and management policies in the projects. For 10 years I have been faced with at least 50 or 60 phone calls, about the end of the session, when people began to get their notices to vacate—because they had earned more than the allowable income to stay in the project.

I was requested, each year, to attend meetings. In most meetings 75 per cent of the tenants were in attendance, putting their project problems to me. I am sure that kind of controversy and conflict has done some good in the Hamilton area. Now, I do not know why, this year, I have not had one telephone call or complaint from that Hamilton project. I do not know whether it is because there has been drastic change in the management policies or whether the people have just given up complaining. I hope it is the former —that there has been a drastic change in the outlook, in the administration policies in Hamilton. They were, for many years, similar to those that have been presented by the member for Windsor West and other members in the House.

I have the feeling, Mr. Chairman, and I say this to the Minister through you, that there is an attitude by the government, by some municipal councillors, and by real estate boards' spokesmen, that some time the need for low-cost public housing will dry up and our problems will be all over. I want to assure you that we have to recognize this will not be the case, that we are faced with a

need, an ever-increasing need, for subsidized low-income public housing and we have to begin to face it in a businesslike and more humane manner.

In the past year, in Hamilton, there have been six public meetings sponsored by various churches in various areas of Hamilton. In attendance were spokesmen from the urban renewal committees, from the social workers, the children's aid societies, and the officers from the municipal welfare department. The main issue this year has been the lack of accommodations for large families. The strongest concern and protest came through the officers of the children's aid societies—their biggest problem and headache was trying to keep families together. They could not do it because of the lack of adequate housing—because there was no housing available that had enough room. Either the rents were too high, or there was not enough money to pay for the accommodation and they had to split up the families.

What I noticed following each one of these sessions after the press wrote their story on the need for more public housing, particularly for large families in the low-income groups, it would be followed by a statement by a spokesman from the real estate boards. Their line would be that there was no need for getting concerned about a crash programme in the low-income public housing field. They—the free enterprise builders—would look after the problem if they could get the government to see the light and they were given the proper initiative—and so on, and so on.

The last one was not long ago and it was a statement put out by the president of the Hamilton real estate board. He talked about the great numbers of houses listed for sale with the real estate people in Hamilton and he even went on to say that they ranged from $6,000 to $31,000. But, on investigation, we found that there were only about six between the $6,000 and $8,000 bracket, and all the rest were in the $25,000 to $35,000 area. Of course, this is not going to rectify our problems a bit.

The other thing that concerns me that we have to be aware of—I have noticed it in the Hamilton area—it is not just the young married couples who are being forced into high-cost, high-rise apartments. I am finding now that many of our old-age pensioners are being conned into going into high-cost apartments.

When I was canvassing last October, during the election, I noticed a chap ahead of me also knocking on doors and speaking to the people in the homes. This was in a predominantly low-income area; most of them are pensioners. I caught up to him and I asked him who he was canvassing for. "Oh," he said, "I am not in the political field. I am trying to buy homes." I said, down in this area most of these people are retired and they are low-cost homes. He said, "We have a market for them, if we can buy them."

I said, "What kind of a pitch are you using?" He said, "Well, I am telling them that they had better sell now as they will get the best price, because if they wait till the Carter commission report is implemented, then they will have to pay a capital gains tax on the money they receive for their home." I said, "That is just a little bit phoney, because it is not the truth." He said, "It is a good pitch anyway," and he and I got into quite an argument at that point.

I have noticed the many "sold" signs that are going up in these low-cost home areas. I have traced four of them and I find that they are now in apartments paying from $140 to $170 a month rent, and I found that they have sold their homes anywhere from $7,000 to $10,000. I just wonder if they realize how long that is going to last and the kind of a situation they are going to be in when that little bit of a nest-egg they thought they had is gone.

Why I say we have to pay a lot of attention to the need for low-income public housing is also based on the report that was requested by the municipality of Hamilton. I think it was finished in February, 1967, and it is what makes me think that the government is not giving the right kind of attention to the need.

As we have criticized this department over the years for the lack of low-income public housing in various areas, we have been told by the Minister—and I suppose in technical terms he is right—he has sort of excused himself by giving as a reason that the initiative has to come from the municipalities. "They tell us what they want and give us the go ahead, and we will provide the homes for them."

I have always said, and I think this side of the House has always said, that this is not enough—that the government has to take the initiative, give the encouragement, and use more persuasion in the areas where we need low-income public housing.

This survey was carried out by the Minister's department and it appears to be a splendid survey. It starts off with recommendations, introduction, location, and no. 1—economy of the areas. And it goes down employment in general: employment, principal

employers, employment capital investment, employment index numbers, incomes, population, past and current trends, age distribution, households, housing market factors—and there are 15 various aspects to that section—they have done a splendid job. What they say in their opening remarks – recommendations: The results of this supplementary survey indicates a demand for additional Ontario housing in the city of Hamilton. The analysis of the 578 applications for family housing and 741 applications for senior citizens—a total of 1,319– revealed an effective demand for 436 family housing units and 611 senior citizens' housing units. Now that totals 1,047. The difference between 1,319 and 1,047 I take it are those they found that did not have enough income to be eligible for application. Or were already living in suitable accommodations. It goes on to say:

> This recommendation is based solely on the effective demand represented by the pending applications for Ontario housing on file with the Hamilton housing authority at the time of the survey. It does not attempt to predict the total effective demand for Ontario housing at this time in the city of Hamilton, nor does it attempt to forecast future demands brought about by a continuation of industrial and commercial expansion or demolition of existing properties as a result of urban renewal.

It is no wonder that we are not going to catch up with the backlog and start to provide the kind of housing we need if this government takes this attitude.

I would have thought that on the basis of the research that was done they would have put in a further paragraph and said because of the 3 per cent anticipated in the normal increase in population, because of the continued industrial expansion in that area, because we have now zoned a one-mile by five-mile mile industrial zone in the city of Hamilton that you are going to need so many houses in the next five years. We knew that we needed this many houses two years ago, and we have not been able to get the thing off the ground yet, so that we have adequate housing.

This is why I say the attitude of the government seems to me to relate to the same attitude that some of the municipal councils have and the real estate board people—that they hope that some day the need for low-income housing in our province will dry up and the situation will be solved.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Carried!

Mr. Gisborn: Is the hon. member for London South trying to indicate to me that the House leader would like to get the floor?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon we will deal with certain matters on the order paper, and the afternoon, I presume, will be largely occupied with that situation. In the evening, we will continue with the estimates of The Department of Trade and Development, and thereafter with The Department of Lands and Forests.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:05 o'clock, p.m.

No. 123



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, June 18, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

TORONTO
THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 18, 1968

Mine rescue team competition, statement by Mr. A. F. Lawrence 4605

Control of odours from meat-packing industries, statement by Mr. Dymond 4606

London board of education, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Nixon 4606

Mining operations, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Shulman 4606

Civil service morale, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Shulman 4607

Instructions to Metro Toronto ambulance drivers, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Shulman 4607

Laboratory services in Ontario, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Shulman 4607

Committee of supply debate on a motion by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Mr. J. Renwick 4608

Recess, 6 o'clock 4645

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: In the east gallery students from the public and separate schools at Spanish; in the west gallery from Dalewood senior public school, St. Catharines, and from Naughton public school, Naughton.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

The Minister of Mines has a statement.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, yesterday saw the conclusion of an activity that I think warrants the attention of hon. members. Each year, the mines of Ontario conduct a series of competitions in the various mining districts to select the best-trained and most efficient mine rescue team in the province.

These teams are made up of working miners who, as an additional activity and mainly on their own time, undergo a special course of arduous training in rescue work and the use of self-contained oxygen breathing apparatus in the event of fire or other conditions underground which make such equipment necessary. Fortunately, occasions on which this training has to be put into serious use are rare, but it is comforting to know that if an emergency does arise there will be men available to cope with it.

The training programme and the equipment used is co-ordinated throughout the province so that teams are readily interchangeable between mines and districts. The co-ordinator of the provincial programme is Mr. George G. McPhail of my department, and full-time superintendents are employed at each of the eight mine rescue stations throughout the mining regions of Ontario. I think I should point out that the total cost of this extremely valuable work is defrayed entirely by the mining industry itself, without direct charge to the taxpayer.

The competitions are divided into two parts. First all teams in each of the districts compete among themselves, and then the district winners are presented with a simulated, but very realistic set of emergency situations. The team which, in the opinion of the judges, best copes with the problem is adjudged the provincial winner and is awarded the mine safety trophy.

It was my pleasure yesterday to send a congratulatory telegram to the general superintendent of Algoma ore division of the Algoma Steel Corporation at Wawa informing him that his team had been chosen as winners of the provincial mine rescue competition. This is the provincial championship here. Second place went to the team representing McIntyre Porcupine Mines Limited in the Timmins area, and the Falconbridge mine team of Falconbridge Nickel Limited placed third.

When it is considered that 300 miners, representing 45 mines in the province were entered in the competition, the standard of performance was very high and final victory was no mean achievement, and on your behalf, sir, and on behalf of the members of this House and on behalf of the public, I hope, of Ontario, certainly northern Ontario, I would like to very warmly congratulate these teams.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I think a question is permitted after these statements.

Does the Minister agree that the enthusiasm of the government for these competitions is rather recent in origin? Does he recall that last year the government was asked to finance the expenses of one of these teams to take part in a national competition during our centennial year, and the government refused to do so?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I do not remember that, Mr. Speaker. I remember it this year, though, and the reasons were quite valid and sound and they can be discussed at a more appropriate time.

Mr. Speaker: Might I point out to the members that the questions following a Minister's statement are for the purpose of

elucidating the statement and not for ancillary matters. The Minister of Health has a statement.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I think you and the hon. members of the House would be interested to know that in co-operation with the air pollution control division of my department, arrangements have now been made with the two largest meat packing industries in the Keele-St. Clair area to undertake the control of obnoxious odours. Both Swift Canadian Company and Canada Packers are presently installing control equipment and we believe when this is completed a great deal of the offensive odours will be removed from this area. After we have had an opportunity to assess the value and success of these, further requirements will be made of these and other industries in the area.

Mr. Speaker: The leader of the Opposition has a question from yesterday.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier, notice of which was sent to his office yesterday.

Has the Premier received a communication from Mr. Neville Ross of London appealing the decision of the Minister of Municipal Affairs not to hold an investigation into the relationship between previous boards of education in London and its school architect's office? And two, whether or not such an appeal has been received, does the Premier contemplate further action in this matter?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I received no such communication and as far as I am concerned, the matter rests where it is at the moment.

Mr. Nixon: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier knows of any alternative that the board of education of London might have in conducting a further investigation of this matter, independent of the government of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The key to the whole matter is that the board of education of its own volition, by a vote, refused to exercise the powers that it has. The chairman of the board then chose to write in his personal capacity to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough).

But I woud point out to you that the board itself refused by vote to exercise the powers which it has.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel), I have been requested to put several questions to the Minister of Mines, if this is all right.

Mr. Speaker: It is quite in order.

Mr. Shulman: Question No. 1 is: Who is doing the mining at Crean Hill open pit?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Carman Construction Limited.

Mr. Shulman: Question No. 2: Is the McIsaac Company operating at Maclennan Mines at Bolands Bay? Is the property producing ore? Are they carrying out standard mining procedure, and how long have they been working this property?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I think the hon. member is getting his spontaneous question mixed up with the written question. That last one was not included in the list of questions that I received.

Mr. Speaker: May I interrupt the Minister for a minute. The last question, which is on the copy which the Speaker has and which is No. 685 and initialled, says: "How long have they been working this property?" That should be on the carbon copy which reached the Minister's office.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The answer to the first part of that question—is the McIsaac Company operating at Maclennan Mines at Bolands Bay?—is yes.

Is this property producing ore? The information of the department is that it is not at the present time, while shaft deepening is in progress.

The next question: Are they carrying out standard mining procedure? The answer that I have is yes.

And I am sorry that the information regarding how long they have been working this property is not available to me today. I will have it for the hon. member tomorrow.

Mr. Shulman: Finally to the Minister of Mines:

Is the Dravo Developing Company doing the mining and hoisting at Clarabell? Does the Dravo Developing Company use its trucks to dump the ore it mines into the open pit? Is the Minister aware that a Dravo official said at an inquest that his company is presently

engaged in mining on five different properties in the Sudbury district?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The answer to these questions, Mr. Speaker, is that Dravo of Canada Limited are operating the Copper Cliff north mine adjacent to the Clarabell open pit.

The next question: Does the Dravo Developing Company use its trucks to dump the ore out of the mine into the open pit? The answer to that is yes, at the dumping sites near the No. 2 shaft.

The next question was: Is the Minister aware that a Dravo official stated at an inquest that this company is presently engaged in mining on five different properties in the Sudbury district? The information in the department is, yes, they are at present operating at Copper Cliff north, Copper Cliff south, Little Stobie, Stobie No. 9 and Kirkwood.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, sir. I have a question for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Prime Minister intervene directly to improve the poor morale of the civil service as revealed in a release by the civil service association June 13, stating that the government was bargaining in poor faith, that employees were disgusted, and that "many of the respresentatives would have preferred more direct and stronger action in the place of arbitration hearings"?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, these arbitration proceedings are just about to commence, and therefore I would not personally interfere in these matters. There will be representations made by both sides under the procedures as set out in the statutes. So, in direct answer to the question—no, I will not be personally interfering in this process.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Prime Minister allow a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Is the Prime Minister aware of the circumstances and are the allegations made in this release correct?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have read the release. I could only say that this is a form of collective bargaining which is just commencing. Possibly there will be various positions taken and statements made about which I would probably have nothing to say. I could say this—that what is being arbitrated is the January 1, 1968 cycle; the civil service association did not make its representations in regard to this particular matter until some time in March.

One other comment that I could make is that I think all the arbitrations arrived at to date have been arrived at unanimously. In other words the representatives of the civil service association who have been present in dealing with the arbitrations have agreed with the decisions that have been handed down, so I find it difficult to believe that the process is about to break up. There are always statements made in the beginning of negotiations of this type. I would hope that these remarks may be in that category.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister. I have a question for the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister believe that ambulance drivers should attempt to do breech deliveries and other such activities such as pushing the mother's uterus up into her abdomen, as suggested in the instructions handed out last week to ambulance drivers working for Metro Toronto?

Is the Minister of the opinion that an ambulance driver is qualified to determine when a tracheotomy should be performed by himself in order to save a life, as suggested by instructions handed out last week to ambulance drivers working for Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not know about these instructions but if they do contain statements or suggestions such as that outlined by the hon. member, then my answer is no.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister allow a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister contact the proper authorities in the Metropolitan Toronto department of health to clarify the situation and perhaps see that wiser instructions are sent out?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would like to be assured, Mr. Speaker, of the existence of these so-called instructions. I have no knowledge that they were issued as official instructions.

Mr. Shulman: I will send a copy across to the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day; the hon. member for High Park put a six-part question to me

last week which I took as notice. I would like to answer that now. The question can be found in *Hansard*, and I shall not repeat it.

The statistics quoted by the hon. member, I now learn, have been extracted from a paid advertisement inserted by Dr. Hannah, managing director of associated medical services incorporated, in the May issue of the *Ontario Medical Review*. I have no knowledge of the source of the statistics, nor do I have any knowledge of the standard set in this special study by Dr. Hannah; therefore it is impossible for me to comment on them.

It is very true, for a number of reasons, that the number of tests in Ontario have increased, as have the costs. There are many more beds and a much greater population. There have been great advances in medical techniques, as the hon. member well knows, and great advances brought about by automation. Whether these tests are necessary, of course, is essentially a matter of medical judgment, since all of them must be ordered by the attending physicians.

I would point out, as I did in the estimates of my department, that all of these matters, which are the source of hospital costs, are the subject of ongoing study and review. If, after thorough investigation, it is deemed that unnecessary tests are being made, I can assure you, sir, steps will be taken to change the pattern.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, what I have to say I hope will facilitate the business of this House.

Last night as a result of a question from the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer), the Minister in charge of Ontario housing corporation was asked to table the offer to sell between the Trent Park developments limited and the OHC. The document that was tabled is not the final document as stated in the Minister's own statement in this House yesterday afternoon. This particular document is one that expires on August 18. By the Minister's statement, the expiry date of the offer was October 31. The amount of money placed on account with the OHC was $100 and, by the Minister's statement, on the final offer the amount was $50,000.

I am sure that tonight we do not want to have a delay in securing this final document. I hoped that by bringing this up on a point of order, the Minister might be able to table the final document this afternoon, so that there will be no delay in passing his estimates.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, I was unaware that there was a second document. If there is I will check, and I will have it for you.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY DEBATE

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the committee of supply.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick), that the motion that the House resolve itself into the committee of supply be amended as follows:

That this House concurs in the historic words of that renowned statesman, the late Sir Winston Churchill, that, and I quote:

> The Conservative Party is nothing less than a deliberate attempt on the part of important sections of the propertied classes to transfer their burdens onto the shoulders of the masses of the people, and to gain greater profit for the investment of their capital by charging higher prices.

And that among other things:

(a) By failing to control exorbitant increases in consumer prices through a prices review board, and by failing to establish a floor in family income through adequate minimum wages and guaranteed incomes;

(b) by cancelling out the pre-election promise of the $50 saving per family through the basic shelter exemption by a post-election hike in regressive taxes, including hospital premiums, of $125 per family;

(c) by rejecting universal medicare, which would permit a 50 per cent reduction in medical premiums;

(d) by failing to protect farmers from corporate exploitation of all kinds and by failing to insure them a fair share of provincial income;

(e) by failing to develop the full potential of northern Ontario by not requiring the processing of its rich resources at home and by not providing conditions which will attract other secondary industry in order to diversify the economy of the north, increase employment opportunities and

reduce the high cost of living which result from an under-developed economy;

(f) by pursuing housing and urban renewal policies in conjunction with the federal government based on a philosophy of socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor, amounting to a denial of the government Throne Speech promise of adequate housing at reasonable cost for all Ontario residents;

(g) by failing to protect tenants from soaring rents and unfair lease terms through the establishment of a rental review board and the revision of archaic landlord and tenant law, including provisions for the standard lease;

The government has forfeited the confidence of this House and the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. MacDonald moves an amendment—

I would be delighted if the House would take the amendment as read; otherwise, of course, I must read it.

Some hon. members: Agreed!

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? The member for York South has the floor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, obviously we have struck home by the reaction that is emerging from the government benches.

This resolution lists some of the government's major sins of omission and commission. It is certainly not an exhaustive list. Some of these sins are of long standing, others are new ones that have emerged in this session of the Legislature. I want at the outset to emphasize that it is not my purpose to rehash what has already been said in this House on these issues, but rather to repeat it only to the extent necessary to draw to the attention of this House and the people of Ontario the overall impact, because sometimes in consideration of the details one can lose the impact.

And I do so in the context of an historic observation by Sir Winston Churchill. Admittedly, as the hon. members on the opposite side of the House have noted, he made this statement in his younger years, while he was still a Progressive and before he became a Conservative, but that does not alter the validity of what he had to say. What he had to say, and this is the context of my remarks, so I repeat it:

> The Conservative Party is nothing less than a deliberate attempt on the part of important sections of the propertied classes to transfer their burdens onto the shoulders of the masses of the people, and to gain greater profits for the investment of their capital by charging higher prices.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I find that statement completely acceptable with the exception of one word which I think must be brought up to date. In the day in which it was made, the term "propertied classes" was more appropriate perhaps because wealth was usually represented in property held. I would think it might be more accurate today—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, are you aware of what has the Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) so disturbed? I thought perhaps that if you knew you might have a sedative of some sort that might help him to relax in his seat again.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister perhaps is making up time.

Mr. MacDonald: What I was attempting to say when the jack-in-the-box effort facing me interrupted was that there is only one word that I would suggest must be changed to bring it up to date. Otherwise, the statement is almost incredibly appropriate today.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Incredibly is right!

Mr. MacDonald: Incredibly appropriate. It is incredible for the hon. member, but it is very, very appropriate for most of the people. I would think moneyed classes might be more appropriate, but who am I to try to change the historic words of a man like Sir Winston Churchill?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing to accept his phraseology for today.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can conclude is that all this noise is appropriate to the fall of the government when this vote is taken.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I trust that you will note by your stop watch all the time that my opponents are taking from my 20 minutes, so that perhaps I can add it on at the end.

In introducing this resolution, I want to concentrate on the impact of the Tory approach on our tax structure, and the striking extent to which it bears lightly on the propertied classes while falling heavily and inequitably, on the lower income groups. Other members of my group here will deal with other ramifications of this magnificent assessment of Tory approach as the debate proceeds this afternoon.

Since we live in a federal state, Mr. Speaker, what the province does itself, or what is done by its creatures, the municipalities, cannot be weighed separately from federal action. The province's action forms just part of the overall impact, and it is significant, therefore, that the Smith committee deliberately avoided any detailed study of income and corporate taxes, despite the fact that a large proportion of Ontario's revenues come from this source. They left that job to the Carter commission implication—and this is stated in the Smith report—the Carter recommendations were accepted as a companion piece, so to speak, to the Smith committee report.

Now, the Carter study documented the extent to which the propertied classes were freeloading—the insurance companies, the oil and the mining companies, the quick profiteers on the stock market and land speculation—to the extent of $600 million in taxes. Now despite revenue needs, Mr. Speaker, the government at Ottawa has refused to move in and to raise this extra $600 million which is there for the taking. By raising it, your would introduce greater equity into the tax structure.

I want to take note at this point, Mr. Speaker, of a repeated interjection of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) when we were discussing this issue earlier in the session.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): I may have a few more later on.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, he will? Wonderful. If we can get the hon. Minister up talking on this issue that will be an achievement. He has not done so for two years, though the documents have been sitting around. This will be a real achievement.

But I do want to acknowledge that the Provincial Treasurer has said it is wrong for us to suggest that $600 million would be available to be spent at will, so to speak. The net amount available to the Treasury would be only $222 million, said the Provincial Treasurer, and he is right.

But he is right, Mr. Speaker, because Carter suggested in order to introduce some equity into our tax structure $400 million of the $600 million odd should be ploughed back into reducing the income tax to the lower income groups. This through a 10 per cent reduction in income tax for those earning less than $5,000 and a 7 per cent decrease for those earning between $5,000 and $10,000. In short, Mr. Speaker, what Carter has recommended is some of the tax load should be shifted from the masses of the people to the propertied classes and thereby establish a more equitable tax structure.

This government has said little or nothing about the Carter commission. We have the prospect, with the Provincial Treasurer's interjection, that he will say something later this afternoon, even though this government shares in a very substantial way in the inequitably applied income and corporate taxes in this country. The Liberals at Ottawa and the Conservatives at Queen's Park not only tolerate but deliberately maintain a situation in which the burden has been transferred in Sir Winston's words, from the propertied classes to the masses of the people. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it becomes equally appropriate in Canada to interchange the term Liberal with Conservative in examining this historic statement of Sir Winston Churchill. The Robarts government, Mr. Speaker, acknowledges the inequity of the tax burden. But let us examine the government's approach to shifting that burden.

Their pre-election promise of the basic shelter exemption amounts to tax relief approximating $50 per family in this province. But consider their post-election performance.

Before the $50 saving has been passed on, and indeed it has not yet been passed on, the budget has imposed more inequitable taxes weighing most heavily on the little people. The gasoline tax, the tobacco tax, fishing licence, hospital premiums, and so on, to the extent of $125 per family. So, in order to put $50 into one pocket of the average family, the government has taken $125 out of the other pocket. What a magnificent example of Tory relief.

With the basic inequity of the tax structure untouched, the government has made a bad situation worse, and in doing so has illustrated anew the truth of Sir Winston's obser-

vation about the Tory party. More of the tax burden has been shifted onto the shoulders of the masses of the people.

But this is only one example, Mr. Speaker, of the far-ranging nature of the pattern that is so magnificently summed up in Sir Winston Churchill's comments. There are many other examples. What I want to do now is just briefly sketch through some of these examples and to set a context within which my colleagues will later provide more material.

First, the government has refused to establish a prices review board, to check the actions of those who seek, in Sir Winston's words, "to gain a greater profit for the investment of their capital by charging higher prices".

The Liberals at Ottawa have now accepted the idea of a prices review board, and the Premier of this province has written to Ottawa immediately indicating that he is willing to co-operate in the effort to make that board operative. But it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that when they finally acknowledged the validity of a prices review board, they have altered the concept of the approach to a prices-wages review board.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to a prices-wages review board, except that it reveals the bias of the Liberals also accepted by the Tories.

A prices-wages review board, if it is going to be balanced, would be a prices-wages-profits review board, because prices are the fruits of labour, and profits are the fruits of management, and wages and profits contribute to make prices.

So, what is magnificently illustrated in this one latest move by the Liberals at Ottawa, supported by the Tories here, is once again an effort to get at the problem of prices by focusing public attention on wages and by ignoring the whole contribution of profits. In short, once again to focus attention on the masses of people and the wages being earned, rather than the fruits that are going to the propertied classes, if I may borrow the great statesman's terminology.

On housing policy, mortgage money has been made available, for the most part, to the middle and the high income brackets. In the words of housing experts—and these are not the words of New Democrats, these are acknowledged experts in the field of housing—it has become socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor. The overwhelming proportion of the mortgage money available has been to people earning in excess of $8,000.

On the basic shelter exemption that this government has introduced, the propertied classes once again benefit.

I do not object to homeowners benefiting since in our society we have gone some direction, some distance in the direction of everybody being able to have a home and, therefore, being a member of the so-called propertied classes. But it is interesting to note that the government could not draw the line between basic shelter, their home, and cottages which are certainly an acquisition of propertied classes. They have gotten away from the basic shelter exemption concept, and they even refuse to draw a line separating out foreign-owned cottages. They are asking the people of the province of Ontario, through the provincial Treasury, to subsidize the tax of foreigners, whereas the government, for example, has refused to consider subsidizing people who happen to live in public housing in the province of Ontario. They balked at it because it is, in their terms, a double subsidy.

Well, here is one other example of action in favour of the propertied classes, without acknowledging the interests of the masses of the people.

The government has refused to enter national medicare, though it could bring about a 50 per cent reduction in premiums for Ontario citizens. The Canadian Press has taken a survey across this country from authoritative sources who have suggested that if national medicare was entered into by this province it would actually cost the province of Ontario less than we are now spending.

The answer to that riddle is not difficult to find. This government is now subsidizing low income groups—the people on pension and those earning less than $2,000—so extensively that there has already been contributed to the expenditure of medicare that subsidy that would have to go into a universal plan.

By having a universal plan as in the Canadian Press survey, the overall expenditures could be reduced from $365 million to some $350 million. But the important thing, Mr. Speaker, is that by refusing to go into the national plan and, therefore, getting a subsidy from Ottawa, this government has made it impossible to pass on to all of the people of Ontario, the people in what might be called the lower-middle and the middle income brackets, a 50 per cent cut in medical premiums at a time when there is a desperate need to assist in the growing cost of living.

In the mining communities, both the Liberal and Conservative governments, federally and provincially, have granted exemptions to corporations, while shifting the burden of taxes, at the municipal as well as the senior levels of government, to the workers who make up the great proportion of the mining community population.

This is perhaps the most flagrant example of Liberal-Tory favouritism on the side of the propertied classes, the mining corporation, so that the little person, the homeowner, the worker, the miner in a mining community has to pick up the tab on behalf of the mining corporation. For years this has persisted.

The Carter commission, at one level, has decried this favouritism and says it is unnecessary. This government, at another level, protected a discriminatory tax set-up for years in spite of growing protest in the mining communities in this Legislature.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I have been complaining about it for years, and never got any support.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member has changed his policy since 1960, as we will one day put on the record, just to indicate just what the change is.

Mr. Speaker, while a provincial Tory government publicly worries about welfare costs, and the new federal Liberal leader calls for an end to what he chooses to describe as "this free handout stuff", the Ontario development corporation hands out amounts up to $500,000 to encourage corporations to establish new plants in the underdeveloped areas of this province.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, welfare for the propertied classes is commendable and engaged in by this government. But welfare for their urgent humane needs is increasingly a matter to be deplored. In short, Mr. Speaker, you have, if I may quote the wisdom of Sir Winston Churchill, an acknowledgment of the fact that there is class consciousness on the part of people, and no government is more conscious of the propertied class and their interest—than this government.

A genuine democracy demands that this government should be the handmaiden of all of the people of the province of Ontario, not a guardian of the interests of the propertied classes, who do not carry a fair share of the tax burden, and who are assisted by this government in uncontrolled price increases to boost the profits in their investments.

In the face of this solid documentation, I call upon this House to vote no confidence in this government in its inequitable policies when we have a vote later this afternoon.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment on the amendment made this afternoon by the hon. member for York South.

You may be aware, sir, that funds made available to Opposition offices will give the hon. member an opportunity to send his speech to all parts of the province if he so chooses. I had the distinct impression that it was made in anticipation of that endeavour this summer, rather than for the enlightenment of this House.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member in proposing the amendment, said that he did not want, in his words, to rehash what had already been said. As we, I hope approach the end of this session, I must inform him that it has been a considerable rehash of views that he has expressed previously. I would say, however, sir, that if you will permit me, I would like to recall some of the historical circumstances surrounding the quote that has been made famous over the years, of the late lamented Winston Churchill. I understand that it was made about 1904, at the time when Winston Churchill was in his Progressive stage. His decision was brought upon him as he sat in the Conservative benches and he was in opposition to the tariff preferential system that was emerging as Conservative policy in those days.

As a matter of fact, the leader of the Opposition, Robert Borden, and the Prime Minister of Canada, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, were involved in this in some small measure themselves, because seeing that here was an opportunity to trade with the Empire in a way that they had not had an opportunity up until that time, they sent a telegram to Great Britain approving of it.

When it was read in the House of Commons, it was Winston Churchill, then a young man just returned from the Boer war, who got up to speak against Empire preferences, particularly as it affected the cost of food. It is in the particular connection, I think, that it has some connection to the debate this afternoon, since we are concerned with rising prices, not directly as a result of preferential tariffs, but perhaps, the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), would say, in the absence of some of the tariffs.

It is interesting that the young politician, Winston Churchill, as he rose to speak, looked around at the Tory benches and found that 80 of his former colleagues rose and left the House, and, I am told by those who have done some research in the history for me, that under those circumstances, he actually broke down in the House.

When he next entered, he came in through the main door, walked to the Bar of the House, looked to his former friends in the government on the left, and turned to the right, and sat down beside Lloyd George and entered the Liberal phase of his career. As you all know, this was a passing period of clarity in the gentleman's thinking as far as politics was concerned, but no one in this House has any doubt as to his overwhelming ability as a leader and a statesman.

There were one or two comments that he made in debates earlier that year that have some interest, at least in this House. I understand that he crossed the floor May 31, 1904, and during the next few weeks he was really a thorn in the side of his former colleagues on the Treasury benches. As a matter of fact, Prime Minister Balfour found that the business of the House was going rather slowly and he was trying his best to achieve an adjournment by August 16 when, as I understand it, grouse shooting began. In order to achieve adjournment, he put a resolution before the House calling for the House to sit after midnight four nights a week and after 5:30 on Fridays. So you can see that government leaders have had their difficulties over the years since then.

While that resolution was being debated, Churchill said the following, and I quote:

> There is one thing on which we must congratulate the Prime Minister, after all we are nearly at the end of the session, and here is the Prime Minister still. The procedure of the House has been mutilated, but never mind.

I interpose here that perhaps he did not like to sit late into the evening either.

> A great quantity of money has been expended, never mind.

It would have been interesting to compare that quantity with the sum that we expend here.

> No legislation of any value has been passed, never mind. But here is the Prime Minister at the end of the session, a great deal more than many people would have expected or hoped for. I offer to the right honourable gentleman, most sincerely, my most humble congratulations on his achievement.

And even this afternoon, when the future of this very government is at stake, our Prime Minister is not in attendance, and he was not here yesterday either. He arrived in the capital, I am told, only in time to lead three cheers for the leader of the federal party, for that handful of the faithful who gathered in the Coliseum last night.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose this is hardly covered by the ambit of the resolution, but you permitted the hon. member for York South to stray a bit. I am told that there were more Liberals attending the nomination convention for Davenport constituency in that hall, than attended the meeting in honour of the leader of the party last night, for the whole of Metro Toronto. And this does not augur well for the success of the Conservatives. I would say, Mr. Speaker, if you would permit this as coming under the amendment, that the Liberal Party is looking for a tremendous sweep at the elections just one week away.

There is at least one other quote that I would like to bring to your attention, sir: the one from Mr. Churchill that is included in the body of the particular amendment, because it does deal with the Conservative Party. And there is another one that deals with it, perhaps not on a class basis, which is the one that my hon. friend from York South selected, but one that is realistic even today.

During the election campaign of 1908 he referred to the Conservative Party as being, and I quote:

> Filled with old doddering peers, cute financial magnates, clever wire pullers, big brewers with bulbouls noses. All the enemies of progress are there—weaklings, sleek, smug, comfortable individuals.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this is language that you would hardly permit in the development of parliamentary procedures as we experience it here, and yet many of these adjectives do describe the attitude toward public responsibility that has been taken by members opposite, and sometimes by the members sitting to our left.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the position of opposing the government. We do not feel that we are with the NDP, we are far ahead of them. But I would say to you, sir, in the

clauses of this particular amendment, the member for York South has dragged out all the old political chestnuts that he has been roasting in the fire for so many years. He has seen fit, as a matter of fact, to curry our support by not being so vicious in his attack on the federal Liberals as he was perhaps in his comments here a few moments ago.

It is for this reason that we on this side, since we are opposed to those "bulbous nosed" politicians sitting opposite, are able to vote in favour of the amendment as a matter of no confidence. We are concerned with some of the provisions of the amendment.

The member for York South has once again referred to the need for a rental agency review. And I must say that I was much struck by the comments made last night by the hon. member for Scarborough Centre (Mrs. M. Renwick) when she was describing in some detail the straitened circumstances that some of the people in her constituency have experienced in recent months. I know that you are aware, sir, that most of us as members of this House have had put upon us the responsibility to deal with these individuals in similar circumstances.

I know it would not be acceptable for all of us to bring to your attention, the individual cases, but I think that it is very worthwhile when someone like the member for Scarborough Centre is constrained so to do, and I believe that she made a very good point to the housing debate that we engaged in last evening.

A rental review agency is, of course, something that would be of definite value in the circumstances that we find are being experienced in our communities right now. The difficulties that consumers in every community are having in meeting their bills and simply putting meals on the table, let alone a roof over the heads of the family, are something that we are all aware of.

We perhaps complain about our own indemnities and we sometimes complain about the length of the sessions of this House keeping us away from some of our other enterprises. And yet we know that we, along with the member for York South, are very much in a privileged class as far as meeting the family responsibilities as individuals. We must never forget that we are here to speak for those much less fortunate than ourselves.

It is very much incumbent upon us that we are aware of this responsibility and that we do not feel that the phrase, the affluent society, refers to everyone that comes under the jurisdiction of the government of Ontario or the government of Canada. And so I say that these review boards could serve a useful purpose. As a Liberal I feel that we must be careful that we do not impose heavy government bureaucracy upon the individual liberties that we hold so dearly as Canadians and as citizens of the West.

The member for York South is right when he says that he is prepared to accept a wages review board, because if we are going to have guidelines in the community, they must encompass all the activities of the community. The hon. member has a list of review boards that is extensive, and it is obviously a propensity of the socialists to regulate and control every aspect of the community.

It may very well be the proposal that we put before the House was long before the proposition that the member for York South finds so attractive this session—that the standing committees of the Legislature be given some continuing responsibility to review changes in the economy that come about by changes in the price of the food, and in the fees and charges by professions such as doctors, lawyers, teachers and others; that the premiums required for automobile insurance and other insurance rates should certainly come under the review of those who carry upon their shoulders the responsibility of the public interest.

If this responsibility would be too onerous for my friend to the left, then it may very well be that some sort of a situation can be developed where a more objective board would have this responsibility.

But my view is held very strongly, sir, that we do not want to encumber our economy with needless bureaucracy which is always so attractive to the socialists. But beyond that, we must accept our responsibility in seeing that the citizens of this province do benefit from what we like to call the just society.

Mr. Speaker, we believe very definitely that if there is going to be a wages review board in conjunction with the other emanations of government that have been proposed here today, they cannot be brought into the scene when positions have hardened, when a strike is imminent or perhaps in progress, but that all of these matters can be used to represent the public interest in a much more effective way than it has been proposed.

We know very well that in this nation and in this province we face at the present time serious challenges to our understanding of modern labour negotiations. We have seen the united auto workers, many of them my own constituents, who have been out on strike in an effort to gain their point in opposition to that held by Massey-Ferguson; the strike has gone on now for more than a month. We see the position taken by the seaway workers, which could very well result in a strike tying up the whole St. Lawrence system.

The Metro members of the Canadian union of public employees, we are told, are going to withdraw their services on Friday of this week which may very well, according to the Metro chairman, result in the garbage piling up, no water being made available and sewage disposal not functioning.

This is a matter of great concern. A matter in which a wages review board should have been of some assistance before the situation reached this particular point. I would say that these matters are of great importance, not only to politicians, but to those who want to see our province and our nation move ahead on a fair and equitable basis; a just basis; a basis in which all sections of society can take part in our growing economy.

Mr. Speaker, I see that the time is going on. There are at least two matters of specific concern that I want to bring to your attention.

The first, has to do with northern development. You know, sir, that we on this side have had a resolution on the order paper for some time dealing with this in detail. It is my hope that my colleague, the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), in the Budget debate, when that order is called some time in the future—you know that we have not had access to that order of business for many weeks—will be able to put our position in more detail. But we do believe, as the hon. member for Sudbury's resolution provides, in the increased activity on the part of this government in seeing that our natural resources are developed here and that the manufacturing takes place within the confines of our own province.

I was interested to read the dilemma the Minister of Mines finds himself in in this very matter. He was rather plaintively suggesting to one of the reporters for the *Globe and Mail* that he wished the appointment could have been postponed for a year so that these difficult matters would not be before him. But I can assure him, sir, that we on this side are prepared to support his efforts to see that the manufacturing of our natural resources does take place within our own boundaries and that we no longer export our birthright from this particular source of wealth.

Mr. Speaker, it has been our view that the Ontario development corporation should have been taking a more effective means, or or applying more effective methods, in providing a channel for public funds in the development of our northern resources.

The Minister has said that he is prepared to use private funds as well in this particular responsibility. We hope that we can have a change in policy that will bring this into effect, but when we talk of the association that the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) has, we must of course, come to something that is a looming problem but has not been discussed in this House for some years. That is the problem of unemployment, which was predicted in the Budget papers brought down in this House some weeks ago by the Treasurer. We are informed already that unemployment in Canada is approaching the 4 per cent level and while it must be much less than that in Ontario, we can say—

An hon. member: We have full employment.

Mr. Nixon: Well 3.1 per cent of our work force is unemployed in Ontario—the hon. Minister equates that with full employment. I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that in one segment of our work force there is probably 60 per cent unemployment and I am talking about the student work force, about which nothing has been done by this government and for which everything should be done.

Mr. Speaker, only a few of our educational institutions have a summer programme. Ryerson is an outstanding example, whereby our young students who do not have an opportunity to go out and employ themselves gainfully for a few months, can, during the summer period, continue with their courses there so that time will not be wasted. I suppose some of the members remember a far different day when students used to languish on the beaches of this province and elsewhere while they were waiting to return to university, but I do not believe that is the case now.

I would think there are between 70,000 and 100,000 young people who are searching for employment in Ontario and who are unable to find it. As has so often happened in

the past, this government is prepared to say that the national employment responsibility should look after this. But I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the government of Ontario, through The Department of Labour or The Department of Education, should have a co-ordinated programme whereby the efforts and abilities and idealism of these young people can be harnessed for the development of our own province.

I would say to you that before these young people get enmeshed in the machinery of big business and big industry that they should have a taste of community service. We should be prepared to employ them in this province for two months or perhaps longer, seeing that they get $400 or $500 for that period, so that they can put that towards their continuing education.

I believe in this way we can provide the kind of service, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) is looking for in the Ontario Hospitals, that the Minister of Agriculture and Food is looking for on our farms, that the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) and the Minister of Energy and Resources Managament (Mr. Simonett) are looking for in their expanding responsibilities having to do with education and the provision of an expanding economy.

I see that the time that I have at my disposal is drawing to an end, Mr. Speaker, but I would say that this is an area of growing challenge as far as Ontario is concerned. This is one particular challenge that we can meet in this province and in which we are failing the young people that come under the purview of provincial responsibility specifically.

I do have one quote remaining from Sir Winston Churchill that was made during his period of enlightenment, when he was sitting with the Liberals in the House of Commons and in those days they were emerging into a three party system. As you know, they have reverted in Great Britain to a two party system, but during that particular period this man, who was making some comments about Conservatism, also left his pearls of wisdom for those who have come after concerning socialism. This was, as I say, while he was supporting Liberalism and I would like to bring these comments to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and I quote as follows:

> Socialism wants to pull down wealth, Liberalism to raise up poverty. Socialism would destroy private interests. Liberalism would preserve them in the only way they could justly be preserved by reconciling them with public rights.
>
> Socialism seeks to kill enterprise. Liberalism seeks to rescue enterprise from the trammels of privilege and preference. Socialism assails the maximum pre-eminence of the individual. Liberalism seeks to build up the standard of the masses.
>
> Socialism attacks capital. Liberalism attacks monopoly. The socialists have a creed of universal self sacrifice, but preach it in the language of spite, envy, hatred and uncharitableness. They desire to reconstruct the world, but leave out human nature.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with these comments that I would say that we intend to vote against the government on the amendment. I believe the amendment is more of a collegiate debating vehicle than any other, but I am glad to have had an opportunity, sir, to put before you my views on this important matter.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to do quite as much research into the old writings of the then young Mr. Churchill as my hon. colleagues on the other side of the House have been able to do.

I did think though, as I read the quote entered in the amendment to the resolution by the hon. member for York South, that he really was reaching. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if ever I saw an example of the devil citing scripture, this is it. I also recognize, of course, that they have not read as carefully the writings of the late Sir Winston Churchill —the writings that shall be remembered long after these which have been quoted today have been forgotten. Indeed, I would suggest to you, sir, that some of them may outlive the Psalms of David, if I may be heretical enough to suggest such a thing. But there is another thing that they have missed in Churchill's character, sir.

Churchill was one of the first to publicly apologize on many occasions for the irresponsible statements and actions of his youth, because he lived to a ripe old age when he became extremely mature, when he learned through which political party he, and anyone who had the concern of his country and the world at heart, could make the greatest contribution.

It is to the everlasting credit of the late Sir Winston Churchill that he was born a Conservative, he strayed for a few moments —as has my hon. friend here, the member for York South—you know at one time, sir, he was headed to be a Conservative, but he

got off the track, and he has not lived quite as long as Sir Winston Churchill yet, but I suggest to you, sir, that he will come back on the track, too, because they are headed in that direction.

I have never lost hope for my hon friend, the leader of the Opposition. He really is, at heart as his venerable father was, Conservative; interested in the development of this great province and this great nation of ours. Sir, could you give the hon. member for York South some of that sedative you were to give somebody on our side a few moments ago?

The hon. member for York South interests me and intrigues me. You know, sir, as I read this amendment, I could think of him as an ultra-modern artist. Now I do not know if you understand modern art. I do not.

As I look at the broad swipes he takes on the canvas I thought he used a stable broom but I believe what he does is he turns on the fan and then he throws the bucket of paint —or whatever is in the bucket that he is going to throw—and, of course, it gets spread. Now this is a broad, all-embracing, irresponsible, kind of picture he paints, Mr. Speaker.

One only has to look at the economic reasoning of the socialist party and it is as irresponsible and as pointless as many of the other things they say and do. We as the government, responsible for the business of running the province, must put the facts before the House, and I am going to deal only with one phase of the amendment—that relative to medicare.

In the hike in taxation that our hon. friend speaks about, he includes hospital premiums. I wonder if, in this way, he is accepting the thesis put forward by hon. friend from Sudbury, who persisted during the presentation of my estimates that premiums are a form of taxation. In my view the very opposite should obtain—that actually the taxation, which is imposed upon the people, to pay for medicare and other health schemes, is really a form of hidden premium. If premiums are taxation then what about the prices and the costs of all other goods?

From the amendment of the hon. member for York South, one is led to believe, or led to think, he is inferring that the increased hospital premium is to be used for other things, for other expenditures in government services, which of course is quite wrong. At the inception of the plan, as he will remember because he and I came into the House at the same time, it was the policy of the government that this should be a three-way partnership; that the cost of hospital services insurance would be divided as closely as possible in three even parts—the two governments each assuming responsibility for one-third of the cost, the remaining third to come from premiums.

This obtained for a little while but it, too, got astray, and we got completely out of balance. All we have sought to do in keeping with escalating costs, Mr. Speaker, is to bring our programme back into line with the policy first laid down. This fiscal year, for instance, as I pointed out a few weeks ago the estimated cost for hospital care and other related services—among those services are the home care programmes, certain outpatient services, certain ambulance services—will be about $744 million.

Of this amount, out of provincial revenues, we are to find $250 million. You will see, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that we are seeking to get this back into the balance that was originally set up.

Now the socialists have another peculiar thing and in this, I think, they are unique Sometimes I think our Liberal friends try to point this out but not quite as blatantly as our socialist friends. They seem to think and to convey the impression that only they have any concern for people; they are the party who cares—bunk! Mr. Speaker, there is no political party in this country that has a corner on the milk of human kindness. Far less this party than any other, for I say to you that they are not only willing but ready and anxious at every time to exploit any misfortune of any individual to gain their own political ends.

I point to you, sir, the experience of every country that is governed by a socialist party. Everywhere, if you study carefully the political history of those countries, you will see them either stagnating or dying. These people tried to impose this on a province in Canada on one occasion, sir. For 20 years—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Why does the Minister not show proof?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The proof is there as clear as anyone wants to have it. For 20-odd years the province of Saskatchewan slowly died; in many phases of its life it was completely stagnant. The people were even leaving the province and you know, even when they finally woke up and replaced this group of socialists they did not go all the way—they did choose a Liberal government.

But even they have been able to inject a little life into that province which was slowly but surely dying as a result of socialist mismanagement over 20 years. In spite of all of this, in spite of the fact, sir, that all the evidence is crystal clear before us, the socialists persist in their views.

Only they are right; they will listen to nobody else's opinion; nobody else knows anything about social services whatsoever. Only their narrow doctrinaire philosophy is any good; only that will work in spite of the fact that it has not worked anywhere. I repeat, sir, it has not worked anywhere, and socialists all over the world are turning against their own philosophy.

Again I repeat to you that their mind is made up and this is typical of their attitude. They do not want us to confuse them with the facts.

In 1959 when this province entered into a hospital insurance programme it became evident that there were serious gaps in certain of our other health care services, particularly in physicians' services. The province of Ontario immediately set about finding a programme that would fill these gaps. I shall not go into the details of the evolutionary process, sir, it is well known to all the members of this House.

We did, however, come to certain basic philosophies. We determined that medical services insurance should be available to all of our people regardless of age, their state of heath, or their ability to pay. It is on this basis that OMSIP has been developed and I say to you, sir, with a great deal of pride, that OMSIP has been successful. It meets the requirements of the people of the province. In combination with other plans that have been brought about through employment, through labour contracts, and so on, OMSIP insures that virtually every person in Ontario has access to medical services insurance and is therefore provided protection against the potential financial catastrophe of major illness or accident.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Turn the fan that way!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: OMSIP, Mr. Speaker, is a demonstration of the policy of this government as I enunciated on April 25, 1963:

> The provision of health care is an individual responsibility and the individual has the right to determine whether or how he will discharge that responsibility.

All of us, I think, know something about the development of national medicare. There is no such thing as national medicare, Mr. Speaker; what, in fact, does exist is a federal proposal, a proposal of the federal government by legislation, which makes certain financial grants or makes certain moneys available to the provinces which would become effective if the provinces meet a specific set of conditions laid down by the federal government.

These four principles are well known. They are—to be eligible for this federal assistance, the programme must provide comprehensive physician services, all physician services; there must be universal—according to the federal interpretation that means compulsory —coverage; it must be publicly administered and, of course, it must be portable, transferable throughout Canada.

The government of Ontario, I say, sir, as has been stated clearly by the hon. Prime Minister of this province on many occasions, has no doctrinaire aversion to a sound scheme of publicly financed medical care. Indeed, we believe that every responsible government must assume responsibility for essential social services, including the provision of such services when and where necessary.

The government of Ontario insists that any publicly financed medicare programme be flexible, be capable of implementation in an orderly manner, meet the expressed needs and priorities of the people to whom it is responsible; and be within the scope of their ability to pay. We must keep in mind at all times that even the most desirable of social programmes will not succeed if its cost is such that the people cannot afford to pay for the programme.

The government of Ontario rejected the current federal proposals for these reasons: they are excessively expensive; not consistent with our priorities; unfair to those provinces unable to afford to participate; and they tamper improperly with matters which are constitutionally the direct responsibility of the provinces.

There are fundamental weaknesses in the programme put forward by the federal government. Only two of the ten provinces have agreed to participate when the programme comes into effect this summer, Rejection has been most emphatic by eight provinces. And, in spite of the fact that included in those provinces are governments which are persuaded to believe in the policies of the present, or the now dying government at

Ottawa, the federal government has paid no attention even to them.

This is a dramatic demonstration of the serious concern throughout the whole of Canada about the ability of our country to finance the cost of medicare as now defined. And I submit to you too, sir, that it is evidence of concern by the provinces that the federal government completely and totally ignores its provincial priorities.

The history of the development of national medicare is well known to everybody, I have not the time to rehash it here. I only want to point out to you that a great deal has been said about it being a federal-provincial co-operative programme. During the bringing about of this programme, a great deal was spoken about co-operative federalism. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to sit in on many of those meetings and I came to the conclusion that if that is co-operative federalism, I had to develop a new name for it. In my view it was federal coercion.

The Prime Minister of Canada of the day came to us with a programme already made out. There was no question of consultation, there was no question of provincial involvement. In spite of all we tried to suggest—

Mr. Stokes: The Minister had already made up his mind.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —they, like the socialists here in Ontario, had their mind made up. They did not want it confused with the facts.

About the costs, Mr. Speaker. Again I cannot begin to understand the economies of our socialist friend; they are totally beyond me.

It is quite true that we will not get 50 per cent of the cost. Ontario would qualify for something like 44 per cent of the cost because of the fact that Ontario provides 46 per cent of all of the revenues that go into the federal coffers at Ottawa. Here again is a fault, a very great fault, with this programme, because this is not a programme of equity. We are in this programme subsidizing—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, if they would just keep quiet a little while then they would understand that the province of Ontario has been one of the leaders in advocating a policy of support for the so-called "have not" provinces.

I say to you, sir, that history will yet record that no province in this nation has provided as much to support the so-called "have not" provinces as has this province of Ontario. And no province, I say to you, sir, has complained less about it than has this province.

We believe, sir, and we have put this on the record, that if there is to be equalization of financing and opportunity it should be on the top of the table and not handed out in this oblique underhanded way.

The Canadian people should know what moneys are being expended for the support of those provinces that need it. Therefore I say to you, sir, that this method—the financing of a so-called national medicare plan, is entirely the wrong way of going about this sort of thing.

May I, just in closing, give you the facts about the costs? Suppose we took this—$147 million is what we would qualify for in this year if we were to go into this programme July 1. This would allow us to bring a single premium to $3.55. But the additional tax that every Ontario person would have to pay to help pay for the programme in the whole of Canada would call for the addition of $4.19, or a total of $7.74 a month. This against the OMSIP premium, which provides more—I emphasize, sir, provides more—than is called for by the federal proposal; the premium for that is $5.90—$5.90 for OMSIP now against $7.74, which it would cost the individual in Ontario.

For a couple the cost would be $15.48, against what they now pay for OMSIP, $11.80. For the family unit, those about whom they are shedding great crocodile tears, Mr. Speaker, their cost would be $19.36 a month, as opposed to the present cost of OMSIP, $14.75.

And I emphasize OMSIP today provides more than the federal programme would. And I also point out that the $230 million a year that the Ontario people would have to find to finance the other provinces would include an annual subsidy of $83 million to the operation of universal medicare in other provinces. Here again, sir, I say to you, that if the province of Ontario were being charged what it costs them we would have no objection, but this is a wrong programme in every way.

My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, made a very good statement in closing but he did not go far enough. He said that the Liberals are far ahead of the NDP. I

suggest to you, sir, that we in the Progressive Conservative Party are far ahead of both of them. For 25 years we have led this province; we continue to lead Ontario. I make bold to predict, sir, that not only will we continue to lead Ontario, but we shall continue to lead Canada ahead to that great destiny which is hers.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise in support of my leader's motion of want of confidence in this government.

First, let me say that I appreciated that the leader of the Opposition, in commenting on it, did manage to speak about some matters of substance in the motion, after a discussion on the background of the quotation which heads the motion of want of confidence. He concluded his remarks, however, Mr. Speaker, by referring to another quotation of the right hon. gentleman, which inveighs against socialism and socialists.

I just want to suggest to you why the leader of the Opposition chose to do that, because I think in the light of what is to take place a few days from now, it was a very understandable action on his part. At the time the quotation was made—the words were delivered—the threat of socialism was certainly looming large on the horizon of the Rt. Hon. Sir Winston Churchill.

In a period of industrial unrest, Mr. Speaker, the foresight for which the right honourable gentleman was credited so often told him that the Labour Party was going to sweep away the last vestiges of the party that the hon. leader of the Opposition now has the temporary honour to lead in this House.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Did you ever read what he said about Attlee?

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Speaker, I think that the leader of the Opposition's reference to that quotation was apt because, on June 25, the people of Canada will have an opportunity to sweep away the last vestiges of an administration which, for the last several years has, equally with the government in this province, contributed to the transferring of the burdens of the property classes onto the shoulders of the masses of the people by gaining greater profits for the investment of the capital in charging higher prices.

The leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, I believe referred—with some nostalgia, perhaps—to the fact that the Rt. Hon. Sir Winston Churchill left the ranks of his party at that time in 1904, when his leader of the day was trying to adjourn the House. The leader of the government here, in this Legislature, would like to do that in the very near future.

I suggest to the leader of the Opposition that after June 25 he will no doubt want to spend more time reading in history, because he might be turning to the history of those days in 1957 and 1958, to look for the parallels that led to the defeat of the current Liberal administration at Ottawa on June 25.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution—this motion of vote of confidence—is extremely timely, because while the people of Canada will have an opportunity to express their disdain for the federal government on June 25, the only way in which the people of Ontario can act to bring about the downfall of this government, as properly deserves to happen to it, is through this motion of want of confidence that is put before the House today.

It is extremely timely, Mr. Speaker, because it comes in juxtaposition to that election at the polls on June 25. It is also in itself a great summation of what has taken place in this session of the Legislature, a summation of the failures of this government to deal with the great issues that are set out in the motion of want of confidence.

One of these I want to deal with while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, is the question of the government's failure to establish a prices review board, and to boost the level of the minimum wage and provide for guaranteed incomes to the citizens of this province who do not share in the affluence enjoyed by those sectors of the population that the motion refers to in the quotation.

Mr. Speaker, prices in this province and in Canada in the last four years have gone up twice as fast as they did on the average in the previous ten-year period from 1953 to 1963. Many costs have gone up and I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that even as costs have gone up in our industrial and commercial sectors, the price increases which have been put into effect have, in many cases, exceeded the increases in costs, and have been well beyond anything that could be possibly justified by rises in labour costs as well.

For example, recently the Ford Motor Company of Canada increased its prices in 1968 model cars by an average of about $90. Its unit sales in 1967 increased by about one per cent. But while its prices went up at the end of the 1967 calendar year on its 1968 models, and its sales went up only by one per cent on a unit basis, the company's

profits after taxes in the calendar year 1967 almost doubled.

Mr. Speaker, there could not be a more appropriate example of how the corporations in a price leadership position use their domination of the market to illustrate the words of the Right Hon. Sir Winston Churchill where he said: "They are gaining greater profits for the investment of their capital by charging higher prices."

The corporations to which I am referring, Mr. Speaker, are doing that in a much more subtle and sophisticated way than they could possibly have done in the days of Sir Winston Churchill.

These corporations, Mr. Speaker, do not go to the bank. Some of them do go to the Minister of Trade and Development opposite for amounts of up to $500,000, but I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that they do not go to the Minister of Trade and Development because they are in any great need of the funds that he supplies to them on a non-interest, non-repayable basis. They go, as the Minister has suggested, because there is $500,000 to be made.

But the money they are really making, Mr. Speaker, they are taking out of the pockets of consumers through higher prices. They do not require the traditional sources of funds in the money markets that they once needed for capital expansion and the purchase of equipment and development of new products.

These funds, Mr. Speaker, for research and technological advance and capital expansion now come out of the prices paid by the average consumer, and in that way, Mr. Speaker, the profits of these corporate price leaders in our private economy are enhanced by charging higher prices even where, as in the case of the automobile market, the company sales rose only by one per cent, yet their profits doubled.

How do they achieve this? Well, they do it through a formula which they establish at the beginning of their model year or sometime before, and it is a formula which I am sure has been adopted by many other industries. It is not a formula under which the company determines what the market will be in coming years and how prices ought to be set so that the volume of sales within that market which is forecast by the companies' economists can be the largest volume possible.

That is not the way prices are determined or profits are determined. What is determined first, Mr. Speaker, is how much money that corporation would like to earn on behalf of its shareholders; what size of return it wishes to maintain or move up to on its shareholders' equity in the corporation.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the volume of production and the price per unit of production is set in order to provide the corporation with that level of return after it has paid off its taxes to the government and paid for its materials and labour. That is how prices are being set and that is how higher prices, Mr. Speaker, are increasingly enhancing the incomes of the managers of these corporations and the shareholders.

When a corporation has decided on that formula it then knows how much production it needs out in that given period of time in order to reach its profit target.

There is a very thorough discussion of the way in which profits are set and how prices result from this profit-setting formula, Mr. Speaker, by a well known sociologist, Daniel Bell in the magazine called *Discent*. He goes into a very thorough discussion of the way in which large corporations, particularly those with price-setting power, use such a formula to maintain, even in the face of a declining market, a very substantial return for themselves and for their shareholders. How they refuse to acknowledge the traditional law of supply and demand, and refuse to acknowledge that the consumer should in any way share in the savings that these firms can achieve through the increase in their productivity and the increases in the technological methods of scheduling their work and improving their product.

There is no other way, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, despite the comments of the leader of the Opposition, to come to grips with this matter other than by the adoption of the suggestion of the leader of my group in his motion; for the establishment of a prices review board.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join in this debate and I am going to attempt, if I can, to set the hon. Minister of Health straight on a few facts.

He and I, over the years, seem to end up tangling over this subject of medical insurance. I did not realize that he was going to be the speaker for the government immediately preceding myself, but at least it gave me an opportunity to change some of my remarks and to try to put the emphasis where I think it should be put.

I think the editorial in the Toronto *Daily Star* of today rather suits the hon. Minister of Health as well as it does the hon. Minister

of Trade and Development. There is an editorial in the Toronto *Daily Star* on Mr. Randall talking about whacking a straw man.

It said some Ontario Cabinet Ministers can whip up a vision or whack the stuffing out of a straw man at the drop of a speaking invitation. Of course, they talked about Mr. Randall on housing; not being able to build houses, but doing a lot of talking.

I find that the hon. Minister of Health is again whacking a straw man when he tells us of the tremendous economic cost that the national medical care scheme will be.

I know that time and time again we have discussed this subject in this House in various stages. There have been bills at different times, and the subject must be getting monotonous to a great many people in public life. But if you look back over the records and over the years, slowly, ever so slowly, the government has been forced to give way.

At one time when the hon. Minister of Health was campaigning for the leadership of the Tory party, he said there would never be any public care programme in the province of Ontario. He was against it. Yet if we look at the record we can see that we in this province are not too far off being in a position to accept the offer made by the federal government.

It is a great pity, Mr. Speaker, that at this stage in the game, the Tory government is still fighting a very obvious need, and that is the national medicare scheme.

I want to emphasize this. We are told that there is going to be a tremendous increase in the cost of health, and it is not the increase in the cost of health, it is merely spreading the cost across the various incomes that people have. I believe, that the total cost of medical care in Canada will not increase more than 10 per cent. We already are spending about 90 per cent of the cost and this is going to probably increase about 10 per cent when the scheme across Canada comes into action. Two provinces already that we know of are going to accept this by July 1 of this year.

But what is so important to this country and to this province is that in Ontario, what we do—being the banner province—is very vital to the country as a whole. But this government, I think, Mr. Speaker, lives up to this quotation that the hon. member for York South quoted from Sir Winston Churchill—that the Conservative Party is nothing less than a deliberate attempt on the part of important sections of the propertied classes to transfer their burdens to the shoulders of the masses of people.

This is exactly what is going on in the cost of medical insurance today. For every $1.30 collected by private insurance companies, $1 goes back to the people. The other 37 cents is kept by the company; 7 per cent is for the cost of administration, which is about what it costs the government to run the scheme. Thirty cents out of every $1.37 is kept by the company as private profit. Would it not be far cheaper, would this not reduce the cost, Mr. Speaker, if this 30 cents was in a government operated scheme?

I say that even regardless of using the federal grant as suggested by Ottawa, we would be saving the people a great deal of money. We are losing, and I know the figures vary because they are more or less estimates for this year, but we are going to lose approximately $116 million a year. I think the total cost of medical insurance for Ontario for this year will be approximately $350 million. The federal share is $160 million and it us up to us in this province to find $190 million.

Whether we had a scheme or not, the provincial government already spends about $70 million in subsidies, and we in this province would have to find $120 million in premiums. Our people today are already paying $175 million in premiums in this province, so that it is quite possible for us in this province to save on the cost of premiums, $155 million. I think that these figures are quite reasonable and quite practical.

The hon. Minister of Health will say you have to get the money from somewhere; where are you going to get it? Here is one matter of principle on which I thoroughly disagree with the hon. Minister and with the Conservative government and it is this.

Premiums are taxation; they are taxation of the very worst kind. They are a regressive taxation; they make the family man, who can least afford it, pay the same amount of money as the man who has got a million dollars. In other words, if a man is earning $4,400 a year—I think that is the approximate break-off figure—and he has a family, he is paying the same premium as a man who is making $50,000 a year. I say that any scheme we have for raising funds for health purposes, for medical purposes, should be based literally and progressively on our income tax.

It is my personal view that I would like to see the cost of medical insurance put on our income tax, in the same way that the

cost of our Canada pension plan is put on our income tax form. In other words, we pay the premium as we pay our income taxes. This is, I think, the only proper and progressive way to pay these taxes.

These things cannot come to pass until we accept the federal scheme. I am not going into details—we have heard it so often and we do not have the time—about the importance of the portability, or the importance of being comprehensive, and universal. Again I emphasize it must be government-oriented, government-controlled, because private profit has no business whatsoever in matters of health.

They say if the government takes over this scheme completely it is going to cost the government, or at least it is going to cost the people, more because whenever the government runs anything—and Leslie Frost used to say this—cost goes up. The Minister may want to remark that I am going to confuse you with facts. I may confuse him with the facts, but I do not know if it is the result of universal medical care in Saskatchewan, or because of the good Liberal administration in Saskatchewan, but in the province of Saskatchewan during the last few years the medical insurance has gone up only 4.9 per cent per year.

Across Canada it has gone up 7.9 per cent. In fairness to a government-controlled scheme in Saskatchewan this is the situation in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, today, in the Toronto *Star* of June 18, 1968, this is what the Canadian tax foundation is quoted as saying about the cost of medicare. It says "Medicare costs not alarming, say tax experts. The net effect of the federal medicare plan on the taxpayer would not be alarming, says the Canadian tax foundation."

In the *Canadian Tax Journal*, the foundation's bi-monthly publication, satistician David Perry says Ottawa's share of national medicare compulsory government medical insurance would amount to 5 per cent of the federal government 1969-1970 revenues. They go on in some detail to explain this, but I want to, in concluding, emphasize that this government has incessantly and continually defended the interest of the private insurance companies to the detriment of every man, woman and child in the province of Ontario and across the country from sea to sea.

It is a disgrace to this province that the province of Ontario has acted as a roadblock to the federal plan. It is certainly a national plan, what else could it be? It has been slow enough in coming, and far too long in coming, and all the more it is a disgrace that it has been continually held up by this administration and by the present administration of the Minister of Health.

I wish the Minister would show far more enthusiasm for a very just and legitimate claim that it is a national medicare plan, than he has shown in trying to oppose it.

Mr. J. W. Snow (Halton East): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter into the debate on this resolution of the hon. member for York South, and will direct my remarks mainly to that portion of the resolution dealing with the housing policy of the government of Ontario.

In my riding of Halton East, we are quite conscious of the shortage of adequate housing in many areas of this province of Ontario as being located in the heart of the Golden Horseshoe and on the fringes of Metropolitan Toronto, and we are one of the areas that is suffering from a shortage of adequate housing. I would say that up until four or five years ago, adequate housing at reasonable cost was available to the citizens of my area, as I believe it was to most areas of Ontario. However, with our rapid industrial expansion and the many desirable features of our area as a place to live, a housing shortage now exists at this time.

Some few years ago, a need was observed in the town of Oakville for adequate accommodation for senior citizens. This need has been taken care of as it has developed by the construction of senior citizen housing units, sponsored by a local service club—the Oakville Rotary club—along with financial assistance from the central mortgage and housing corporation, the Ontario housing corporation and a great deal of co-operation of the municipal council of the town of Oakville. This organization now operates over 100 senior citizen units, and it has just now again this year become obvious that further units will be required.

Some two years ago a need was acknowledged for low rental housing in this area and as of last Thursday afternoon, June 13, the Ontario housing corporation completed the first OHC project and families were busy over the weekend. This new accommodation which was immediately made available to them upon being turned over by the contractor to the authority and the houses were turned over by Thursday afternoon. Last fall, a further need was recognized by the

community for additional low rental housing as well as additional senior citizen units, and the Ontario housing corporation are presently calling tenders for a second development in this area.

Mr. Speaker, if I may now carry on to discuss the broader basis of the programme of the Ontario government in meeting the housing needs of our citizens throughout the whole province of Ontario. There is one comparison which I feel best indicates the record of Ontario housing corporation which was organized less than four years ago, and that is that by the end of this year, the corporation will have provided housing for the population equivalent to the entire population of the province of Prince Edward Island. As of December, 1967, the OHC had under management almost 14,000 rental units in 64 municipalities, housing 70,000 persons. Completions anticipated this calendar year of 1968 will provide accommodation for a further 30,000 people. I would point out that as of the end of 1967, OHC had under management, construction, or development, almost 30,000 housing units. The ratio of family housing units to senior citizens was roughly nine to one. This, Mr. Speaker, does not include student housing.

The Ontario student housing corporation was created in the fall of 1967 and already has under construction or development over 12,000 units for 12 universities and post-secondary educational institutions. The launching of a programme of this magnitude in such a short space of time is indicative of the way in which Ontario housing corporation works with the building industry and has thus been able to produce the most significant results.

From just under 1,200 starts in 1965, OHC's programme climbed to more than 12,000 last year. As indicated in the CMHC annual report for 1967, this represented 81.9 per cent of all public housing starts in Canada, and utilized 96.3 per cent of all federal money available for these purposes. In addition, 4,000 starts were undertaken for universities by the Ontario student housing corporation for a grand total of 11,000 starts in 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put these figures into their proper perspective by using the United States' housing programme as an example. When we relate the United States population to the Ontario population, and compare our respective public housing programmes, we find that on a per capita basis, Ontario housing corporation, in 1966 started twice as much public housing as our United States counterpart, and using the same yardstick for 1967, Ontario started four times as much per capita as did the United States. President Johnson has recently announced an accelerated housing programme for the United States. On a per capita basis, our 7,500 starts this year and plans for family and senior citizens housing, and exclusive of student housing, will be nearly three times the accelerated United States programme.

I would like, for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to mention the land development programme inaugurated last year and known as the HOME plan. During 1967, the corporation made service lots available to prospective homeowners in ten municipalities, and it is currently active in land development in more than 40 municipalities. In some of these, large areas of land has been purchased or secured under option, the largest today in any one area being more than 2,000 acres. By the end of last year, the corporation had placed on the market sufficient land to permit the building of 1,200 dwellings. The current year programme will produce enough service land to permit development of another 9,000.

The total amount of land currently under development is approximately 7,500 acres, and the corporation continues with its programme for the acquisition and servicing of land. To date, over 86 per cent of all lots disposed of by OHC were on a leasehold basis, on a monthly rental, based on a net cost to the corporation at an interest rate of 7.25 per cent. The HOME plan programme is not oriented or set up for the selling of lots on a cash sales basis. It is wholly oriented to leasehold of agreement of sale, with an option to purchase when the homeowner's economic circumstances permit, after the first five years. At that time, the market price per building lot when the lot was leased is the selling price. If land values continue to rise, as no doubt they will, then the lessee enjoys the appreciated value when he exercises his option to purchase the lot.

Mr. Speaker, the introduction of condominium legislation last year will provide a climate in which private enterprise and government can collectively work toward meeting a housing need. I believe it is a fact that if housing on an ownership basis is to be made available to our modest income families, then they must be prepared to accept individual ownership of units in multiple developments.

Recently, Ontario housing corporation invited proposals from builders on the first condominium type development sponsored by the corporation. I am sure home seekers in towns all over Ontario will shortly be able to secure this type of accommodation in their area.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the equally important problem facing our homeowner today, as well as the availability of accommodation, is, of course, the end cost of such accommodation. First, the purchase price for the new home is high, and secondly with the inflated interest rates that we are encountering today, the end cost and the monthly carrying charges are of serious concern.

One way which I feel the cost of actual construction of homes can be decreased is by the adoption by this province of the national building code as a standard code for all construction in every area of the province. As you know, Mr. Speaker, on March 4 earlier in this current session, I presented a resolution to this Legislature calling for this action and I was very pleased recently to hear the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) announce that this proposal was being very seriously studied at this time.

The adoption of this standard code would streamline the construction industry and would allow our merchant builders who are responsible for the major portion of the housing construction in Ontario, to organize their programmes on a businesslike basis. The adoption of this code would also help to bring about the standardization of the modular building system which again would create further economies through the more orderly manufacture and distribution of standard building components.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of this government, I am proud of the action and the programmes that have been undertaken so promptly by this government when it became obvious a few years ago that a housing shortage was looming on our horizons. I am sure that with the progress that has been made in these early years and in the plans for extended programmes in the immediate future, that we will soon proudly be able to say that the housing shortage for our citizens has been dealt with in a most satisfactory and economical fashion, as have the other needs of the residents of this province been looked after by this government in a just manner over the past 25 years.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, the situation in northern Ontario is a perfect illustration of Sir Winston Churchill's famous remark. The financial establishments in large corporate enterprises, with the sanction and protection of successive Progressive Conservative governments, have exploited and raped the natural resources of the north so that they have realized huge profits at our expense. This is borne out by a paragraph or two in this morning's *Globe and Mail*. It says:

> Falconbridge Nickel Mines Ltd. of Toronto has traditionally shipped its concentrates for refining in Norway. Most of the iron ore produced in Ontario is shipped to the United States in ore or pelletized form. Many industrial minerals are exported in unprocessed or semi-processed forms. The ores from Texas Gulf are sent to Quebec, United States, Europe and Japan.
>
> On the other hand, by comparison, these companies have put back into the north precious little in social capital. Those people who have worked to bring about the present state of development of the north have not received their fair share of the wealth they hope to accumulate. What they do get is a considerably higher cost of living, while the average northern income is below the provincial average.
>
> The northerner pays about $200 a year more for the basic essentials than his counterpart in the south even though his income is actually lower.

Recently the hon. Premier of this province talked about how Canada should have a billion dollar development fund which would be used to help overcome some of the basic regional inequities which have haunted Confederation since 1867. Now, if he were to take just a small portion of that billion dollars and earmark it for a regional development programme that would really bring growth to the north, he would be making a concrete contribution to unity within this province.

However, Mr. Speaker, he is not likely to do so, since he does not wish to interfere with the monopoly of exploitation of his free enterprising corporate supporters who are determined to perpetuate the present inequalities as far as the north is concerned.

I have mentioned on a number of occasions, in this Legislature, the reasons government intervention is necessary in the location of Texas Gulf smelter to process the ore from the Kidd Creek mines near Timmins. I have even introduced a private member's bill to make such intervention possible by the

Minister of Mines who says, without it, his hands are tied.

However, the Minister of Mines will not intervene in this situation. As reported in the Timmins *Daily Press* of May 31, 1968, the hon. Minister said, in effect, that any steps Ontario takes to bring about smelter construction will not discriminate for or against the Texas Gulf Sulphur Company.

In other words, he said the company can go ahead and do what they like and the government will not interfere.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): That is not what he said.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Pretty close to it.

Mr. Ferrier: He said the same thing in this morning's *Globe and Mail.*

It is obvious that the Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. has gotten to the Minister, has pulled the strings and, like a dyed-in-the-wool Tory that he is, he has fallen into line. The exploitation of these natural resources and others in the north can continue as far as this Minister and the government of which he is a member is concerned.

In fact, after his performance it is difficult to persuade the people of the north that the Minister of Mines is anything other than a typical Bay Street boy acting to protect their interest.

They also believe that there should be further development exploration in the north and that this could be done through private or through public capital in a SOQUEM plan. Many of these mines are phasing out around communities such as Geraldton and exploration and development needs to go on there. The private capital and such does not seem to be available. If it is not available, then the public should do it.

If northern resources are to be processed in the north, Mr. Speaker, so that secondary industry can grow up and employment opportunities be expanded, it is necessary that adequate supplies of cheap power be available. The Adams mine near Kirkland Lake would not have come into production had there not been adequate supplies of natural gas readily available.

In order that the possibilities of employment and development be expanded in the north our party pleaded with this government to carry out research and present a well-documented brief to the national energy board to ensure that Trans-Canada Pipe Lines would build a second pipeline through the northern part of Ontario.

By looping the present route part way and then branching off down the communities along the north shore of Lake Superior might have natural gas and such communities as Rainy River, Fort Frances, Atikokan, Schreiber, Terrace Bay, Marathon, Heron Bay, Manitouwadge, White River, Wawa and Sault Ste. Marie would all have abundant supplies of natural gas. The jobs created by the pipeline being built through the north, the boost to Canadian industry in supplying the materials and the subsequent assessment benefits, as well as preserving Canadian sovereignty over our own natural resources, were all telling arguments in favour of an all-Canadian route. But this government did not want to protect the people's interest. They were more concerned that the corporate interest of the gas and petroleum companies be guarded. As a result, no studies were made.

It was a further illustration of this Tory government's desire to let big business do what they like for profits. If this government had carried out the various studies required and had pressed for the welfare of the people of the north in particular, we might have had the northern route.

Moreover, James M. Cameron, general counsel of Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Ltd., in a letter to Marion Bryden, research director of the New Democratic Party caucus, has stated, in part:

> I wish to advise that Great Lakes Gas Transmission Co. told us that the actual direct cost of constructing phase 1 of the Great Lakes line amounted to $175,400 per mile.

This compares with estimates given to the national energy board and the federal power commission of $155,000 per mile. This is an increase of approximately 13.2 per cent. If this government had protected Ontario's interests we could have had the all-Canadian route proceeded with probably a year earlier and the cost of construction could very well have been equalized on this basis. Thus the possibilities of growth and development of the north shore Lake Superior communities would be greatly expanded.

In fact, this government should take a long look at its energy policy and seriously consider extending its policy concerning hydro for adequate supplies of hydro power at cost to the field of natural gas. It would mean that all areas could be serviced as quickly as possible, that the people could receive natural

gas at a more favourable rate, and wasteful advertising between natural gas and hydro could be largely eliminated. It would again put people before profit, but alas the Tories in this government are not much interested in this principle.

It is interesting to note that the Ontario development corporation makes forgivable loans of up to $500,000 to industries under its equalization of opportunity programme. Such indutsries as Allied Chemical received such loans at plants they are establishing at Belleville and Falconbridge, although it is worthy of note that the plant at Falconbridge is dependent on the sulphuric acid byproduct from the Falconbridge smelter for its operation. Its likelihood of locating anywhere else is rather remote, so that one wonders if this money is always well spent.

However, if we ask that the ONR grant favourable freight rates and not raise its rates on copper concentrates and the like on small and marginal mining companies so that they may continue to operate and possibly expand to create more jobs in our areas, the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management states that we must not subsidize the mining companies. It is all right to subsidize large industries in other parts of the province, but the hon. Minister has scruples about such when it comes to a whole area of the north. Surely the ONR must be considered as a development railroad. If favourable freight rates are required in order for secondary industry to locate in our part of the province and to operate, then I believe the ONR must grant such and operate at a loss if necessary to necessitate development of the north.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part in this proposed amendment to the supply motion—that the Conservative Party is nothing less than a deliberate attempt on the part of important sections of the propertied classes to transfer their burdens to the shoulders of the masses of the people and to gain greater profits for the investment of their capital by charging higher prices and among other things failing to protect farmers from corporate exploitation of all kinds and failing to ensure them a fair share of provincial income.

During the last few years the agricultural industry in this province and prices paid to farmers for agricultural products have been going down. The net return to the farmer after a year of operation is not reasonable for his work or money invested. The purchasing power of the farmer is dwindling and if prices of farm products do not increase to the producer, industries, manufacturing, agricultural machinery and agricultural products will be closing their plants. This will have an adverse effect on the whole economy of our province and the country.

We have in this country the farmers complaining about the low prices of agricultural products and on the other side the consumers complaining about the high prices they have to pay for food. The price spread between the farmer and the consumer is too great and the farmer should receive more of the consumer's dollar.

The Ontario food council reports that the Wisconsin statistical reporting service says that the index of retail prices for home foods has risen 30 per cent over the last 20 years but the index of prices received by the farmer for all commodities was 2 per cent lower than 20 years ago. We also have in Ontario the threat of corporation exploitation of the agricultural industry, corporations in the turkey industry, the broiler industry and the hog industry, and now we read that it is quite possible that meat-packing corporations do not own feed lots in a physical sense.

However, there is little doubt that at least one large processor has a finger in the pie. It is reported that the packer operates through a front organization headed by a prominent western Ontario farmer. It is reported that this group handled up to 50,000 slaughtered cattle last year and the main attraction is that the corporation arranges an easy supply of credit. It is further reported that in some cases there are no interest payments. Apparently the corporation likes the farmer's face so much that the 7.5 and 8 per cent interest rates are forgotten. But that is only what the signer to the agreement thinks and the packer gets back his investment either by short-changing the farmer when the cattle are delivered or by using the cattle along with those from other satisfactory farmers to depress the market price of cattle, when he decides.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, in the United States I read in a publication that one big corporation is building a feed lot at the present time that will produce 100,000 cattle.

We also read in publications that one great big feed company in the United States produced 4 million hogs last year. That is half the number of hogs produced in all of Canada, so two feed companies could produce all the hogs that are required in Canada. This is a threat to our whole economy. It is a concern to the farmer and I must say if this

continues, Mr. Speaker, they will control the price to the consumer.

Also, the Minister of Agriculture and Food has warned us in Ontario, in his opening remarks of the estimates of his department in the Legislature this year that American corporations are eyeing Ontario agriculture for a take-over.

The farmers in the province are not satisfied with the prices of farm products and they are concerned about the future of agriculture. Two or three years ago we saw tractor demonstrations on our highways and still we read that farmers are threatening to take some action if the government does not take action to improve their income.

A few days ago I read an article in the press, which impressed me greatly, entitled "Governments' Planning Basis of Discontent," and I will quote a part of this article:

> In the United States much of the recent violence reflects an angry belief that government has failed and does not care much and that it has failed to make life tolerable economically for a vast and growing number of citizens. These citizens are as frustrated as the poet who asked for bread and received a stone. What they receive is one report after another. These reports are largely devoted to demonstrating the marvellous accomplishments of state economic planning. It is unfortunate that so many of the poor are economic illiterates, who are not impressed by demonstrations. All they are interested in and all they can understand and even then only dimly, are results at the individual level. This must be very frustrating for the planners who are making so many sacrifices in order to promote national economic efficiency, and equally it must be very difficult for those politicians who conceive that it is their duty to protect the people from their own ignorance and impatience.
>
> In the United States and Canada not only those who are accustomed to poverty are not content to wait any longer for something more tangible than statistics dealing with national economic accounts. Increasing numbers of the economic middle classes are becoming angry too, as state planning edges them closer to the poverty line.
>
> In countries which pride themselves in having a particularly well trained and integrated group of state planners, with an unusual amount of authority, it is more obvious than elsewhere that from the uneducated mob's point of view, the basis of the difficulty is that while the rich get richer, the poor get poorer. Only nowadays it is the state that wallows in wealth and boasts of their accumulation of wealth. Elsewhere it is little use for the politicians to say that the rich are being evicted from their mansions through taxation, when their wealth merely is, or seems to be transferred to government and the poor cannot afford a home.
>
> Although the poor probably do not rationalize it, in effect governments nowadays have succeeded to the unpopularity that once pertained to great private estates. While welfare departments in the guise of the former Lady Bountiful, distribute aid and homilies, other administrative departments play the role of the estate agent whose business it is to promote economic efficiency, not to listen to tales of individual hardship. Meantime the politicians, like the absentee landlords, are sorry but they cannot interfere with their agent in whom they have full confidence.

In brief, some of today's troubles, and I venture to suggest a good deal of them, point to the failure of government planning to serve the people. It is replacing a system founded upon individual economic enterprise, which certainly had abuses but which equally certainly, where practised vigorously, vastly reduced the incidence of comparative poverty. Moreover, under that system those who were aggrieved felt they could appeal to government to correct abuses. Today one can see so clearly that grievances are against government itself, the highest authority and the only appeal they are beginning to believe is mob violence.

This article from which I have quoted, reminds me of the agricultural industry as it now is in the province of Ontario, with prices to the farmer for agricultural products going down and the prices of food to the consumer going up. I will quote just one illustration. In southwestern Ontario we produce around 70 million bushels of corn. Corn is quoted as of today at $1.20 for 56 lbs., or 2⅛ cents a lb.—this is dry corn. Cornflakes are made from this corn and one 12-ounce box of cornflakes sells to the consumer for 45 cents. The farmer receives 2 cents for the corn in a box of flakes that cost 45 cents. This is unfair and too great a spread between what the farmer gets and what the consumer has to pay. Mr. Speaker, if the farmer could receive another 3 cents for the corn in a 45 cent box of cornflakes, then he would receive a fair return for his work.

This is only one illustration, and I will add that the government gives grants to build silos and buildings to encourage the hard-pressed farmer and this helps considerably; but what the farmer wants is not handouts, but a fair share of the consumer's dollar.

I must say that this government has failed to deal with corporate exploitation of all kinds in Ontario and also has failed to ensure the farmer a fair share of the provincial income.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the amendment to the supply motion dealing with section (d) re agricultural aspects brought out by the hon. member for York South—after his glib tongued oration—his pious platitudes about the agricultural industry—I felt that I should just bring him up to date on a few things the province of Ontario is doing for the agricultural people of Ontario.

As I mentioned earlier this year, Mr. Speaker, I think we must evaluate any criticisms concerning agriculture made by our socialist friends in the light of their inexperience with the problems involved. As we know, not a single member sitting on the socialist benches has had any personal experience with this subject and is really therefore unable to appreciate what is happening today on the farms of Ontario. I would like to place on the record some of the initiatives which have been taken by our government and which have placed Ontario in the forefront among all Canadians provinces in relation to farm policies.

In dealing with marketing, one of the outstanding examples of positive programmes to raise farm income is provided through our marketing legislation. As the Minister of Agriculture and Food stated, in introducing his 1968-1969 estimates to the House, "Our Ontario farmers are today making greater use of marketing legislation than those in any other jurisdiction in North America and perhaps the world." During this session, we have seen several important extensions in this particular field.

Legislation was introduced this session to increase the amount of money available to the Ontario beef improvement association from around $20,000 to more than $100,000 per year. The funds accumulated as a result of this legislation will be used solely for the purpose of financing the activities of the Ontario beef improvement association and improving the marketing of beef cattle in the province.

Another amendment was introduced to The Farm Products Marketing Act which will enable the Cabinet to establish an apple marketing commission. This commission will facilitate the orderly marketing of Ontario apple production which is an increasingly important facet of our province's agricultural economy.

The pool quota policy for fluid milk introduced by the milk marketing board is another important development. Previously farmers who were unable to find a market for their fluid milk had no hope of obtaining the top price for their produce. Now, all dairy farmers will be able to share in the fluid milk market, regardless of their location. Under the pool quota system the province is divided into six areas or pools. Farmers will be treated alike, regardless of their location. At the same time, qualified industrial milk producers may enter the fluid milk pool as soon as they are able to pass government inspection and have proven they can produce high quality milk.

These marketing programmes are, of course, only a portion of the story. The government has initiated many other programmes designed to assist our farmers in this period of cost-price squeeze.

I refer to the capital grants programme. Under this programme $129 million will be made available to farmers over the next 12-year period. The programme is designed to provide financial assistance to farmers who wish to improve their facilities and modernize their operations. The programme is aimed at making the family farm a viable economic unit and to enable enterprising farmers to better use their time and capital.

In the 12 months ended March 31, 1968, 13,249 grants were made under this programme amounting to a total of $7,163,000. Of these 9,502 grants, worth $6,246,000, were for farm structures, while the remaining 3,747 grants were for farm water supplies or field enlargements.

Last year our government embarked on a farm enlargement programme under ARDA. Under this programme, farmers who are hindered by uneconomic units can be given assistance in acquiring adjacent acreage. As of March 31, 1968, the Ontario government had acquired 355 farms, totalling 50,683 acres. These lands are then leased to interested farmers for a period of five years, with the option to buy at any time within that

period, or to renew the lease for a further five years.

This programme enables farm families to build economic units without heavy capital commitments during the period of adjustment.

Ontario, in co-operation with the federal government, has gone further in the development of a comprehensive crop insurance programme for its producers than any other province. In less than two years, the Ontario crop insurance commission has been able to provide protection for the growers of all the key crops of our Ontario farms.

Before insurance became available, our farm producers had to rely on handouts from the public purse or temporary programmes, such as guaranteed and subsidized loans, to aid them in periods of crop losses. Now every farmer can insure his crop just as he insures his buildings or his car, and his home.

As further evidence of the deep concern of this govenment with the agricultural and food industry, we have the establishment of the farm income committee. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the *Globe and Mail* of Thursday, January 11, 1968, as follows:

> In Ontario, the special committee on farm income has commissioned a $500,000 study of Ontario Agriculture by Hedlin-Menzies and Associates Limited, of Winnipeg. Roger Schwass, director of the project, says that the report, which is due in December, will propose "rational policies for the food industry, which will lead to the development of fully economic farms capable of producing low-cost food and capable of returning a fair income to the commercial farmer."

This same article mentions the five-man federal task force on agriculture which is to project national goals and recommend policies to meet them and is due to report in December of this year.

With the publication of these reports, we can anticipate further substantial strides to improve the competitive position of the agricultural industry of this province.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Ontario government acting alone cannot satisfactorily solve the problems facing Ontario farmers. Our government cannot prevent cheap imports from entering this province from outside and reducing our farmers' income by undercutting the price which our growers must receive if they are to maintain reasonable income levels. The importation of agricultural products from other countries or provinces can, and does, adversely affect our producers, even though they may be operating under provincial marketing machinery.

As the Minister of Agriculture and Food stated in his estimates speech, "Because of the limitations placed on us by the constitution, it is impractical for us as a province to attempt unilateral solutions to many of our acute farm problems within our own provincial boundaries. We must co-operate with the federal jurisdiction and, through such agencies as the federal task force, seek to either modify these firm and rigid jurisdictional boundaries or influence national policy."

I would therefore submit, Mr. Speaker, that the record clearly indicates our government is taking, and has taken, vigorous steps to insure that farm incomes rise in proportion to other sectors of our economy and to prevent corporate exploitation of our province's farmers.

Just one further comment, Mr. Speaker. I notice that the various parties in these forthcoming fisticuffs that are going to come to their conclusion next Tuesday have been asked about their farm policy. From what I read in some of our agricultural magazines, as I already stated here, it seems these people do not have any farm policy, because they do not know anything about the agricultural business. It is for that reason that I intend to vote against the amendment.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, in no area do Mr. Churchill's remarks have more pertinence than in the housing market today. When only those with incomes of over $8,500 a year can afford to buy houses, and when three-quarters of the people are excluded—and they are the people that need housing the most—then this is a gross case of socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor.

We all know the roles played by various financial agencies and others in supporting the present structure. I think of the speculator, and I think that it can be said in all fairness that the speculator as he operates in Vaughan township and in Ontario is nothing but a parasite.

As far as the land speculator is concerned, he makes a positive contribution and I think that, on the whole, the developer's costs are not out of line, nor are his profits overly great, in most instances. There are other factors that are operating in the spiralling costs, as far as he is concerned. We have the role

of the trust and loan corporations, and I think that in their field they are not altogether to be dismissed as blameworthy in this regard, on the contrary.

As things stand this afternoon, in institutional lending throughout this provice, the rate that is being granted on ordinary loans is between 9.25 and 9.75 per cent. The average mortgage company will not lend any money in excess of a period of five years at the present time.

How can the homeowner face the prospect of liquidating that sort of loan in that short a time? None of these mortgages, or very few of them, contain any privileges in the form of prepayment or otherwise to make these things easier for the individual.

I have a number of points to make. First, it always bemused me somewhat the way in which moneys being advanced through governments for mortgage purposes and land development is considered. These moneys are not giveaways, they are not welfare expenditures. They are a form of capitalization programme on which the government or whoever does the lending derives a usufruct in mighty proportion for the amounts of money loaned.

In other words, this money is in the form of an investment, and it may be recapitalized in any number of forms. The mortgage money or the ownership of the land can be used as the background for the guarantee of a new issue of debentures for bond holding or, even if the government would consider it, a remortgaging of the mortgages concerned, thereby always having, so to speak, a capital bank in the form of mortgages with which to do future borrowing on the capital market.

As to the availability of such capital, if this government or the federal government were not so sunk in their several sloughs of despond, they very well might, without coercion and through their present friendly relationships—as was pointed out by the hon. Minister of Trade and Development in touching on the university residences—with the cooperatives, and the insurance companies, pension funds, and mutual funds in the province, persuade or, if necessary, pass permissive legislation of no great restrictive intent, requiring that a certain investment or percentage of sinking funds reserves and capital accumulations in the province be directed into the mortgage market. This would have the effect right off the bat of substantially reducing the interest rate across the board on the mortgage market in the province.

If it was necessary, and if that type of measure which you have not really availed yourselves of in any great extent were proved not too feasible, then there is no reason in the world that you yourself could not go into the first mortgage field. Again, the threat to do so would have a great effect on the economy, and the actual going in would harvest numerous benefits. The benefits, if the government would consider this sort of thing, would be in terms of perhaps the American model, where the amortization schedules and the repayment clauses in mortgages could be strung out over a much longer period than is at present envisaged or actually done in this country.

At the present time in United States, the period is very often 35 and 40 years. And even, in cases of veterans' housing in some places in the States, the mortgages of the amortization schedule, to make it easy for returning soldiers, is 60 years.

I suggest that you can actuarially compute on an average in principle and adjust your mortgages from time to time to give a fair return on the investment to the lender—in this case, to the government itself—over against the market. I think this should be considered and some work done towards working out the possibilities of that situation.

I would like to mention, as my fourth point, that the government should very well consider there is enormous resistance to it, again by the hon. Minister of Trade and Development, with respect to a direct tax, a capital gains tax. They are saying that it discourages economic activity in this province, as I have heard too often in this House.

I can hardly believe that the province of opportunity, such as you claim this to be, with the resources available which are available nowhere else in the world, with our developing economy, will not attract capital. They are used to tax being imposed—they are used to having capital gains at home, because practically any other nation in the world has it. I would not want it on any great scale but, taken together with the moves that were made in this House a few days ago as to The Planning Act, it would have a very beneficial effect in suppressing speculation on land, and bring some benefit into the province in the process of doing so.

The probably, the prime cause of the housing shortage at the present time, is that the municipalities themselves are starved for funds. They cannot even provide the services. This is completely beyond their monetary competence. Much less in municipalities bearing the cost of the educational burden. Willy nilly this has to be removed. I have little

doubt that this government will come to it and very shortly, much as they may resist their recognition of having to life that educational burden, at least in substantial part.

As a result the municipalities are throwing up all kinds of blockades, slowing down, throwing in red tape, and not allowing subdivisions or new building developments to go ahead. They simply do not want new homes, and this is causing enormous difficulty because of an antequated theory of taxation that is presently operating in the province.

I wanted to say one word about land assembly. We are talking, but doing very little, about leaping over the inflated areas in order to assemble land. This can be done at no overwhelming cost to this government, insofar as there are federal funds also available in this regard. This would place the speculators and those sitting on land and paying agricultural taxes in direct competition. Immediately it would have again the effect of forcing down the price of these lands which are being taken out of cultivation and are simply waste land so far as the province at this time is concerned, and also standing in the way of development.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make mention of the page in the Toronto *Telegram* today in which a certain Mr. Stanfield says, "Plans for aid to homebuyer" and it goes on down and says: "Conservative leader Robert Stanfield last night became the first party leader to promise specific dollar and cents help to relieve homeowners trapped with soaring interest rates."

What a perversion. What a piece of yellow nonsense. My party and this group in the House have for years had in our party programme, federal and provincial, a scheme of subsidization and various other ways of helping the homeowner. If any of these governments would seize the nettle and bring themselves to doing so, then the problem that we face today on the housing market would not exist.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on this resolution.

Several weeks ago when the students and labour in France were joining together to try to overthrow the government of that country, we all took it most seriously. So, of course, do I take this moment very seriously, because obviously there is a movement afoot to overthrow the government of this province. I welcome the opportunity to join in this effort, although somewhat reluctantly.

I feel that this government, in many ways, has recognized problems in northern and northwestern Ontario and has tried to do things about it, but believe me, Mr. Speaker, if the government members opposite think that they are doing enough I have got news for them.

Perhaps they will say the people are never satisfied. I think that the people of northern and northwestern Ontario have been satisfied with too little for too long.

I pride myself as having been an adopted son of northern Ontario. I was born and educated down in this part of the province, and I enjoyed that very much. But one day I saw the opportunity to go north to seek my fortunes and seek to participate in the development of something very great, to be involved in a great adventure. The longer I stayed there, the more I liked it and eventually became completely involved, as I am now.

Certainly as a news editor I have had the opportunity to observe very closely that part of the province and to observe what governments were doing about it. I am absolutely amazed how little this government really knows about northern and northwestern Ontario, because it seems that if they really realized and understood what was up there, they would be doing far more about it at this time.

For example, we should have a department of northern affairs, or surely at least a fund for northern development. But this government seems to have a theory: "We do not do anything special for any one part of the provinve except Metro Toronto." Of course, we saw that last Thursday, when the Premier, in his big transportation study, underlined some very serious problems here in Metro Toronto. So here something special has got to be done, but northern Ontario? No. We have got to be careful not to do anything special up there.

I propose to authenticate these remarks. These are not just rash charges. Not too long ago the hon. member for Thunder Bay rose in the House and asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs why he could not put back the June 28 deadline for submissions on the Hardy report. The Minister, it seems to me, if I remember correctly, the Minister said, "Well, we do not want to set a precedent. There are other regional studies going on, and if we turned around and extended this submission date for the Lakehead, well then, we are going to have to do it for other areas."

We do not want to be treated the same as other areas. We have problems of our own. We are 900 miles away from Toronto, and it is cold and it is isolated, to some extent.

We have special problems, and I think this business of blanket legislation—the policy that this government has pursued for many years—has got to be changed. We have got to come up with some tailor-made legislation for specific areas, and I think this government has got to bear the responsibility for that. I recognize that through this regional government system what I am alluding to is is going to be solved to some extent, but I think this government itself has got to recognize this.

The hon. Minister of Highways admitted in the House, during the estimates of his department, that the standards of highway construction are the same in the north as they are in the south. There is an example of blanket legislation. The same everywhere. Yet everybody knows that the climatic conditions in the north are not the same as in the south.

I think that the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) has pointed out to this House another problem we have. We need doctors and nurses up there. We have asked for special incentives—some kind of a programme to attract doctors and nurses up there, but we have not got the nod from the government on the other side.

I mentioned isolation a moment ago; that seems to be our biggest problem. The only cure for it is transportation, and yet I see nothing. I see no special effort on behalf of this government to solve our transportation problems. This government prefers to say, "Well, that is the problem of the federal government."

All right. In areas where it especially applies to the federal government I would expect a big brother at Queen's Park to go to bat for us. I would expect big brother to knock on the door in Ottawa and say, "Look, we will help. Let us do something special about breaching this transportation gap that those people up there in northern Ontario have." The high freight rate, for example—the demurrage problem that we have in our seaport there at the Lakehead.

The other day I called to the attention of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Bales) the fact that we have quite a labour problem developing up in the Lakehead right now, and in northern Ontario, where elevator work and woods work seems to be our two big industries. I found that the Minister of Labour sort of sloughed that off, he did not recognize the big problem.

I understand that this week 1,300 elevator workers are threatening to go out on strike, and shortly after them the workers in the woods industry are going to come up with legitimate problems and request a wage increase. I bet you there is going to be a strike there too, and there just does not seem to be effective action on the part of this government.

When it is northern and northwestern Ontario it just seems to be too far away for anybody to really understand the problems. Another thing that has caused me no end of resentment is the fact that I stand up in the House and bring very serious problems to the attention of this government—I have just been dying to do this for several years now—and from the other side all I get is jeers and catcalls. So I am very happy to support this vote of non-confidence because I am not at all satisfied with the answers or attention that I have had on behalf of my people.

When I stand here I feel I am 60,000 people strong. Those are the people who sent me here, and the problems that I bring to your attention are not the result of my conjuring up something to lambaste your government with. These problems come to me from the people that I represent. I have been listening to them for about nine years.

So I certainly support item 5 in this resolution because I just feel this government has not taken strong, efficient, courageous action on behalf of northern and northwestern Ontario. It is a different part of the province. Our problems are different and blanket legislation is not the solution.

Mr. J. Jessiman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I feel sure we have had enough borrowing from the words of Sir Winston Churchill, but it is gratifying to me that after 20 years of frustration as a Liberal, Sir Winston returned and remained as a member of the Conservative Party, and never saw fit to change his view or join the socialist party.

But in answer to the hon. member for York South, as a member for Fort William I am more anxious and concerned to see the development of northern Ontario speeded up than the member for York South. But I am unable to agree with him that this—

Mr. Stokes: You said everything was rosy up there.

Mr. Jessiman: Is that moonlighting member from the north shore of Lake Superior sounding off?

Mr. Stokes: That is who it is.

Mr. Jessiman: Back to your railroad!

Mr. Stokes: You spoke at Lakehead University and did not even know the name of the riding which I represent.

Mr. Jessiman: Would you like me to bring my speech over to you?

Mr. Sopha: You know the dog barks but the caravan passes by.

Mr. Jessiman: All together, fellows.

But I am unable to agree with him that this government has failed in the manner suggested in its efforts to develop the north or that it has forfeited the confidence of this House and the people of Ontario. The fact that I am here as a government member in this House, the first Conservative member from Fort William since 1959, is evidence of the confidence of the people of Fort William in this government.

In that period from 1959 to 1967, I might add, the residents tried representatives of both Opposition parties before they saw the wisdom of returning to the Conservative fold. Federally, of course, Fort William has been Liberal for many, many years. Port Arthur, on the other hand, was Conservative provincially, and Liberal and NDP federally.

I mention these facts merely to make the point that responsibility for the present state of affairs in northern Ontario does not rest with the members of any one party, but must be shared by members of all parties; by the residents of the area themselves, by the private sector of our economy, as well as governments at the municipal, provincial and federal level.

Similarly, the full potential of this area will never be developed by the provincial government acting in isolation, but only through the concerted and co-ordinated efforts of all those who are concerned with the problem. It is, of course, easy for the socialists to complain and find fault. But the residents of northern Ontario are not unaware of the experience of Saskatchewan, where the difference between socialist theory and practice was so badly demonstrated.

Another utopian thought conveyed by this resolution is that our base minerals should be translated into finished products here in Ontario. I would like to ask the hon. member for York South why we do not apply this theory right across the board.

If we did, our wheat to Russia and China would have to be exported in the form of flour or better still, as the breakfast food of champions. Our barley and rye could be exported only an underproof firewater, and our forest resources as tissue, crying towels, which our hon. friends across the way require so frequently.

And what about our exports of oil and gas? Should we also insist that these be manufactured into the full range of chemical products which can be produced from crude oil and natural gas? But why go on? It simply is not in the economic scheme of things that 20 million Canadians or seven million Ontarians, with our immense heritage of natural resources, can either consume their potential or export this potential in completely finished or even semi-processed state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the alleged failure of the government to provide conditions which will attract other secondary industry to the north, as mentioned in the NDP amendment. In answer to this charge let me state some of the most important measures and plans which have been initiated recently by this government.

First, there is our programme for the equalization of industrial opportunities in Ontario. Under this programme, nearly $2 million in direct loans have been made available in northern Ontario. In addition, through its advisory services of ODC, the government has enabled industry to obtain $1.2 million from regular lenders and $1.7 million in contingent financing, for a grand total of more than $4.7 million.

These funds have either created or maintained more than 1,000 new jobs in northern Ontario. In addition, a further 10 loans under the EIO programme, involving a further $1.7 million, are now being processed and at this particular time I would mention to the member for Port Arthur that there is a team at the Prince Arthur hotel investigating and interviewing prospects for more industry in the north country.

Transportation, Mr. Speaker, is a major factor in developing our north. In the past, railways opened up new resources for exploitation. Today, the Ontario government is undertaking an active roads-to-resources programme, to provide access to proven mineral, forest and recreational wealth in many remote area in northern Ontario.

Our Department of Transport is actively engaged in a programme to develop new air corridors for wheeled aircraft, with

special priority being given to two corridors; the first, from Fort Frances north to Kenora and Red Lake and the second, from Sault Ste. Marie northeasterly to Wawa, Chapleau and Timmins.

The Department of Energy and Resources Management is financing a detailed survey on the supply and industrial requirements of energy in northern Ontario projected to the year 1980. I must also mention the full scale socio-economic survey of northwestern Ontario announced by the Minister of Agriculture and Food in Port Arthur on April 19 of this year.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): After federal urging!

Mr. Jessiman: This programme is launched and on the way.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Jessiman: One aspect of this extensive multi-purpose study will be a survey of the entire economic base for northwestern Ontario. Another part of the study is designed to develop ways and means of improving living standards of Indian people in the region. An examination will also be made of the development policies of all departments, both federal and provincial governments, with a view to maximizing the efficiency of public investments, and to better enable the northwestern Ontario regional development council to establish priority objectives in conformity with the development plan.

When this study has been completed, and the information assessed, assistance will be sought from the federal economic development fund, the FRED fund, for its implementation.

The Department of Lands and Forests is also heavily committed with programmes and studies aimed at resource development and with a priority first being conducted in the Nipigon area at this present time. There is the joint federal-provincial Canada land inventory programme under which land capability is being assessed and mapped for agriculture, forestry, recreation and wildlife. When completed, this inventory will be of inestimable value for making policy decisions relative to land use and natural resource management.

Special fisheries management units such as those at Lake-of-the-Woods and Fort Frances have been established to provide better management of this resource. Additional units are also in the planning stages.

Our government has also been a major participant in the sea lamprey control programme in Lake Superior, and as a result the fishing industry is now well on the road to recovery.

Thus far, Mr. Speaker, I have made no mention of the resource development being carried out by the private sector of our economy. The government of Ontario cannot, of course, claim all the credit for these developments by the private sector, but we can claim to have established and maintained in this province that climate of confidence and co-operation which has been a hallmark of relations between the private sector and successive Conservative governments throughout our history.

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday I had the very great privilege of being present at the opening of the $62 million Griffith mine and pelletizing plant at Red Lake. I met a federal member up there by the name of Reid. And I believe the opening of the Griffith mine is but the first major step in the rapid expansion of the population and economy of the Red Lake area. This project is of particular relevance to this debate, for it fulfils Stelco's objective and ours of developing a major source of iron ore here in our own province, and it increases the company's self-sufficiency in the raw materials required for its expanding production.

Mr. Stokes: All you need is a steel complex at the Lakehead.

Mr. Jessiman: We will leave that to the member for Thunder Bay.

The Griffith mine is providing new employment opportunities for over 350 men and has an annual payroll of over $2 million. New employment is badly needed in this area at the present time because of the difficulties facing the area's hard hit gold mining industry. With ore reserves estimated to be sufficient for 30 to 50 years of production, the operation of the mine is naturally creating a continuously expanding need for local supplies and services.

Mr. Speaker: Order! May I draw to the member's attention that he is now encroaching on other time and I would ask that he bring his remarks to a conclusion.

Mr. Jessiman: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the catcalls and the interjections from the far side. It was a pleasure being up there at the

opening of this wonderful new mine; the total production of the Caland and Steep Rock and new Griffith mine will come down to the Lakehead as a new industry, be shipped on to Hamilton and refined at Hamilton. It is very wonderful being on the right side of a good government that helps these people settle in Ontario. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The debate has reached this position and I would like to have the views of the members. In order to have the windup; we have about 13 minutes. There are three more speakers and if each one would take only five minutes we can have these three speakers. If not, then I think we should give this extra time to windup speakers. Are we agreed that we have three more speakers at approximately five minutes apiece? And I would say to the Ministers, there are two of them who wish to speak from the government side. They might make up their minds as to which of the two would have the five minutes, the Provincial Treasurer or the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

The member for Brantford.

Mr. M. Makarchuk (Brantford): Before I touch on the farm portion of this debate, I want to make something clear, although it has been mentioned before. When Sir Winston Churchill was referring to the Conservative Party, in his case he was referring to one particular Conservative Party. In Canada, the conditions are slightly different. We have two Conservative parties, the difference being a matter of labelling and nervousness. The one sitting on the right is more nervous.

It is significant to note that the federal Minister of Agriculture of the other Conservative Party does not dare run in a rural area but is looking for greenery in the cement at Niagara Falls. As far as farm policies are concerned, both parties have a dismal record. Both federal and provincial parties have failed to protect the farmer from corporate exploitation. Churchill's statement that propertied classes transfer their burden to the shoulder of the masses of the people to gain greater profit for investment of their capital was demonstrated very blatantly in the recent closing of the sugar refinery at Chatham.

Here you have a giant corporation, its fingers reaching into every corner of the world, deciding that it would gain greater profits by closing the plant, despite promises that it would continue operation; despite the fact that close to 1,000 farmers depended on it for their livelihood; despite all this it closed, because it would make higher profits some place else. And what did the two levels of government do? They had get-togethers, they went through the motions. They tried to impress on the farmer that they were concerned, but the end result was a shutdown. At this time, one stands and wonders as to who exactly is running this country; is it the government of this province or the country, elected by the people, or is it being run, as in this case, by Tate and Lyle, a giant corporation?

The point, Mr. Speaker, as was so well demonstrated in the closing of the plant, is that when the old parties are faced with the choice of protecting the farmer or the corporation, they have demonstrated where they stand, and that is on the side of the corporation.

The farmer's share of the consumer dollar is declining. His share of the economic pie in all its aspects is also declining, despite what the members opposite try to tell us. The reason for this is that the two Conservative parties in this country and the province are not prepared or willing to interfere with the manipulative practices of their corporate friends. To them, profit is paramount, people are the means to the profits.

Why is this so? The corporate interests and the two Conservative parties are really the same thing. It would be interesting to see how much Tate and Lyle has contributed to the campaign funds of both political parties, a proven method of ensuring that the burden remain on the shoulders of the people and will continue to remain there as long as we have our two Conservative parties in places of power.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Despicable is the word!

Mr. MacDonald: It cuts pretty close to the bone.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, in this debate I would especially draw to the attention of the House that portion of this resolution which deals with the plight of certain tenants in Ontario.

While this resolution calls for a rental review board whose powers of publicity and moral persuasion may be useful, it is even more important for this government to rewrite in simple terms The Landlord and Tenant Act. My text for today is written as section 42 in the 206th chapter of the Revised Statutes of Ontario, "Distress shall be reasonable".

This is indeed a careful viewing by this government of the entire problem of the tenant in today's society. The distress referred to is the ancient and dishonourable practice of entering into a premises and seizing items to cover the overdue rent for a property. Today the phrase must mean the distress of a tenant who wishes to read and understand this statute or his own lease and that supposedly must be reasonable.

Surely the 79 sections of this Act are not all reasonable. Surely a real distress signal would be sent out to an unresponding administration by any unlettered tenant who tried to plough through the two lengthy paragraphs of section 37 which deal with bankruptcy liens and assignees' rents.

In Ontario we all labour under this statute which is so out of date that it has become partially dignified and ennobled with the adjective, archaic. But, Mr. Speaker, distress amongst tenants because of the statute continues, and their distress is of an unreasonable kind which this legislation cannot cover. This is not to say for a moment that all tenants are harmed and wronged every day and that all landlords are villains. Many landlords are fair and reasonable and seek to make a fair profit from their investments in buildings, and this is entirely circumspect.

On the other hand, many tenants are wilful and uncaring and destructive. But the proper function of government here is surely to set out the adaptable ground rules which are fair for both parties, and to create a standard and mutually fair lease.

It is only when we have an abundant supply of housing and apartments that the present pressures on rental prices will be eased. The long term reaction of the market place to the factors of supply and demand will tend to stabilize and then perhaps to reduce rents, but until this happens, I believe that this government has a responsibility which it is shirking.

A recent report to the city of Kitchener by the Ontario housing corporation has brought forth problems which must be settled now. One hundred and fifty low rental housing units were suggested by this report, but city council says it needs 250. Ninety senior citizens' units would come in 1969, but the council says it needs them now. Land assembly schemes are not to be started until the regional government review is completed. But city council properly and correctly realizes that the review has absolutely no intelligent relation to any of the aspects of the current housing problem today.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, this same report in April of this year stated that we needed 1,800 more units per year, half of them to be owner-occupied, and half of them to be rented. All this is being admitted while the land assembly scheme on which to build these homes is refused.

In the city of Kitchener we have immediate problems of sub-standard dwelling units, and of units with shared facilities which are found in converted houses. As our planning director, Mr. William E. Thompson, wrote in a report to the Kitchener housing authority, and I quote:

> This lack of apartments for lower income and larger families poses two problems. These families have the immediate difficulty in finding a suitable place in which to live at a price they can afford. There is also the long-range problem that the more they are forced to pay for suitable rental accommodation, the less money they will be able to save toward a down payment for a house, or spend on food, clothing or to have other necessiites, besides very little on luxuries which tends to cause family dissatisfaction and in some cases both broken homes and broken spirits.

Comparisons in the tables presented in this report are very interesting. They probably recite a scheme of items that is a common one to all the urban areas in the province.

First, 30 per cent of households rent. Secondly, over 50 per cent of the households renting make $4,000 per year in income or less. Third, of the renters, 30 per cent have four or more children. Fourth, about 60 per cent of the renters with four or more children are in apartments or above stores or in crowded older homes. Fifth, 25 per cent of all dwellings in the city are over 45 years old. But, as we are admonished by the good book, distress must be reasonable.

The distress of those without proper accommodation can no longer be reasonable. The distress of the members of this House who are daily faced with these problems in urban areas can no longer be reasonable. This government has not moved to have land assembled and then to provide building lots for low rental homes with the speed and decision that is required for 1968.

Assistance in planning to replace the conventional grid of a sub-division with cluster zoning to provide green spaces for community breathing room is also needed, for we have an obligation not only to build houses, but also to help create homes. The animals in the zoo respond best to cages that resemble

their natural habitats. Our citizens surely deserve no less. They, too, will respond best in living areas that are planned communities. Our tenants and our landlords can both enjoy their roles if leadership is given. Positive action to change ancient law and to encourage modern practice is required now if these matters are to be resolved to benefit all the clitizens of Ontario.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the New Democratic Party has referred to the farm vote in Ontario and to the people of Ontario, verily, by saying that this government has failed to protect farmers' interests from corporate exploitation.

I refer him to the speech that was made by the hon. member for Ontario South a few moments ago, when he referred to what has been done for the farm people of this province by this government. I would compare that with the record we have of the only socialist government that Canada has ever known. For 20 years in Saskatchewan it never did one single thing for the farm people of Saskatchewan.

They were there for 20 years and they never brought in one single marketing plan to do one thing for the farmers of that province. Had it not been for the government of R. B. Bennett—the Conservative government of R. B. Bennett, Mr. Speaker—they would not have had a wheat marketing plan in the three western provinces.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Let us just go one step further to include our Liberal friends across the aisle. Mr. Speaker, we only have five minutes and I would like my hon. friends to listen to what I have to say, because I think they will learn something. When my hon. friends across the aisle talk about what they would do for the farm people, we think about what the Liberal premier of Saskatchewan said when they took the only vote that was ever held in Saskatchewan on the hog marketing plan. He said to the farmers of Saskatchewan, if it is voted in, I will not approve it. That is what he thinks of farmers' marketing plans in Saskatchewan.

These people talk about the things that we have not done. You know, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon when this resolution was introduced I could not help but think of Stephen Leacock, that great Canadian who referred to socialism in saying this, "Socialism won't work except in heaven where they do not need it, and in hell where they already have it." And you know there is an awful lot of truth in that.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I could not help but think, as well, of the words that have been said about socialism this afternoon when they said a socialist is an unsuccessful person who figures his last chance to get something is to get a part of yours. That is socialism in action, and that is about what this resolution says.

When the leader of the New Democratic Party this afternoon talks about the lack of confidence in this government, I just want him to note that the very rural paper, *Farm and Country*, formerly known as the *Rural Co-Operator*, published a series of questionnaires. One of them had to do with medicare. This paper recorded the farm feeling in Ontario as saying that, and I quote, we do not want medicare, Mr. Pearson, not now, not ever. The rural people of Ontario voted 93 per cent against medicare in that survey. To me those are pretty significant figures.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, just who our hon. friends represent? They say they have no confidence in us. Who do they represent? We are here by the majority of the people, and they are over there by a lack of the majority of the people of this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: And then, Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, the *Globe and Mail* recorded a report of a speech that was made by the Prime Minister of Canada for two days. Mr. Trudeau who was in Saskatchewan where he referred to the agricultural policy of Canada by saying, "Free trade is the answer for Canadian agriculture." My hon. friends, free trade for Canadian agriculture! Do the farm people of this county realize what free trade would mean? Do we not remember what cheap Irish pork did to the only decent price Canadian farmers ever enjoyed for pork in this country? It was let into this country by the Liberal government in Ottawa.

We are in favour, Mr. Speaker, of this policy that we believe has real meaning for the farmers of Canada. That is where the farmers of eastern Canada are able to do something about designing the agricultural policy that will have real meaning for them in preserving eastern agriculture. When we recognize that one-third of the total agricultural wealth of Canada is produced in the province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, and when we recognize that this government put up $500,000 to help the farmers themselves find the answers, and that we had met the real

problem of the people of this province—to which the leader of the New Democratic Party himself approved in conference at Kemptville—then I think we are doing something for the farm people of this province.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, there are perhaps two attributes which can, I think, be remembered about the Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill; one was courage and the other was foresight. He saw in the 1930"s the rising cloud of Nazism, sir, and the rise of Hitlerism, and he tried to warn the people of England about what was happening. It takes a great deal of foresight in a period before war, and even more foresight to see what is happening in a society in peace time. And if you look at the society of Canada today you can see a country in which the majority of people can no longer own a home, where resources are wasted and polluted, and human resources are squandered; where there is certainly no priority, in terms of values, when we build office buildings but can find nothing with which to build homes.

The advantage in a democracy is that during wartime it can act, but during peacetime it is very slow to act. Unfortunately this is an economic problem and in economic problems, too, a democracy works very slowly. We in this group believe that in a democracy you need foresight, in economic democracy as well as political democracy. We think that it is ludicrous for us to be elected to represent the people of Ontario and make a few peripheral decisions while the main decisions are being made a couple of miles south of this building.

I was greatly disappointed today when the leader of the Opposition labelled as an extension of bureaucracy any effort on the part of this party to gain some control over the meaningful decisions. Well, what is a bureaucracy? It is a scare word. A bureaucracy is a group of skilled, intelligent people who can put into effect what we wish for the people of Ontario, and what they wish for themselves.

We put a man in jail for taking advantage of others, and then in a shortage of housing we allow rents to go up and allow people to take advantage of others. We ask for a rent review board, and we ask for a prices review board, and we put people in jail for stealing and yet we are unwilling to put any pressure on those who are willing to take unjust profits from a decent society. You know, we have an amazing pattern going on in this society. I wonder if you have noticed it, Mr. Speaker?

What happens is that the New Democratic Party puts forward a policy, and then turns to the people and asks the people to support that policy. The people then put a great deal of pressure on the government. The governments, of course, Conservative or Liberal, are not willing to act, so what we have then is a Royal commission. It does not matter about the subject; it can be medicare, education, taxation, foreign ownership. The government puts into the Royal commission the elite of the establishment—individuals who will come up with the decision which they are expected to come up with.

Unfortunately, they forget about the magic of human rationality. After these gentlemen sit and listen to the arguments of those who come before them, and they have a chance to reflect, they come down with what was essentially the New Democratic Party's proposal. You only have to look at the Carter report on taxation, the Hall commission report on medicare, the Watkins report on foreign ownership, the Hall report on education.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Pitman: Where do we get it from? We get it because we regard politics as an exercise in rational thinking and placing that thinking into effect.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pitman: Politics is also an exercise in compassion for the people at the bottom of the economic ladder instead of all those at the top. Sooner or later, Mr. Speaker, the people of the province will come to the decision that they would rather have their reform firsthand, because while they wait they suffer. We have the worst taxation system in the western world, and what have we got in this session? We have waited for the Provincial Treasurer to give us the taxation reform that he has promised. We put our taxes on the lower income. In other words, while we wait for reform, you suffer! Right down the line.

We have sales taxes, gasoline taxes, all the way down the line. Mr. Speaker, one only has to look at the federal election campaign to see the distraught state of our political system. We have two Conservative parties, one even a reactinary party. Mr. Trudeau goes about now talking about balanced budgets, a slogan from the 1930's; no scholarships for university students; stop

the handouts. Now we have the *Globe and Mail*, that last resort of every reactionary policy, solidly behind the Liberal party and Mr. Trudeau.

Their support for this motion this afternoon will condemn them out of their own mouths. This afternoon reminds me of a quotation from Benjamin Disraeli, who said: "The closest thing to a Tory in disguise is a Whig in power."

Mr. Speaker, at the same time we have seen the other reactionary party nailing down planks and quickly pulling them up. In the first few days of the campaign, we had a minimum wage suggested by the leader of the Conservative Party, and a few days ago it was suggested that what he meant really was not a minimum wage at all. And here I thought that there had been almost the opening of paradise for our friends across the aisle, that they had finally see the light, and finally we could stop this horrible counting of people's pennies and stop using people to provide all kinds of services which would help them. But no, we are back down on the handout basis, and that is the end of what I thought was a new dimension in the Conservative policy of this country.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude by saying that we will fight to have this kind of enlightened society. One only has to read the Premier's speeches from the beginning of this session to see how often the word planning comes through, and only six or seven years ago all planners were very dangerous socialists. We will have a department of urban affairs and housing, and we will have a land assembly; we will have decent public housing, and we will have medicare soon, and we will have a just system of taxation. Here, Mr. Speaker, for the Provincial Treasurer, who seems to be quite activated at the moment, is a petition from literally thousands of people:

> We the undersigned are angered by pyramiding attacks on our pocket books by provincial on top of federal government, while industry and financial institutions, and insurance corporations, mainly foreign controlled, and high income citizens are continually given preferential treatment which increases their share of the profits in this growing wealth. We call on your government to legislate a capital gains tax immediately to secure revenue from those now protected, and to ease the staggering burden on the common man by removing taxation on necessities and pleasures, and employment. This increase, forced on us by your government, and an additional amount equal to 5 cents per hour out of our pay pocket on the average worker, along with federal increases on the common man, is not in keeping with the type of taxation to help the economy at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I call on all those who have the courage of Mr. Churchill, who crossed the floor, and had the foresight to glimpse the future—I call on those to support this amendment.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I cannot speak with the eloquence of some others this afternoon on this amendment that has been proposed by the leader of the NDP, but I do agree with the contention that the policies of this government have resulted unfortunately in socialism for the enrichment of the rich in a way that not even the rich care to have it occur. Also it has caused an unnecessary burden on the poor.

On this matter of a prices review board. There is no question that a prices review board could do a great deal. It has been seen before that an exposure of factors and well-presented and well-balanced facts in relation to rent; in connection with groceries; in connection with manufacturing pricing; and in connection with wages, do have a very beneficial effect on decision of business, or unions, or whatever, is involved. A prices review board that considers all these factors would certainly be, as my leader mentioned, a very worthwhile introduction, if it were to involve all these factors.

The second matter is in the programming in the north that my worthy colleague from Port Arthur mentioned. So many of the programmes that are introduced by the government seem to forget the real needs as decided and as desired by the people living there. They are designed here in Toronto and not in the north. And so much of what is wanted, when they get down to it, is not charity, but the opportunity to do a job. The government can provide the catalytic addition that will mean that they can stand on their own feet and progress in a way that they have not been able to do in the past.

In the field of agriculture, the policy of the government with regard to the sale of milk is very unsatisfactory in relation to the policy that the government has followed with regard to beef marketing, for example. There

is the latter, it has given incentive to a branch of agriculture to develop its own market, to develop a higher standard of quality and therefore improve the prices it can get for its product, rather than trying to bring all down to the lowest common denominator.

In the field of medicare, the policy of this government in not adopting it has meant that there is a continuation of a very costly procedure in processing of payment of accounts, because you have to consider constantly the matter as to who is entitled to free OMSIP and who is not. The amount of red tape and delay that has arisen as a result of the present policy has been incredible, and is not a good form of medicare.

A very good example of the poor policies of this government is particularly seen in the field of housing. We see the remarkable confusion and discrepancies that arise when the government tries to get on both the side of socialism and free enterprise, and forgets the real role of the government.

We know from basic experience in business, and in all fields of life, that supply and demand are what makes markets. The government tries to interfere and control and decide when development is premature or otherwise. It is also putting all sorts of road blocks in the way of developers, so that they are not able to get land processed into building lots and on the market.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Do you want to abolish the zoning bylaws?

Mr. Deacon: We listened to an excellent treatise—that I wondered at—by the member for Windsor West, when he mentioned Ford could control its price in the markets. I keep on wondering if he has had much experience in actually going out into the sales field and trying to sell a product.

It is interesting that those of us who have had much experience in selling find it very difficult to predict what we will sell and at what prices. Very seldom do market conditions go in our favour, as the government of Ontario has enabled it to go in the favour of those that own land.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Your price control board will not fix that.

Mr. Deacon: If you had a free enterprise open development of land, where everyone could develop a lot who wanted to—or to a great degree, within reason—so that there is an excess of supply over demand, then we would see the difficulties in price control and a weakening in market occur, that we see in regular business.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: What would your review board do?

Mr. Deacon: This matter of big business is always coming forward. It is interesting to note that only one of ten leading New York stock exchange stocks of 1928 is still in existence. Big business suffers from this matter of markets and difficulty of keeping alive, as does small business, and the mention that people on the left made about the big business is just not so.

What we want out of government is an opportunity for freedom and responsibility. That is what everyone wants, regardless of their role in life. They do not want government controlling every decision they make; they want service from government. They do not want bureaucratic supervision. The result of the timid and the traditional and unimaginative attempts of this government to please everyone, Mr. Speaker, is not pleasing anyone at all, and is causing great increase in cost. Waste is as bad as profit. But the policies of this government have been causing both waste and profit.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, may I enter this debate on behalf of the government side and refer to the resolution which has been sponsored by the leader of the New Democratic Party, sometimes referred to in this House as the socialist end of the House.

It is also a very lengthy resolution. It is a well doctored-up group of words, probably trying to achieve an aura of respectability by embracing the aura of that very great world stateman, Mr. Churchill. That is a great way to cover up the nature of the debate. The truth of the matter is that we are here today enjoying a debate which is on socialism. That is the whole matter of it, and they are trying to get Mr. Churchill's support for it.

But as usual, our friends do not give all of the information. In all of their credit material, which is sent out at the expense of all the people of Ontario from this building, with the use of the frank, and so on, only part of this story is told. But let us proceed, Mr. Speaker, and have a look at some of

these situations which have been disarmed at length today.

The amendment, which is actually more of a socialist election manifesto than an amendment, covers an extremely broad and complex area. This is just the point, it is a self-serving resolution. Mr. Speaker, though it suggests that Ontario should at once establish a prices review board and a guaranteed annual wage, it in no sense indicates that restraint should be shown by other than one side of the labour-management dichotomy.

In effect, the socialists are saying, "Control prices and at the same time boost the minimum wage and establish a guaranteed annual income." They do this, Mr. Speaker, at a time when their admitted allies, the paid union leadership throughout Canada, have as one voice refused to countenance any thought of restraint in wage demands, and have told the federal government that they will have nothing to do with such a programme.

Let us have a look at the ambivalence of the socialist position, which is obvious, as is the intent of the amendment now before the House.

As far as the prices review board is concerned, I have often, in this House pointed out that, though the regulation of prices is under provincial control constitutionally, in a practical sense, no single jurisdiction in Canada could intelligently contemplate such a programme. I refer to that independent recent Royal commissioner, Judge Madden, in the very able report that she presented.

When socialist politicians glibly infer that such a course of action is not only possible, but would be relatively easy to accomplish, they mislead and they deceive.

Only yesterday the Toronto *Star* exposed the fallacy behind this socialist scheme when it discussed the offhand promise being parroted all across Canada by the NDP and its federal leader.

The promise, as reported, is to the effect that a socialist government, "would set up a national prices review board which would operate, with the concurrence of the provincial governments, to check profiteering and hold down price increases."

The *Star* pointed out how unlikely this type of concurrence would be in coming, stating, and I quote: "So any hope of unanimous provincial concurrence in price controls is a pipe dream."

This is right in the *Daily Star*. There it is, and the *Daily Star*, while it is known as a great supporter of the Liberal Party, is also known as being a friend of yours. Now let us have a look. He says that Mr. Douglas' idea is a pipe dream.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I guess it is biting, eh? Let us go on: "Thus any attempt by an NDP government in Ottawa to control prices would be doomed before it was started. But no one would ever suspect that from listening to Mr. Douglas' campaign speeches."

Let me just digress for a moment—I will show you. There we are, there is the editorial right there—let me read it. I know, but let us just look at it. The writer says there are only two ways that a price review board could operate. One is without any controls or any power.

Then the editorial writer says that will not work so the other alternative is if the government would have to—I presume an NDP government—would have to put teeth in it. Now let us see what they say about that point. Let me just read it—let the members of the House hear exactly what the *Star* said about your national leader's ideas.

> Or does Mr. Douglas contemplate a board armed with powers to impose price controls? If so, then he is kidding the public. Short of declaring a national emergency, it would be virtually impossible for a Canadian government to control prices.

There we are. Then it also went on and said:

> The positive and assured manner with which the NDP leader approaches national problems during an election campaign is impressive. But it rests largely on his habit of disregarding obstacles and pretending they do not exist.

It was not my original intention to discuss this matter in the context presented here, and I do not necessarily agree with the *Star* conclusions about the feasibility of a prices review board. I do agree that such a board could not be established without the greatest degree of preparation and co-operation possible between the provinces and Ottawa. I think, moreover, that it is misleading and out of place in the context in which it has been brought before this House.

Just a short word about medicare, and I want to give you a quotation. Here is a quotation, something from a man by the name of Douglas Houghton, who is now chairman of the parliamentary Labour Party in Britain and formerly was the Minister in

charge of Health and Welfare. This is a socialist party and I want to just tell you what he says:

> —the poor and the needy it is said, get inadequate help because of the costly and wasteful spread of higher benefits over all. Universalism is certainly on the defensive. It is being attacked on economic as well as social grounds; even on moral grounds it can be contended that judged from the standpoint of the quality and efficiency or the adequacy of the services we are now getting the worst of both worlds.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Against the background of Churchilliana—and I do not think any one of us would want to ignore that aura and that atmosphere, that climate, which the member for York South tried to set—I should like to continue in that vein. But instead of quoting the old cliches of 50 or 60 years ago, I want to quote from Sir Winston Churchill since the last war in his most mature years and at a time when he had achieved his great success as a Tory.

There is more to this NDP amendment, of course, than the way they talk about a predictable socialist pie in the sky. One would think, on reading the amendment, that Sir Winston Churchill was some sort of a blatant socialist. Sir Winston was, as is well known, and as has been repeated here today, a one-time Liberal in the British House of Commons. As a matter of fact, I am surprised at the leader of the Opposition has declared he is going to support the amendment. You would think, out of courtesy to Sir Winston Churchill they would carry it on and on this day in honour of his memory. But not the Liberal Party, not them.

I was reminded, as I read this NDP attempt to embrace Sir Winston—you know it is a little bit like the left-wing Liberals in the Canada debate, they are trying to embrace everybody—for its own purposes, of words spoken in this House by an apostate Tory on the occasion of the great wartime Prime Minister's death.

He, being the hon. NDP leader opposite said, and I quote:

> Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that in the fullness of history—this is his tribute to Sir Winston—I think it also will be recognized that Winston Churchill was not a party man, even though in his latter years he became firmly associated with one political party. He was a man of fierce and rugged individualistic tendencies.

Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that Sir Winston will be remembered as one of the greatest of all Conservatives, an accolade that I am sure would please him more than the attempted misuse of his alleged words by the NDP.

As a matter of interest, the socialist invocation of an alleged quotation from Sir Winston so intrigued me that I took the trouble to try and authenticate it.

After much searching, it turned out that there was no record in the standard texts dealing with Churchilliana in the British House of Commons or in any of his well-known speeches—though to be sure, the record showed passages against Conservatism made by Sir Winston in his youth.

This particular quote, however, had a strange genesis as near as I can tell. It is part of a book called "Parliament and Mumbo-Jumbo", that is the name of the book.

Mr. Speaker, if this is the only source of the statement, then it is shallow indeed, as shallow as the resolution before us. Of course, without proper authentication we will never know.

However, such is not the case with many things said by Sir Winston. With the permission of the House, I would like to mention just a few here. With respect to the quote used by the NDP, supposing that it can somehow be proven to be the words of Churchill, I call the attention of the House to a statement made by Sir Winston on April 21, 1944, in the House of Commons. He said:

> I have no intention of passing my remaining years in explaining or withdrawing anything I have said in the past, still less apologizing for it.

Well, typically Churchill. He later said:

> The old radical campaign against exploitation, monopolies, unfair rakeoffs and the like, in which I took part in my young days, was a healthy and necessary corrective to the system of free enterprise. But this grotesque idea of managing vast enterprises by centralized direction from London can only lead to bankruptcy and ruin.

He said:

> Those who believe in the creation of a socialist state controlling all means of production, distribution and exchange, and are working towards such a goal, are separated from those who seek to exalt the individual and allow freedom of enterprise under well-known laws and safeguards.
>
> The vote-catching election cry "fair share for all"—now this is Churchill on

> socialism—should not deceive keen-minded men and women. It is meaningless unless it is also stated who is to be the judge of what is fair. But what the average socialist really means when he speaks of "fair shares for all" is equal shares for all. Equal shares for those who toil and those who shirk. Equal shares for those who save and those who squander. No reward offered to the skilled craftsman. No incentive to the industrious and experienced piece-worker, no reward for enterprise, ingenuity, thrift and good housekeeping. "Equal shares for all", that is what the socialist government really mean.

He referred later to the era of nationalization—

> —which among socialists was the cure-all for social and economic difficulties. Now keep this to yourselves—he said at Margate one day—there is a general feeling that the whole thing is now a flop.

That is plain language, Churchillian language.

There is no doubt that nationalization has been proved a failure. All this is an illustration of the inherent fallacy of socialism as a pholosophy. In conclusion, I am astounded to come here in this House, today, Mr. Speaker, and hear the leader of the Opposition announce his support, but some corroboration of the support being given by the official Opposition in this House to the socialists and their resolutions on several occasions may well be found.

It may be some corroboration of a rumour when Mr. Thomson was the leader of that party; there was some discussion, certainly popular in the halls of this building, that the Liberals were anticipating a union with the NDPs. It was my understanding that the present leader of the Opposition was the negotiator and maybe this is why.

The Liberals over there are all socialists. I had a looks at some of them today and made some notes, but there are some Liberals left. Let me just say you know who the Liberals are in your party. I will tell you, there are about six or eight of them.

There is the hon. member for Sudbury. There is the hon. member for Humber (Mr. Ben). And there is the hon. member for Kent, and I think there is the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton), the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator). I would say the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook), the hon. member—well, he is not here. I think the hon. member for Kitchener. Those are the real Liberals. The rest of you are socialists.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I say this, that is has always been my desire to try and facilitate the handling of the business in the House, that when suggestions are made by the other two parties, we would agree and go along. And it was rather my hope that when it came the NDP turn to have this go on a confidence motion that we would be able to join with them in a meaningful contribution to the work of this Legislature. But I am sorry, having looked at its socialistic tendencies, we on this side must reject out of hand any support of that resolution.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into committee of supply.

Mr. MacDonald moves an amendment and it is the pleasure of the House that reading of the amendment be omitted.

The House divided on the amendment of Mr. MacDonald, which was lost on the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Braithwaite	Allan
Breithaupt	Apps
Bukator	Auld
Bullbrook	Belanger
Burr	Bernier
Davison	Boyer
Deacon	Brunelle
Deans	Carton
De Monte	Connell
Edighoffer	Davis
Farquhar	Demers
Ferrier	Downer
Gaunt	Dymond
Gisborn	Evans
Haggerty	Gomme
Innes	Hamilton
Jackson	Hodgson (York North)
Knight	Jessiman
Lawlor	Johnston (Parry Sound)
MacDonald	Johnston (St. Catharines)
Makarchuk	Johnston (Carleton)
Nixon	Kennedy
Paterson	Kerr
Peacock	Lawrence (Carleton East)
Pilkey	
Pitman	
Reid (Rainy River)	
Reid (Scarborough East)	

Ayes	Nays
Renwick (Riverdale)	Lawrence (St. George)
Renwick (Mrs.) (Scarborough Centre)	MacNaughton
Ruston	Meen
Shulman	Morin
Singer	Morningstar
Smith (Nipissing)	Morrow
Sopha	McKeough
Spence	McNeil
Stokes	Newman (Ontario South)
Trotter	Potter
Worton	Price
Young—40	Pritchard (Mrs.)
	Randall
	Reilly
	Reuter
	Robarts
	Rollins
	Rowe
	Rowntree
	Simonett
	Smith (Simcoe East)
	Smith (Hamilton Mountain)
	Snow
	Stewart
	Villeneuve
	White
	Winkler
	Yakabuski
	Yaremko—53

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the ayes are 40 and the nays 53.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

The motion now is that Mr. Speaker leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into committee of supply. It is the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

It being 6 of the clock p.m., the House took recess.

No. 124



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Tuesday, June 18, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 18, 1968

Estimates, Department of Trade and Development, Mr. Randall, concluded 4649

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 4683

Errata 4683

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

(Concluded)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 407. The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, when the House adjourned last evening, I was referring to what I considered to be the most fatuous report that I have ever read. It was compiled by the Minister's department on a request by the city of Hamilton in January, 1967, and it was presented in February, 1967. It certainly was done in good haste. The Minister might tell me later on what has come about from this report, but the main point that I started to make was that the opening remarks of the report tell us that the results of this supplementary survey indicate the extent of the demand for additional Ontario housing in the city of Hamilton. They base their effective demand on the present applications in the hands of the Hamilton housing authority—namely 578 for family housing and 741 for senior citizens' accommodation. They came up with the recommendation of 436 family housing units and 611 for senior citizens' housing.

Some of the pertinent part of the report is on the first and second pages. I will again put it on the record to add some continuity to my opening remarks. This recommendation is based solely on the effective demand represented by the pending applications for Ontario housing on file with the Hamilton housing authority at the time of the survey. It does not attempt to predict the effective demand for Ontario housing at this time for the city of Hamilton, nor does it attempt to forecast future demands brought about by the continuation of industrial and commercial expansion or demolition of existing properties as a result of urban renewal. On page 2 it says:

> However, it is highly probably that the effective demand for Ontario housing will increase as a result of economic expansion in future years, and it is recommended that a comprehensive housing study should be considered in order to fully investigate the extent of the present and future demands for Ontario housing in the city of Hamilton.

On page 3 it says this:

> This report is divided in two sections. The first part deals with the need for Ontario housing in Hamilton as revealed by an examination of the general economic and housing conditions in the municipality.

That is a fairly good statement. The balance of the report provides statistical evidence, lays the ground work, for the kind of survey. The second part of the paragraph says this:

> The second section is a comprehensive analysis of all applications on file with the city of Hamilton housing authority at the time of the survey.

That part relates to the fatuous results of this examination. I think, myself, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, that I could have come up with the first three pages of this report in about two days' time. We have applications on file with the Hamilton housing authority, and in the applications is the necessary information—the income, the number in the family, their present accommodation, and their needs—and from this we get this kind of recommendation. I just cannot understand it.

If we go through the report we find that on page 4 it gives us the geographical layout of the city of Hamilton, the physical make-up, the labour supply, the power potential, and air, water and highway facilities. On page 5 it gives a pretty good picture of the growth potentiality. On page 6, there is the labour force by occupation and sex, and this is taken from the DBS figures, the 1961 catalogue. It is all good information. On page 7 we get a table which gives us 30 of the principal employers in Hamilton and the numbers employed, taken from the Hamilton industrial index of manufacturers, obtainable at the city hall in Hamilton. On page 10, we get table 3, the employment index in numbers of the city of Hamilton, taken from

DBS figures, employment and payroll catalogue 72002.

In table 5, on page 11, we get the wages and salaries, heads of families, and family earnings, 1961, for the city of Hamilton, province of Ontario, this is taken from the DBS figures catalogue, 1961. On page 5 we get another table of index—the payroll index numbers—they are also from the DBS employment and payroll catalogue. On page 13 we get the population for the city of Hamilton, in the province of Ontairo from 1961-1966, and this is taken from the assessment department files that are complied by the Minister's own department from the *Ontario Statistical Review*, Department of Economics and Development, government of Ontario. On page 14 we get table 7, age distribution of population of the city of Hamilton, taken from the assessment department, in the city of Hamilton. We get the housing factors on page 16, and this is taken from the 1961 census as outlined in a previous report and survey on the city of Hamilton.

On page 17, we get another table giving us the number of occupied dwellings, the age of the structures of the city of Hamilton for 1961, the province of Ontario, and this is taken from DBS figures. All very good. We get, on page 19, what is going on in urban renewal, demolition of houses for the urban renewal programme; this is taken from the assessment department of the city of Hamilton. On page 20 we get the sales market and general market conditions, and this again is taken from the central mortgage and housing corporation's housing statistics. The report goes on like that page after page, and of course, in the last section, three or four pages, we get a breakdown compiled from the applications that have been filed with the Hamilton housing authority.

I cannot understand just what has been the thinking of the Minister's department in asking his officers to compile such a report. I cannot see why, after compiling the statistics that are in the report, that they could not have carried on for a little bit longer, and really come up with a projected figure of what we are going to need in Hamilton, based on the effect of demand in regards to the things that were mentioned—the normal population growth; the increased population growth; the results of the demolition of houses and the urban renewal factor.

The fact that Hamilton has now zoned a large portion of the northeast end of the city as industrial in the next ten years will bring about the removal of thousands of homes. We could have really known what we are going to need in the city of Hamilton, in relation to the kind of adequate low cost public houses we are going to need. I hope the Minister can explain this kind of a report; that really does nothing for anyone in the city of Hamilton; that gives no more new information outside of the statistics that we have already had channelled to us through other sources.

Another area, Mr. Chairman. I mentioned one of the serious problems in Hamilton, was the fact that many families have been separated because of the lack of adequate houses. This has been verified by the various agencies in Hamilton, and particularly the children's aid society. I want to read a letter into the record. I will send the Minister a copy. I am also going to send a copy to the controller on the Hamilton housing committee and appeal for some assistance in this regard. Now, when I say this is one case that I have had directed to me—and I think it should be given priority in regards to getting a family back together—I would suggest that the Minister send into Hamilton, and any other major city in this province that may justify it, a reliable officer to check with the children's aid society and the social agencies, as to how many families are separated because they cannot find adequate housing. Make a crash programme of giving them top priority in housing.

You will find that the children's aid have several on record, they have the children scattered all over the city in foster homes, living with relatives, and the father and mother making shift the best they can.

This letter I have, says:

Mr. Reg. Gisborn, MPP.

Dear Sir:

It seems to me there is something terribly wrong in this city when people cannot find a house to live in. When a man, who was born right here, and lived here all his life, has to place his five children in different homes, and he and his wife take a room because there is no house for them, this is truly sad.

Of course, being just average working folks we cannot afford the ridiculous rents that are being asked. Mr. Gisborn, there must be dozens of people in the same circumstances, but what are we supposed to do?

At the Hamilton housing I was told it would be four months before they would

even look at my application. Do they not realize, when a man has a wife and five children, he needs shelter for them now. The house we have lived in for seven years at 52 Stapleton was sold, and we had to be out on May 24. Our rent was $75 a month.

Not being able to find a place, we put our furniture in a friend's basement, our two girls, Debbie, 13, and Diane, 12, went to stay with my wife's cousin, Mrs. Daniels, at 1377 Cannon Street east. Mrs. Daniels has three small children of her own. Wayne, aged 14, went to stay at my brother's—Garry Thompson, 58 Division Street. They have four children of their own. Brian, aged 9, and Danny, aged 8, went to stay with another brother, Doug Thompson at 83 Stapleton Avenue. They have three children of their own.

We are paying $10 a week at each of these places for the children. My wife and I rented just a sleeping room at Ken Mooney's, for $16 a week. My job is at the Skyway plaza Texaco in Burlington, since March. The pay is gross $90, net $82 a week. My wife works part-time at Triangle Cleaners—an average of $20. She will be finished there at the end of June.

Now Mr. Gisborn, I ask you humbly, is there anything you can do for us? We are not asking for a big plush house to live in. Just a plain everyday place where we can be comfortable and all together. Thank you kindly.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, I will send a copy of the letter to the Minister and if he can do anything at all, in relation to the case, I will appreciate it. And I will also appreciate him looking into this particular situation in Hamilton and other cities.

Now, we talked about briefly the establishment of housing registrars in the various cities, and the Minister mentioned that they had one in Hamilton. I interjected—and I checked the *Hansard* script—the interjection was there. I interjected that you should try and find them sometime.

I telephoned 15 times in the past year since that so-called registrar was established in the city hall of Hamilton. I have never once caught them in. I believe his name is Mr. Crumb and his assistant, Mr. Parry. I might be wrong in that, but I think those are the names of the two gentlemen.

I understood, when they established that registrar in the city of Hamilton, that the purpose was going to be that he would be there, available for people to call and find out what the housing availability was in the city. He would have a list of all available housing, apartments and so on, and we could get that information when we had problems.

The Minister's answer to my interjection —from *Hansard*—was this:

> We give him an office and a coathanger; tell him to keep his head under, and remind him not to be there; go out there in the field; we do not want him sitting around; we want him out on the job.

What the Minister means by this, I do not know, but maybe he can clear up just what he means. What is the housing registrar doing in the city of Hamilton? He has a telephone there; when you call the switchboard and ask for the city housing registrar, they put you through to another line. The girls says, "Hello", and you ask for so-and-so, but he is not there. If this is the case, I think we should do away with the façade of having somebody there to give us information. The Minister can answer that question at his convenience.

I would like to raise a question in regard to the Hamilton building trade council in Hamilton. The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Pritchard), Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith), Hamilton Centre (Mr. Davison), Wentworth (Mr. Deans) and myself were invited to attend a meeting this morning with the building trade council in Hamilton. In general, their complaint was the high unemployment in their particular trade—about 1,600 out of work—25 per cent of their tradesmen in Hamilton.

I want to deal specifically with their complaint about the method of contracting out jobs under the Ontario housing corporation. I think their requests are reasonable and I think, maybe the Minister has had some correspondence from them. Maybe he has given them an answer. I am not sure.

But what they would like to establish in Hamilton, is that when the advertisements are made to receive proposals, designs or projects—I do not know just how that works, whether it is a firm contract, but nevertheless, they are taken up—what they tell me is that invariably a Toronto developing firm gets the major contracts. Then he sublets out to subcontractors and the subcontractor, in turn, hires his own group and his own tradesmen. They bring their people from Toronto and they work on the Hamilton jobs, while we have the tradesmen unemployed in Hamilton.

What they request, is that the Minister include in his contract that, where they do projects in a locality stipulating they should hire local tradesmen, they should stipulate that they be union tradesmen.

I know that the Minister may not be in favour of that kind of a request, but I assure him that it would be an improvement. I found out there is no conflict between the union and those who are organized in this field. If they hire union work, it makes no difference to the cost of the project when it is completed. I understand there is a dollar spread in the carpenter field and in the bricklaying field, between the organized bricklayers and carpenters and the unorganized. This is not reflected in the finished price. If they hire the unorganized tradesmen for $1 an hour less, somebody gets it—either the contractor or the developer. And you, in most cases, get shoddy work. I would ask the Minister to give some consideration to this kind of protection. I think it would be an improvement.

In conclusion, I might add in relation to that subject, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Minister, that they did make some reference to the project. I am not fully conversant with it, but I understand the department is taking on the Martinique project at Jackson and Hess Streets. Is that correct? That new development, the one that has been standing empty for so long, is being taken over for senior citizens' apartments. They tell me that the contractor and developer, Kat Key Construction Limited, is from Toronto, all the subcontractors on the job are from Toronto and each has brought his own work crew from Toronto.

As you might be aware, the building trades council in Hamilton tried to persuade them to hire Hamilton help and they were not successful. They put a picket line up to try and be more persuasive and, of course, there was an injunction issued and they lost out.

But I hope the Minister will give some consideration to their request, which will relieve the high unemployment in the building trades in the Hamilton area. It is going well in other areas. Hamilton has a peculiar situation because the high industrial construction that goes on most of the time at the Dofasco and Stelco plants has been reduced by about 75 per cent in the last few months. This quickly affects the building trades in the Hamilton area. I will have more to say about that in The Department of Public Works estimates.

I would just like to support the suggestion that was brought up by my colleague, the member for Windsor West (Mr. Peacock). I would hope that the Minister would give a lot of consideration to his nine-point proposal in regards to the management policy of the housing projects—in particular the one that asks for the establishment of a tenants' council, so that they can carry their complaints with some right and dignity to the management of the housing projects. I think it would do something for these projects.

I do not think they should have all of the rights that some might suggest. But I am convinced that, if they were recognized as a committee to have some right to look after the grievances of the tenants, they could help keep the projects in better shape. Through the friendly persuasion that kind of an organization could give, they would get a feeling of belonging to the community. They do not have that feeling now. I would like consideration of that section anyway. Of course, I dealt with the need for housing registry and I hope the Minister will tell me what he thinks about the housing registry in Hamilton and just what it is supposed to be doing.

Mr. Chairman: On votes 407, 408, 409 and 410, does the Minister wish to reply?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Yes, I will, Mr. Chairman.

First let us get the gentlemen straightened out in Hamilton. Mr. Crumb, the gentleman referred to, is an employee of the city of Hamilton, not the Ontario housing corporation. I have since been advised he was released from his duties there recently, but he is now an employee of the Ontario housing corporation, and they run their own registry over there, we do not run it. The other gentleman I was referring to when I asked him to keep his hat on was our man, Mr. Alaven, and he was there to get on with the precise jobs we had lined up for him. Since he got them underway in the city of Hamilton, he is now back in Toronto doing other work. So I hope I have made myself clear on these two gentlemen the member brought up.

Insofar as the work being done in Hamilton is concerned, we did receive a letter asking us to give consideration to employing local people and this is a letter written by our corporate secretary to the city of Hamilton. We say:

> Your letter of April 25 last, addressed to Mr. Suters, vice-chairman and managing director of this corporation, relating to the use of Hamilton building and construction

tradesmen on OHC projects in the city of Hamilton, has been referred to the writer for reply.

It must be pointed out that as the taxpayers of the province of Ontario and Canada at large are providing the capital resources to finance the housing developments in the city of Hamilton and in other municipalities, Ontario housing corporation cannot reasonably take the position of requiring its contractors to confine their hiring of tradesmen to local tradesmen in your city. However, this corporation is sympathetic to the problems within your municipaliity, and although it cannot require its contractors to engage only local tradesmen, Ontario housing corporation will urge its contractors to use local trades wherever feasible.

Perhaps I could give the member a rundown on what we suggest to all contractors in regard to labour on Ontario housing corporation projects. On all projects carried out by OHC or OSHC the classification, the wage rates and the hours are laid down by The Ontario Department of Labour for the municipality concerned, and in each proposal document issued by either corporation there is a section dealing with wages which reads as follows:

The proponent and all subcontractors employed by him shall pay or cause to be paid weekly to every workman employed in the execution of the work covered in the proposal, the minimum province of Ontario fair wage scale for the area in which the work proposed is to be carried out, as set out in the "fair wage clause, new construction" of this document and as amended from time to time. Wherever possible and where capital local labour is available, the proponent and all subcontractors employed by him shall make every effort to employ such local labour on the works covered in the proposal.

The schedule of labour conditions which is laid down by The Ontario Department of Labour forms part of the proposal document. This document clearly states that:

All persons employed by the contractor or subcontractor shall at no time be paid less than the rates of wages stipulated by The Ontario Department of Labour. The working hours of all persons employed are also stipulated by The Ontario Department of Labour and shall not exceed eight hours per day or 44 hours per week. Changes in working hours in cases of emergency must receive prior approval of the corporations. Whatever overtime is approved in excess of eight hours per day or 44 hours per week, the rate shall be not less than 1.5 times the wage rate required to be paid under the contract. The corporation does not require union rates and conditions, but the labour conditions for each contract are stipulated by The Ontario Department of Labour for the municipality concerned.

With reference to the Martinique project, this is not Kat Key Construction; you must have been misinformed there. The contractor is Martinique Apartments Ltd., of Hamilton, and has no association whatever with Kat Key, so it is a local contractor that is rebuilding or refurnishing or refinishing this Martinique project. I thought perhaps you would like to know that.

Dealing with your comments on the report that you have just read from, that was a quick survey requested of us by the city of Hamilton to get on with some immediate projects. They said, "We would like a long-term survey but will you give us a quick survey so we can get underway. We did this, and I will read off to you in a few minutes what we are doing in Hamilton. But they have also asked us now for a complete comprehensive survey of the Hamilton housing needs, and this is underway and we anticipate that within the next 30 or 45 days this also will be available to discuss the problems of Hamilton.

Out of that quick survey perhaps I should point out that we already have under management in Hamilton: 202 senior citizens' units and 1,254 family units. Under construction we have 92 family units at the present time and 557 senior citizens' units. Construction about to commence includes 250 family units, and another 397 senior citizens' units. I think you will see from that report that we did take action and it was in cooperation with the city of Hamilton.

We have been able to act on that report perhaps more quickly than we would have had we gone for a long-term comprehensive report. But, we agree with you, with the land assembly projects and the programmes we have for Hamilton, we would like to know what the long-term needs are for the city of Hamilton. I think this is one area where our survey will give us much information we can probably use in other areas.

I think I have answered, Mr. Chairman, most of the questions that the hon. member asked. If I have not I will be glad to dig up any further information he wants.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of brief questions. When will the present development at Roxborough Park be ready for occupancy?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am informed that the one that are started now will be ready before the end of this year.

Mr. Gisborn: They seem to me to be completed now. They are putting in the driveways at Roxborough Park and certainly they will be ready for occupancy before the end of the year.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I say they are going to finished within the foreseeable future. We think they will all be finished this year.

Mr. Gisborn: Just one remark in regard to that project. It seems small but the only complaint I have had is that the contractors are leaving the streets in that area in an awful mess. If you have any influence—or somebody gets in touch with them—they should be starting to clean them up. The streets four or five blocks away from the project are covered with clay.

In regard to the Roxborough Park survey in general when we talked about the possibility of purchase of some of the units in there, I think the Minister told this Legislature that they were making a survey on how many could be purchased and when they might be ready. Have we found out how many might be sold to the present tenants at this time?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are using the estimates of the Guelph project to get an understanding with OHC, and that has not come back from Ottawa yet. When we get the Guelph estimates back then we will be able to proceed with those others. They are on the old programme, not on the one that you are referring to.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): I wonder if I could pursue for a few minutes the question of the land deal in Peterborough last fall. The Minister very kindly tabled the offer to sell and the statement that he made on June 30 when this agreement was made. It expired on August 18. A $100 deposit was made on that date. Apparently, on August 29, the expired offer to sell was then dealt with, but some days after it had expired. At that time, the board of directors approved the purchase. In fact, an order in council of authority was given on that date, and on August 31, the closing date was extended to October 31. At that time a $50,000 deposit was made on that particular offer to purchase. This particular arrangement was done by letter and that has been tabled today.

> Further to our telephone conversation, please find attached hereto our cheque for $50,000 bringing a further deposit on the purchase of the above property, bringing the deposit up to $50,100.

I wonder if the Minister could explain a jump in the deposit from $100 to $50,000 in just those few days.

> In consideration of the additional deposit, Trent Park Development Limited hereby do agree to the extension of the closing date of this transaction to October 31, 1967. All other terms of said offer to purchase remain unchanged.

Then the conditions, I assume, go back to the expired offer to sell of August 18, and the conditions are very few and very simple.

> This offer is conditional upon Ontario housing corporation obtaining the necessary federal, provincial and municipal approval or consents which may be required for it to consumate its intended use of said lands for a land assembly project.

It goes on to say that CMHC must provide the necessary financing. CMHC indicated that it was willing to consent to financing, and so far as the federal consent is concerned, it would seem that all is clear there. So far as the provincial—well, this is the Minister himself and his influence on the provincial government. As for municipal approvals, no attempt was made to secure municipal approval.

Hon. Mr. Randall: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member has made an incorrect statement here. CMHC never indicated that they were prepared to go ahead in any correspondence that we had. They never commented at all. It was a time when they were waiting to see if they had any money for many of our projects that we had in mind.

Mr. Pitman: So what the Minister is saying is that the federal authority did not turn down the project: this is the important thing.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is in limbo. They never approved it either.

Mr. Pitman: It is in limbo, but I think that the point is that for some strange reason, this

company was willing to give back the $50,000, even though no attempt had been made to carry out what were essentially the conditions of this offer to sell. This is what appears to be entirely baffling, to say the least.

When the Minister made the following statement—and I want to comment on this because this has caused a tremendous amount of concern in the area which I happen to represent, and indeed the whole housing project has been delayed by carfuffles of this nature. When the proposed transaction became known and the centre of a political controversy—that is, of course a euphemism because the Minister himself announced that proposed transaction—it was obvious that local resistance could result in the delays in obtaining the necessary rezoning. What delays? What local resistance? There was no local resistance at all that was formed in regard to this project, so how is it possible to suggest this? How would this create or negate any advantage over the terms of time over the corporations' other holdings?

This has been a major problem because, as the Minister knows, the other 183 lots were delayed and have not been built on during this summer. The fact that we have 22 units in Peterborough as of June, 1968, is a result of this kind of delay and confusion which seems to emanate from this office. In an interjection when I read this yesterday, the Minister said: "The price of land went up!" But it was the Minister himself who announced the price of land and it was the department that announced the increase in the price of land. So if there is any influence on the price of land, this department is responsible for it. I think that the final statement was that the provincial authorization for the OHC to proceed with the purchase was withdrawn. I find it entirely baffling that this kind of action would be taken.

There are three things that baffle me. First, that in this kind of agreement, the Trent Park Developments would not even ask the Minister to comply with the conditions of the offer to sell and secondly would hand back the $50,100 without having the agreement complied with whatsoever. Thirdly, of course the whole basis of this final agreement is extremely baffling. I think that, too, it is very unfortunate of the Minister to stop a project which his own department seemed ready to go through with because of some kind of nebulous political controversy.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not consider it nebulous political controversy. Perhaps I could read back some of your statements the minute that we made the announcement. You made it your business, in order to get your election promises ahead, to make some very definite statements that created most of the difficulty. Let me read back a few of your statements so we know where we are. Here is one of them:

> The area east of the Trent canal, which OHC would pay $500,000 for, ranks last in five areas surveyed by the city engineering department for residential development, Walter Pitman said Thursday. Mr. Murphy said he was sick and tired of hearing NDP criticism of PC housing policies. He took a swipe at the city planning board of which Mr. Pitman is a member for doing nothing towards getting land for public housing.

He is referring to you.

> An area of land had suddenly become an area of housing, although never once had an OHC official appeared at a planning board meeting, an incredible lack of consideration, said Mr. Pitman.

I hear the word incredible from you about 15 times a day, so it is a standard procedure for you to find everything incredible.

> If the OHC goes through with its plans to purchase—

Mr. Pitman: Twenty-two units for 50,000 people.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I know that it is, but we are successful, you hate success. If you would get out of the way, we would get more of them built, but you do not want housing. Here is your last statement:

> If the OHC goes through with the plans to purchase the 292 acres and build houses, it would mean a complete distortion of the present plans for the city, and it means a complete reversal of priority in relation to buildings, water, sewers, and educational services.

Mr. Pitman: Right, and look at the map—

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is the opinion of the hon. member for Peterborough and it was not the opinion of a lot of other people who were interested in that area. If you want to know what the political implications are, there they are.

Let me deal with the other two points that you brought up here. There was nothing wrong with making a down payment of $100 or a $1 bill to have a look-see. We are doing that every day of the week. When we show an interest, we have to come up with greener money, and so we came up with more money because we did have an interest. We made

an ordinary commercial transaction, which we do every day of the week, with nothing insidious about it. It is done by everybody in the land development business. If we are going to deal with these people and the kind of competition that we are up against, we have to follow the same practices, so we put up the $50,000. There is nothing wrong with that. After we had a look at the property, and we listened to the criticism that we had up there, we realized that we were not going to be able to service it. It was definite that we could not get service there any quicker than to any of the property we already owned so we decided to pull out.

We pulled out. The taxpayer has not lost a dime, and we have our money back. We will take a look at other properties in the city of Peterborough. In fact, just so that we get the facts straight, we are looking for land in Peterborough and are still looking. Perhaps if it comes to the board, you will help us this time. We had an offer of 18 acres in the city of Peterborough for $295,000, approximately $16,000 an acre. That was April 28, 1967, and, of course, we refused it. This is like buying uranium property. On May 15, 1968, we had an offer of 185 acres in the city of Peterborough at $3,000 per acre and this land was in the city of Peterborough. On May 16, 1968, we had 93.5 acres in the township of Smith, bordering the city of Peterborough, offered at $2,500 per acre. We are still looking at these last two deals I mentioned and perhaps they are good deals. What may be a good deal for us may not be a good deal for a private developer. As I told you the other day, when we move in we are trying to buy as much land as we can, so there is a sell-off. If there is a sell-off, we will have a profit to put in the community centre, or the school if possible, and lower the cost of lots that we put into public housing.

We have no intentions of going in and taking X number of acres and putting only $15,000 homes in there any more than anybody in his right mind would put in only $35,000 homes. We may have to operate a little differently to the ordinary developer, because of the fact that we are Ontario housing corporation. We may have to look a little further ahead.

Perhaps in some cases we may be accused of paying a little too much, but we know what we are going to do with the property when we get it. As far as we are concerned, the Peterborough deal is a closed book. But we are still looking at land in Peterborough, and there is nothing insidious about what we did with the deal. You have the documents. We have not taken anything then shoved it under the counter. You have had a look at everything we have.

Mr. Pitman: I did not realize that I could have so much influence on this government. But all the things that the Minister just read back are completely true. They can be found in the planning department, they can be found in engineers department, and it seems incredible to me that—and I use that word again in all of its meaning—the Ontario housing corporation would march into a community with the amount of co-operation which it showed and pick up this piece of land, and of course, the cost of the land, the Minister did not mention the degree at which the value of this land rose after the Ontario housing corporation got control of it. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that I do not think Ontario housing corporation has any intention of carrying out a housing project on that land. It was an election gimmick all the way. I think it is a disgraceful way to carry on the government of this province.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You killed the deal. Let me just say to you right now—

Mr. Pitman: Baloney.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Our people did have discussions with city officials in Hamilton, but they do not go to the planning department and the engineering department and advertise that they are in the market for land. This would be the worst thing to do. I said the other day, why should the government take in the taxpayers' money and send a bandwagon ahead to advertise, "Here comes the government; get your prices up." When we are going in for land, we are going in as quietly as we can; we are going to pick the land up at the right prices. We are not going to advertise the fact that it has taken taxpayers' money, "Come on and hook us."

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I listened with a very great deal of interest to the explanation and the revelations with regard to the details of this whole project in the last couple of days, and I want to—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I said you would not see it our way, so go ahead.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I was listening for the facts, I was not particularly interested in your way. When I get the facts then I will revise my opinon if necessary, but I have not found it necessary to revise my opinon. I will

say right now, Mr. Chairman, that this was not an arm's length deal. It now becomes very obvious that it was not an arm's length deal. And this is, again, an incredible proposition that an agency of the Crown should be playing games in this fashion. Let us take a look at a couple of aspects of this whole proposition, Mr. Chairman. According to the contract, they had to obtain the necessary federal, provincial and municipal approvals. Now what is the record? You have never heard from the federal government. The Minister at the moment is hiding behind the fact that the government did not approve. The important thing is that the federal government did not disapprove of it.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, did I not approve it?

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute now—they take even longer sometimes than you do to make up your mind. The Minister has been sitting on offers that he had dating back to April, 1967, so you do not move like lightning. The Minister is going to do something for housing, yet he is sitting on property offered back last year.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am not sitting on any offer from 1967, we turned that offer down. I said that a few minutes ago. We are not sittting on the offer of $16,000 an acre in the city of Hamilton. We turned it down. I told you that.

Mr. MacDonald: You said also that there were offers at $2,500 an acre and $3,000 an acre. You ended your discussion by saying you are still considering these.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Made in May of this year.

Mr. MacDonald: They did not make it until this year?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sure, we got two offers in May of this year.

Mr. MacDonald: May of this year? Well, let's not get side-tracked on that. Let us deal with the issue here: The simple fact of the matter is that you have never had any disapproval, or cancellation, of the support from the federal government. The Minister at this point is rationalizing the matter by saying you did not get approval. You did not ask, you did not try to push the deal, to find out whether you could get approval. As for the municipal end of it, you never sought any approval. The Minister is now saying that he is proven to be wise, in hindsight, because subsequently the planning board was refused the right to rezone it. Once again, that is irrelevant. The simple fact of the matter is—and this is what the Minister who is a businessman, who presumably knows something about the operations of the businessmen—that he suggested that they made an offer and that the government had the right to withdraw from the offer just by having his "right arm" say that his "left arm" could not go ahead with the deal.

The Minister is a member of the Cabinet. The whole thing started with an order in council approving the proposition, and the whole thing came to an end with the same provincial government withdrawing its approval of the project. Well, this is playing games. And, Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Peterborough is dead right when he says it was playing games for political purposes during the election campaign. I draw to your attention that it was the Minister who made the announcement on September 23—in the body of the election campaign so to speak—and some two or three weeks after the election was over, it was the Minister who then announced that they had withdrawn their offer and that the whole proposal had collapsed. This is just proof that you were playing games. You had control of the whole situation.

However, Mr. Chairman, there is a fiinal question that the Minister should speak to, and give some explanation of. If you were dealing at arm's length on a bona fide transaction, what group of people, when given $50,000, is going to back out of it and return the $50,000 to the government?

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): That is a good question.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, what group of businessmen? If the Minister is a businessman, if he entered a contract and was offered $50,000 and there was no disapproval from Ottawa, there was no disapproval from the municipal level, there was just the government playing games by withdrawing its approval on something it had originally approved, what businessman is going to hand back the $50,000? Mr. Chairman, I have a question to put to the Minister. What was the deal—when a group of people handed back $50,000? Are they on the string for another sale of land to the government at some stage later? Because it is an open secret that everybody knows, that this land value had been pyramided in a period of

three or four years for something like $100,000 or $140,000 to $500,000, and one of the key men in the process was the then sitting member from the Legislature.

Mr. Trotter: A Tory.

Mr. MacDonald: A Tory. Right, a Tory. Now, if the government backed out of it, please do not blame the hon. member sitting for Peterborough. The people down at Peterborough were not going to have anything more to do with this kind of a game that the government was playing. A group of people who were in the process of making some three to four times the value of land, by sales from a series of agencies—indeed in one instance there were one or two sales within the same day—so that the value of the property went up by some tens of thousands of dollars. The government now tries to blame the hon. member for Peterborough as being responsible for it.

This Minister was involved in a messy deal. That is what he was involved in. He was involved in a messy deal which he cooked up for election purposes. He announced it in the election, and he killed the deal shortly after the election was over. Do not try to kid anybody else as to what the exact nature of this is. We have been playing games with it long enough, and if this is the kind of deal that Ontario housing is in, in the name of the Minister, or the Minister is in, in the name of Ontario housing, then certainly the time has come for us to look very closely at the operation of this arm of the Crown.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You are entitled to your opinions. I heartly disagree with you, and I do not expect you to let your man off the hook either. It is always this side of the House that is in difficulty, and I say this to you: In this Legislature, your people have done more to delay a home-housing programme in this province than anybody else I know. You are always looking for a scandal. If a man has anything to do with the government he is a crook, everybody who has ever been in politics on this side of the House. We are not supposed to buy a nickel's worth of goods from the man once he has served in here, and if he leaves you cannot give him a job, you cannot hire him as a lawyer, you cannot buy from him because he is a crook. I do not know what is the matter with your kind of mentality when you put everybody in that category.

Let me just spell out for you one thing, and one thing very clearly. This is a standard condition on every offer to sell that we have, and I do not care whether a man gets $50,000 or $200,000, if those conditions are not met, then the deal is cancelled. This is a standard form that we use at the Ontario housing corporation and we will continue to use.

We make these conditions because we have no assurance whatsoever when we make a deal here first. We are the bird dog, we ferret it out. When we get it and send it to Ottawa, we do not know whether they are going to accept it or not, and last year Ottawa told us they had no money for many land deals, they had no money for buying instant lots. They wanted out at the end of 15 years, once the cow pasture was serviced. We agreed to bail them out at the end of 15 years.

In October of last year they owed us $40 million on deals they had made, and Mr. Suters had to go to Ottawa, sit down with Mr. Nicholson, and Mr. Hignett, and say, "Look, we have made deals. They are sitting in Ottawa. You say you are going to approve them. We want the $40 million." This is the kind of a basis we find ourselves in, in making land deals, and we are going to make these kinds of deals now and from hereon in, and if we—

Mr. MacDonald: You do not have to buy at inflated land values.

Hon. Mr. Randall: And if we put the right conditions in, we have every right to cancel out if we feel we want to cancel out the conditions and the money is not there. And this is exactly what we do.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The conditions were not met. We did not get the CMHC money. We never got the approval.

Mr. MacDonald: You did not ask for the approval.

Hon. Mr. Randall: How do you know we did not ask for it? Were you there?

Mr. MacDonald: You did not—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Were you there?

Mr. MacDonald: You did not get a refusal.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Were you there?

Mr. Pitman: No, and neither was the Minister. You never got it. You never asked for it.

Mr. MacDonald: In fact, you are misleading this House.

Hon. Mr. Randall: No, I am not.

Mr. Pitman: If anyone is responsible for the break down of these negotiations, and the lack of that land, it is the Minister himself. Because the Minister announced that during the election campaign and he had no need to announce it at all. Did he? There is no reason why it had to be announced. It was not consummated. It is not, as the Minister himself has said, the policy of the Ontario housing corporation to make announcements of this sort. It is certainly not the policy of the Ontario housing corporation to make announcements about the price of the land they are buying. But the Minister himself did this.

Furthermore, are the newspapermen across this country completely without blame? Was there a headline Scott Young wrote under in in the *Globe and Mail*?

Hon. Mr. Randall: They got—

Mr. Pitman: Harold Greer wrote about it in several other newspapers across this province.

Hon. Mr. Randall: You went and got—

Mr. Pitman: It was public knowledge—

Hon. Mr. Randall: Who got them? You fed them.

Mr. Pitman: Oh, baloney! Do you think I got my election campaign to feed the newspapermen across this province? You are out of your mind.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there is one point that I wanted to deal with. The Minister indicated that we are calling everybody who happened to have some association with this government as a crook.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Sure you are.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the record is very clear that the hon. gentlemen had a few tens of thousands of dollars involved, and the rest of it was mortgages. It started at $140,000, and in three years it was pyramided to over $500,000, which this government is willing to buy.

Hon. Mr. Randall: How many times has that happened on other—

Mr. MacDonald: I do not care how many times it has happened.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Mr. MacDonald: And there now is the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) saying that this is defensible. The proposition that a group of local Tories should be inflating land values which should then be bought by the Ontario housing corporation, and should be built into the rental charges that people have to pay—this is the problem in Ontario.

It is one thing for the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and others, to get up and lament about the high cost of land, but it is another thing to examine who is building the high cost of land. And when it is a group of local Tories who are skyrocketing the land prices, and then you are buying it up—I say to the Minister once again: this was a messy deal that even the Minitser could not remain associated with. So he is blaming central mortgage and housing. He is blaming the municipality. He is blaming the hon. member for Peterborough. But he should blame himself.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I will make you an offer. If you find any land that belongs to its original owner, will you bring it into the Ontario housing corporation, and we will pay you a commission. Because the owners of land today are maybe a half a dozen removed from the original owner.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, go out and dig—do not ask me to do your work for you.

Hon. Mr. Randall: If you find some original owners bring them in, because we would be glad to do business with them.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word in regard to the Peterborough property. I have had an opportunity to see the contract that was tabled, and also the letter of August 31, 1967. It has already been referred to.

There is no question in my mind that this is a real can of worms. I have listened to the hon. Minister on this matter. I think for a certainty he is covering up for somebody. Or either there has just been a major bungle on the part of—

Hon. Mr. Randall: What have we got to cover up? All the money is back and the taxpayer has not lost a dime. What are we covering up?

Mr. MacDonald: Just because you were scared out of the deal—

Mr. Trotter: The whole background of this transaction is such that it is utterly ridiculous for the Minister to blame the present member for Peterborough for this deal falling through.

Mr. MacDonald: He is here because of the reaction of the people.

Mr. Trotter: What went on in that election—certainly those of us who were following what happened in Peterborough—is probably the reason why the NDP is now representing Peterborough, it is because of the background of this deal. It has been known for some time that this land increased in value three or four times in a short period of time and the former Conservative member for Peterborough was involved in the transaction.

I would think it is the responsibility of the Minister to table what correspondence he would have with central mortgage and housing—either on Ontario housing corporation asking for approval of the transaction, or secondly, where central mortgage and housing has turned them down.

I frankly do not believe that such letters exist. It would appear to me, having listened to what has gone on, that the government entered into this transaction as an election gimmick in order to make it appear they were going to do something. Either that or, because the deal was so smelly, they became afraid of it and backed off.

My own personal view, from what I read in the newspapers and from what I have heard in this House and other places, is simply that it was not an election gimmick. I think it was so smelly that they had to back off because of the press it was getting.

When the Minister has been questioned by the member for Peterborough and the leader of the New Democratic Party, he has come back with answers that are completely evasive. He says they have the right to check into these deals or certain conditions, they have the right to cancel them, that they go to central mortgage and housing, and central mortgage and housing sometimes approves and disapproves.

Well, he talks about some deals but the Minister never talks about this particular transaction. I am of the opinion—and again I repeat it—that the Minister never made any attempt, either with the municipality of the city of Peterborough or with the federal government, through its central mortgage and housing corporation, to have this deal approved. He has used it as an excuse. And the people involved, the Trent Park Developments Limited, gladly gave up the $50,000 because, being friends of the government, they simply did not want to get involved any further in a deal which had become a can of worms.

No doubt, the same group of people behind Trent Park Developments will be befriended again in some way—probably more successful—by this government in the hope that the Opposition, or the press, or the public does not get wind of it.

But there is no question in my mind—and I am sure in the public's mind—that there is a lot here still to be uncovered. The whole behaviour of the Minister indicates that he has a lot to hide. I would suggest, through you, Mr. Chairman, that the fault may be not so much with Ontario housing corporation but with the politicians in the back room some place who concocted this transaction in the first place.

This is where the real mystery lies. Not in the offices of Ontario housing corporation, but in the back rooms of certain individuals of the Tory party who were looking for a pay-off. Here the pay-off fell flat. But I would like to ask the Minister this. Would he table in this House—either now or within the next few days—any other correspondence involving this transaction, particularly where central mortgage and housing is involved and where approval would be requested of the city of Peterborough? Would you table those or do you have them?

Hon. Mr. Randall: This is a letter from CMHC addressed to Ontario housing corporation, attention Mr. J. F. Metcalfe, land assembly section, 35A, Peterborough Ontario.

> We wish to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 6th requiring additional land under section 35 for a land assembly project under HOME programme at Peterborough. At the present time, we are holding 40 lots in phase four of the land assembly for the HOME programme and hope to have 183 lots in phase five serviced by late fall.
>
> This will leave approximately 600 lots in phase five to be developed within the next two or three years. We would therefore appreciate receiving from you, a brief summary of the findings of your planning and research department and the recent survey of need and demand and approximately how many lots you are considering for the 35A HOME programme for Peterborough before we can approve authority to investigate acquisition.
>
> Yours truly,
> Regional Supervisor,
> Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Peterborough.

Mr. Trotter: Well, that is not turning down anything or, if I—

Hon. Mr. Randall: You asked me if we ever made an application to central mortgage and housing. We did. We make it with the local people first.

Mr. Trotter: Again that is very evasive. Even the letter is very general, and secondly, it certainly was not—

Hon. Mr. Randall: You asked me a question, "Would we table any further correspondence?" I will be glad—this week, next week or the week after—to give you any further correspondence. We have nothing to hide, as I said yesterday.

Mr. Trotter: Well, I am glad to hear it. Anything you have on that file pertaining to—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I will be glad to.

Mr. Trotter: Pertaining to Ashburnam Road property in Peterborough?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Be glad to.

Mr. Trotter: I would like to see it tabled.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Provincial Treasurer): Frustrating, isn't it?

Mr. Trotter: Well, there is no question—for three or four years there has been hanky-panky going on in regard to this land and I—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: Well, it suits you people very well. I have stronger words than that for you people—

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order.

Mr. Trotter: See, I am in a Parliament, I just have to hold my tongue.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Trotter: They would be well placed.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I would like to seek a piece of information from the Minister.

My recollection of the press reports at the time seem to indicate that the former member for Peterborough, Keith Brown, sold the property in question to a corporation and he got, if my memory is correct, $125,000 on that sale. Is it a fact that, notwithstanding what happened in the ultimate stages of the transaction, Brown received that consideration to himself in any event in respect of the sale of this land?

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is a private market deal. Brown is privileged to sell it to anybody he wishes to sell it to. The people that came to us were Trent Realty—whatever their name is—they were the ones that came to us with the deal, not Mr. Brown. We had nothing to do with Mr. Brown. Trent Realty came to us after the deal was sold to them.

Mr. Sopha: Well then, I assume it is correct.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are not aware that Mr. Brown even owned any property up there.

Mr. Sopha: Then I assume it is—and I want to put on the record that I assume—to be correct. So anyone can quarrel with it if it is not correct. I assume that Brown as an entrepreneur in dealing with this land, entered into a transaction with some other person—a company—and he got a consideration, which memory tells me, was in the neighbourhood of $125,000. Subsequently, the purchaser from him, or a subsequent purchaser, entered into a transaction with Ontario housing corporation whose transactions, ultimately, by agreement of the parties, was rescinded.

Those are the facts that I assume to be correct. In that case, it is clear to me, entering this debate at the late stages—it is absolutely clear to me—that what there ought to be, is a judicial enquiry.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): If I may—

Mr. Sopha: Just a moment.

Mr. White: I will not be a minute.

Mr. Sopha: No, no. I am not through—

The Premier of this province, acting under the prerogatives he has—and I hope that *Hansard* will record the last of that remark, because I was perfectly serious when I made that proposition—on September 5 last year, acting on the prerogative vested in him, the Prime Minister dissolved the House, and on that day Keith Brown was a member of this House. He ceased, on that day, to be a member. Who would believe that between September 5, when he ceased to be a member of the House, and some time later in the fall, when the deal with the OHC came to an end, that that was the first involvement of Keith Brown with the deal?

What the judicial enquiry ought to attempt to ascertain, was what the activities of Brown were, in respect of this land before September 5, because if it was intended that this land, ultimately be a housing development, under the aegis of OHC, then there is more in the suggestion or suspicion that Brown was in conflict of his interest as a member. He was playing the part in the creation of a set of relations that would ultimately benefit Brown, as a member, from the public Treasury of the province, no matter how it was obscured. If that was the intent and the government in those circumstances, having listened to all this debate—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You are having a pipe dream.

Mr. Sopha: The government should not hesitate to institute a judicial enquiry in order to reveal all the details of this transaction and if—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Say that outside the House and let Brown tell you a few good words.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Sopha: Listen you—

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order.

Mr. Sopha: I say this to you because I get tired of that about outside the House—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not think it is seemly or proper conduct for any member to say "listen you" to any other member.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury is aware of the procedures as well as the Chairman. I ask him to observe those procedures.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister of Health—a medical man—should not provoke a member over here so that the backlash gets our friend, the Provincial Treasurer, into a state of hypertension; the top of his head might blow off.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Stop playing the gallery and get to it.

Mr. Sopha: So I ask the Minister of Health to lay off him.

Mr. MacDonald: There is a lot to play. You are all very disturbed.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Despicable.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The member for Sudbury may proceed.

Mr. Sopha: Is that not terrible? Is that not terrible conduct on the part of the Minister? I am ashamed for you. I am ashamed.

Mr. MacDonald: They are caught redhanded.

Mr. Sopha: I am ashamed for you—

Mr. Chairman: Vote 407?

Mr. Sopha: Here we are, the guardians of the public interest, and we come upon this set of circumstances; and when we start to enquire into it, in proper place, and in the proper body of Ontario, you get a little foolish person like that, start to talk. "Say it outside the House." I hope you maintain silence.

A typification of complete irresponsibility.

Mr. MacDonald: Political bluff.

Mr. Sopha: All right, let us put it this way, now that the matter has been unravelled here —and the way it has. If the Ontario housing corporation and the Minister of Trade and Development have nothing to hide, and with the evidence that we have, of the involvement of a member of the House, while he was a member of the House—if all that is innocent, then put it in the hands of a proper body in order to demonstrate to the people of Ontario that they have no grounds for concern. Finally, I say that I thought we were entering an era—I was optimistic enough to believe that we were entering an era—when politicians rigidly separated their private affairs from their public responsibilities. That would be a cause for great enthusiasm in this democracy.

That member, as I knew him, loved to be a member of this House. He used to go to great expense to bring his people to the galleries, he would bring busloads of them here. I was very surprised when he did not run again. I suspect that the reason he did not run again was because of his involvement with this Minister.

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, this is out of order, this attack on a previous distinguished member—

Mr. Sopha: What is he nattering about, I did not hear him?

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the member would return to the vote.

Mr. Sopha: Finally, Mr. Chairman, I say to this Minister: We lay down the challenge; we toss the gauntlet; or any other way you want to put it. If you have nothing to hide —we have nothing to hide. Let us have an independent enquiry to find out what involved that member while he was a member of the House. Notwithstanding all this other folderol about our conduct over here, in drawing this to the attention of the public in this way, ultimately we have our responsibilities and if it involves taking the type of abuse to which we are subjected, from such people as the Minister of Health, and the member for London South, then we have got to bear that abuse with all the fortitude we can muster.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: So the whole debate would be the launching pad for that judicial enquiry. He could take this debate, and everything that has been said here from this side, and from the Minister's own lips, and with that, begin to enquire. If that member was free of all blame or guilt of involvement; if he was indeed like Caesar's wife; then the people of Peterborough will be indeed the first that will be glad to hear it. It was said here to the Minister tonight—and this is noteworthy—that the reason the member is not here and that they have a member from a new party is because of the activity of this Minister.

So the conscience of this Minister ought to be ruffled to the extent that he would be among the very first to go to the first citizen, the president of the executive council, and say: "Our hands are clean, let us get the details out into the open."

So that is the measure of the challenge. We can assume that if that challenge is not taken up after this debate is read, then no doubt over the years it will leave a gross distaste in the mouths of the people of Peterborough and others in the province who become aware of it. All right, I put it this way, so the Minister of Health will know the principle on which I stand in this respect.

I am against, now and forever, the involvement of any member's private affairs with his public responsibilities. As long as I am in public life I will make available—and be ready at a moment's notice to make available —any private affairs in which I am involved myself. And being ready to do that, and having something of an idealistic view of the new politician in the new democracy which we are approaching, then I am entitled to insist upon at least that from all others I encounter in public life.

There is the principle and I hope the Minister of Health for whom, in cooler moments, I have a high admiration, will maybe consider these words and digest them. And I hope that, in the future, he will not spoil what could be a friendship over the years with this type of intemperate outburst which, unfortunately, he sometimes gives.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wellington South? The member for Hastings.

Mr. C. T. Rollins (Hastings): Mr. Chairman, there have been remarks made here tonight concerning Keith Brown and involving a so-called land deal in Peterborough. I would like to say to the members across the floor that because Keith Brown operates a private business, there could be some jealousy. Keith Brown happened to occupy and work out of the same office as I have, since being elected. The reason Keith Brown is not here today was with reference to pleadings from his wife owing to an episode that happened in Peterborough and threats on his family.

That is the reason he is not here today and nothing else. I would hope that the members of this House would give Keith Brown the same oportunity—without the protection of this House—to say the things that they have said here tonight. I am sure he would be amply able to take care of himself and answer all and any questions that may be put forth. He is not here—not because of any land deal, but because of what had taken place in Peterborough from threats on his family.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, well I do not think—

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, I am moved. I had no intention of speaking on this but I cannot help but contrast this situation—where the government, in fact, did not spend any money with Mr. Brown from Peterborough—to the situation of the NDP's Mr. Brown, a man that we have been trying to get in front of a committee on privileges and elections for some months. As a matter of fact, he avoids this House like the plague. He flits in and out at quiet moments. His leader has not got the gumption, the fortitude, the integrity, or the honour to put him in front of a committee on—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South will please state his point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the initiative for getting before the committee on elections and privileges rests with the government, and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I object to the hon. gentleman getting up and questioning my gumption. If he has not the courage of his convictions let the government take the initiative.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I do not think this is properly before us at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. But your man raised it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, Order. Will the members please be seated. Order. Will they please revert to the estimates of The Department of Trade and Development? The member for Wellington South has been trying to get the floor for some time.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman: All right. Are you ready to speak?

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, after that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, are you going to allow this defiance of the chair?

Mr. Chairman: If the member for York South will suggest to the Chairman how he can control it, I will try to. I do not know what to do.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Perhaps if we just remove the member for London South from the chamber we could get on with the business of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order. The member for Wellington South. Order please. Will the member for Wellington South please proceed?

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, as the Minister knows, during the past year the Guelph rental project and the tenants and the administrator and the board have had several meetings and this rental development in Guelph is getting to be quite a large project. I am wondering if the Minister would suggest tenant representation. As I understand it, when we originally started that project with central mortgage back in 1953, we had an appointment of three members from the federal government and three members from the provincial government. I am wondering, sir, that now that this has developed into a unit of somewhere over 200 houses and some 70-odd senior citizens' housing units, whether there could not be negotiations between the federal government and the provincial government to see if we could have representation from the tenants.

It seems to me that there is something lacking here. When these people have problems, they do not have an opportunity to meet with the board and get the facts on what is taking place. I think that, perhaps, would solve some of the liaison that is missing between the tenants, the board, and the government. Would you give consideration to taking this up with Ottawa after June 25?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have some information on that for the hon. member. Just a second, I will see if I can find it here. I might say that we have had this matter under consideration, but no decision has been made as yet.

The same question was asked earlier and the answer was that tenant representation on a local housing authority appears, on the surface, to be a relatively simple matter. However, it should be borne in mind that housing authorities are dealing with confidential matters affecting individual tenants. From time to time, it may be necessary to take disciplinary action against a particular tenant. For this reason it would be unreasonable that one tenant should have access to confidential information concerning other tenants or, for that matter, should take part in decisions concerning other tenants.

Again, any housing authority would welcome tenants representing the tenants' association for that part of the proceedings not concerning personal information regarding other tenants. I think you can see what we are driving at here. If a man in that locality was on the housing authority, it might be difficult for him still to live there after helping make a decision against a tenant—perhaps reprimanding or evicting him. For that reason, we think that perhaps they could serve in some other capacity, but not on the housing authority. There is no immediate decision that has been made on that there will not be. We will take a look at it. If we can come up with a recommendation, we will.

Mr. Worton: Well, Mr. Chairman, is there a possibility of having an independent person serve and adjudicate, or at least have a liaison between the tenants and the housing authority and the government so that they can be better informed as to what is taking place, and why decisions are being made or changed?

Hon. Mr. Randall: In the first place, when we set up the housing authority it was comprised of independent people in that community—you know, citizens who wanted to serve in an independent capacity. They are not employees. They are not civil servants, they are not employees of the Ontario housing corporation. They are people who have offered their services. In that respect, we feel that the people do have representation independent of authority. If there are any recommendations of how we can improve that authority for the benefit of the tenants, we are quite prepared to take a look at them.

Mr. Worton: Unfortunately, these boards do give a lot of time and they take it very seriously. Sometimes they are put in a position of receiving unfair criticisms. I am trying to come up with a solution that will do away with this criticism of the job they are trying to do.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. H. Peacock (Windsor West): Mr. Chairman, I find the Minister's answer—I did not catch all of his statement—but I find his answer to the member for Wellington South rather provocative. I do so for this reason:

In the brochure entitled *Appointment of Members of Local Housing Authorities,* issued by the Ontario housing corporation for the guidance of its local authorities, there is a section headed "Qualifications for Membership"—membership on the local housing authority boards. And it reads:

> Nominees are required to be responsible and established residents of the local community. They must be public spirited because these positions are non-remunerative. They may be representative of all walks of life.

But Mr. Chairman, such walks of life as bankers, doctors, dentists, lawyers, insurance personnel, ex-mayors, ex-councillors, retired real estate persons, welfare workers, social agency personnel, builders, engineers, architects, merchants and so on, is a fair-sized category. But it hardly takes us through the full list of all occupations in all walks of life. I think there are two points to be made here about the Minister's reply to the member for Wellington South.

One is, just how does the Minister distinguish the capacity of the housing authority board member in one of these walks of life to retain confidential information which he may receive through his membership on the board, as against the capacity of a tenant not in one of these occupations?

Mr. Chairman, it is beyond my comprehension how the Minister can make such a distinction. It is an utterly unfair, unjust and unfounded distinction, and I ask him to eradicate it from this brochure. I ask him to sincerely consider the proposition that tenants themselves have just as much capacity to be responsible and established residents of the local community as any one of these other home-ownership interested classifications.

They have just as much capacity to serve on a board of a local housing authority, to handle tenants' problems—if not a greater capacity, Mr. Chairman, than any of these occupations listed in this brochure. They have just as great a capacity to keep confidential information to themselves, and not to gossip about it amongst their neighbours in the tenant project. And they have the capacity in every other respect to be able members of a local housing authority board.

Mr. Chairman, if the Minister does not take this step of eliminating the restraints he has placed on qualification for membership in this brochure, if he does not include tenants themselves, and the many other occupations that we can find in our community—office workers, labourers, factory workers, bank clerks, as well as bankers, tenants themselves—then he is guilty of a continuing act of discrimination that should be outlawed by the Ontario human rights code.

Mr. Chairman, the roles of local housing authorities need to be greatly enhanced. The boards of the local housing authorities do not distribute to their tenants any kind of annual report so far as I know. Tenants do not know the names of their housing authority board members. They have no channels of communication with them. The channels of communication are entirely through the office of the board authorities. I suggest that extending the qualifications of membership to cover other categories of tenants and other occupations, would be one fundamental way in which the Minister could greatly enhance the prestige and effectiveness

of local housing authority boards. And it could better the relationship between the housing corporation's tenants and the corporation.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to make some comment on the words of the member for London South. It is unfortunate that he has left the chamber. One of his interjections was—

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with Ontario housing corporation.

Mr. Pilkey: I recognize that, but this was part of it and I think that this House should know what he said. Because there were threats, they said, on Mr. Brown, he called those people gangsters. There were implications on the whole trade union movement. I know what he was talking about in the city of Peterborough and this reflects on the whole trade union movement and every worker who is organized in this province. I think it is rather unfair that he should use the word "gangsters." I think they are honest citizens with a tremendous amount of integrity who make a contribution to the whole of this province.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Anybody who threatens a man's life is a gangster, is he not?

Mr. Pilkey: Yet he was implying that the whole trade union movement in that area was gangsters.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I never heard anything about unions. You should not have mentioned the unions. You brought them into the debate.

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with Ontario housing corporation, votes 407, 408, 409 and 410.

Mr. Pilkey: If the shoe fits, wear it. Let me say the people of this province are going to continue to rebel against injustice in our society.

Mr. Chairman: Do you have something on housing?

Mr. Pilkey: I do not think there is anything that has moved me more in my short period in this House than a critical situation that I experienced about two weeks ago.

Tonight I am sure that I was only scratching the surface in this area of housing. There was a young immigrant family to this province, Scottish immigrants, and they were being evicted from their apartment. I know that their eviction was due to their having five children. We made a concentrated effort in the city of Oshawa and the surrounding area, and through the welfare and the president of the real estate board, we looked everywhere for accommodation for this young family.

It was not because they did not have the ability to pay. The husband was a sheet metal worker earning $175 per week in Toronto, but could find no accommodation. They ended up in an area around Frenchman's Bay. There should be a complete investigation by government of the hovels that exist in that area in which people have to live. I went into that home, and it was one of the better cottages—a summer cottage. Most of them are winterized, but very, very poor accommodation. This woman turned the tap on and told me to smell the water. Let me tell you that water was so odorous, it really stank.

That was the kind of accommodation that these people had to live in because there was no other place for them. I suppose that they could have got some place for $200 a month that they could not afford, but they could afford something in the area of $135 a month. I came into this House and raised it because I thought that there should have been an emergency debate when I saw the appalling condition that existed in that area. I am sure that if it is critical in that area, heaven knows what it is like in a municipality, like the city of Toronto. Heaven knows what it is like.

We have got to face up to this situation. The Minister, in his opening remarks, said we are going as fast as we can go and we must not push the panic button. Let me say that we are not going fast enough and there is a need to push the panic button. We ought to be pushing it because we have got to get on top of this question of housing and provide suitable accommodation for the people of this province.

I recall this afternoon the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree) stood up, waving an editorial around. I thought it was Diogenes with the lamp of truth. The way that he was throwing that editorial around, it must have been the gospel truth.

Let us get at this editorial tonight. Was it the gospel truth? "Mr. Randall whacks a straw man on housing." Is this the truth? Is this the truth, another editorial from the same paper saying the rent for an average house is $279 per month, and if it is, who can afford

it? Surely there is no working man who can afford this. I want to suggest that the job is just not being done, and you cannot stand up and say you are providing X number of houses here and X number of houses there. We have not mobilized the resources of this province to alleviate the question of the housing shortage, and I want to say that the shortage is acute. I would suggest that we ought to have a war on housing in this province.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Want to blow them all up?

Mr. Pilkey: You know the government said that they could not put a medicare plan into effect, because they were going to deal in priorities and we could not afford this. Well, surely this question of housing is a priority item. Maybe we have got a measure of coverage in terms of medicare, but we will still have to go ahead with it. Surely if medicare is not a priority item, then housing should be and we ought to be doing much more about it.

It has to be done in short term, and we have got to do it now, and we have to concentrate in two areas. We have to work on a short-term basis to get on top of the situation, to provide the housing that is immediately necessary and eliminate that need; and then we have got to do it on a long-term basis, so that we keep up with it. Make no mistake about it, this province and this country are going to grow. The whole country is going to grow, and we need to provide more housing.

I am not convinced that we cannot provide the single-family dwellings necessary, that we have got to put people into high-rise apartments in high-density areas. Here we are sitting in the most vast country in the world, a country that is supposed to be part of the affluent society, and yet we cannot provide family dwellings, we have got to put them in high-rise apartments, or in high-density housing areas.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pilkey: I want to suggest to the Minister that we should be providing that kind of environment – a single-family dwelling so that children can be raised with a yard to play in. This is important, to have a yard to play in, rather than an asphalt jungle, in which so many children are raised today. I think that we owe it to the future generation to provide that kind of housing. We owe it to this generation too.

There have been a number of editorials pointing out that the people with less than $8,000 income—and I suspect that it is getting to the point, with the high interest rates—cannot afford to purchase a home today. I was just reading an article today which pointed out that land has been purchased here for $500 an acre, and subdivided and sold for $20,000 an acre, and you can imagine the kind of profit that these people are making on that kind of land assembly. When I say $20,000 an acre, this is only at $4,000 per lot. This morning I heard that you could not buy a lot in Toronto for $4,000—that it was impossible. A 50-foot lot is selling for something like $12,000 for the lot, never mind putting a home on it.

It pointed out that even if one could build a house today for around $20,000, if this was based on nine per cent over 35 years—because unfortunately they could not pay it over 25 years—the interest on the $20,000 home would be over $40,000. In other words, that home would cost far in excess of $60,000 for that wage earner before it would be his.

Mr. Yakabuski: Talk to Ottawa, not to us.

Mr. Pilkey: I am going to talk to somebody about it because we must do something about the situation. Mr. Chairman, I am not too sure that all the brains happen to be sitting on that side of the House, in regard to this critical area. I am not too sure at all. If this government is sincere, why do we not make an all-party attack on this question of housing? For my part, if we could find some all-party resolve for a system of attack on this appalling and critical situation, I would not care who got the credit for it. This government could have all of the credit in terms of resolving that problem, as far as I am concerned, if we could find a solution and some people went to work at it.

I am suggesting to you, Mr. Chairman, that there is a solution to this problem, there is a solution. If there was a war declared tomorrow and we needed the weapons of war, we could find the resources, make no mistake about that. We would mobilize the whole resources of this country to meet the common enemy, and yet we have a common enemy here. We need a war on housing to provide it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Pilkey: I want to say something about these slogans. The slogan of "home ownership made easy" maybe is doing something. I am not confident that it is, because

we still have a serious condition, it still exists, and I think the government is long on the propaganda and short on the effectiveness of solving this problem. I say this in all sincerity, that we just have to find a solution to this problem and provide the housing.

I just cannot say it strongly enough, with the critical and appalling conditions that these people have to live in today in the province of Ontario. Frankly, private enterprise has not met and is unable to meet the need, and I am convinced that where it cannot meet the need, then the government has to step into that vacuum and provide it, and it has to give leadership. It is going to take some strong leadership to provide the solution to the problem and meet it head-on. You cannot be weak in this situation, it is going to take some strong leadership.

Hon. Mr. Randall: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member would permit me to say that we have already taken that leadership he is talking about with the HOME programme. Let us look at the facts. We have assembled the land as fast as we can get it. We have passed condominium legislation to build multiple housing in urban areas where people want to live; they do not want to live outside the city proper; they have to live in multiple-family housing. Now, we have already arranged for the HOME programme; we have already arranged to build homes for less than $15,000; and they are now going up.

Mr. Chairman: I must point out to the Minister that that is not a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is a point of order because we are talking about "we must mobilize our efforts."

Mr. Trotter: The Chairman said it is not.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I must point out that we have also, in the last few weeks, arranged the mortgage money. Now, I do not know what more the government can do.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister is not on a point of order.

Mr. Pilkey: There is no question about the growth and we do have a critical problem now. The other day the hon. Minister, the Provincial Treasurer, made an interjection and I remember him saying the province is getting bigger, is getting fatter. I want to suggest to you, sir, that there are some who are getting bigger and fatter but there are others getting thinner and a lot leaner.

These are the people that we have to take care of—and I recognize that it is pretty nice for us to be in this Legislature and have a decent home. I suspect everyone in this whole Legislature has a decent home. It is not a question of providing something for us, it is a question of having some compassion and doing something for other people.

That is how we have to mobilize our thinking and mobilize our resources, to meet this problem. Not for ourselves. All of us are probably living in a rather comfortable environment or comfortable homes, but there are many people who are not. Until this government recognizes that there is a problem, there is no use of standing up and saying that we are doing this, and we are doing that, and we are on top of the job, and saying to the people of this province that we are doing a job, because, frankly, we are not. If we are not meeting it on the basis of the present programme, then let us try something else.

I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there should be a Minister of urban development, so he can devote his full time to this critical situation. And if we find a resolve, and we get on top of the situation, and you want to disband the ministry after that, fine, let us do it, but let us get someone on a full-time basis now. The Minister's job now is to provide employment through industrial expansion. In addition he has to resolve this problem. Let me say to him, sir, that both those jobs are jobs of magnitude. To try to handle both of these portfolios at the same time must be taxing him to a great extent.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister should be relieved of one of them. Either that or you take the trade part of it away and concentrate on the question of housing.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Take both of them away from him.

Mr. Pilkey: I want to conclude by saying that this deserves top priority with this government. It deserves top priority, so we can provide decent homes. Every once in a while you pick up the newspaper, not just in Toronto, but in other municipalities, and in my town, just a couple of weeks ago, you see big headlines—"Family of eight being evicted." The welfare department, the

mayor, or anybody else could not do anything about it that moment. Fortunately, somebody came along and found them a house. But we are going from crisis to crisis all the time. This is what we have to eliminate. We have to eliminate this whole area of operating from crisis to crisis in housing. As I said, it is just beyond my imagination what is happening in these larger cities. When you find a city like Oshawa faced with this problem, a town of 80,000, it must be appalling in these other larger municipalities.

So I want to suggest to the Minister that—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are all coming here from Saskatchewan and we have to find homes for them.

Mr. Pilkey: We have a lot from Nova Scotia, too.

But I want to suggest, as strongly as I can, to the Minister that we give this top priority and get on with the job that is necessary to find the solution to this question of housing.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this. I listened with much interest to what the hon. member said. I do not think anybody on this side of the House, certainly not the Minister, has any quarrel with the contribution he made to the House tonight.

But one thing puzzles me, Mr. Chairman. I am going to be very brief about this; the HOME programme has been explained to this Legislature time and time again. Now, I ask the hon. member for Oshawa, because I think he is quite sincere in the comments he just made, why is it—and I put some questions to the other side of the House now—from the very day that the HOME programme was announced in the Throne speech, it has been treated with very little but derision from the other side of the House?

An hon. member: Because it is inadequate.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Just let me take a moment on this. The hon. member for Oshawa quite properly explained the problem of low and low middle-income classes in acquiring homes for themselves. It is recognized, in Metro at least, that one of the great obstacles standing in the way of home ownership is the cost of land. There is no question about that. It seems to me that it was elementary to attempt to bring the cost of home ownership down to that income level to which the hon. member made appropriate reference, by taking out the cost of the land and making this a burden on the capital funds available to the province of Ontario. Providing him then with a house, a single-family dwelling if you wish, on a basis of a low down payment, a schedule of payments over a long amortization period that he had some hope of meeting, with the opportunity to acquire the land after five years at market value, and as his circumstances warranted, acquire the land so he could, in fact, then call himself a proprietor as far as home ownership was concerned. Why then—and I am directing my remarks principally to the hon. member for Oshawa—that from the very day a proposal was advanced from the Throne speech to help alleviate the very situation the hon. member for Oshawa has described, has it been met with nothing but derision from the Opposition benches? I ask the hon. members to ponder that question.

Mr. Trotter: Because it is completely inadequate.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How do you know?

Mr. Trotter: Everything is inadequate.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Absolutely, you are inadequate.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well you see, Mr. Chairman, here is what you get from one attempt—one attempt that has not failed—it has provided and is still providing a lot of single-family dwellings on a basis that the individual low income home owner can acquire. It is doing that. It is working better than you people will admit. Much better.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Did you provide what you promised?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It seems to me that just once in a while it would not hurt the Opposition members, if they are conscientious and they believe in what they are saying, to lend a little element of support to a sensible attempt to makes homes available to this income level group on a basis that may well be within their means. Goodness knows it is difficult enough. Everybody on this side is aware of it; you people have no monopoly on recognizing that this is a problem. But here is an honest attempt, one that is working, maybe not as fast as we would like it, but an honest attempt to do it. I think this is what the hon. member

for Oshawa had in mind. It seems to me that it would be a lot more effective to deal objectively with this very critical problem than the type of red-herring nonsense we have heard in the Legislature here tonight.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the Provincial Treasurer has quite sincerely thrown a challenge across here. I am going to accept it.

The Provincial Treasurer said that the government, through its HOME programme, has been trying to cope with this real problem; namely, the capital costs by making the land available on a rental basis rather than having to purchase it. What the Provincial Treasurer is in effect saying is that the grossly inflated land values and the capital required for them is being accepted by the public treasury so that we can make the houses available to the people.

I suggest to the Provincial Treasurer that the real answer is to get at the inflation of land costs. Do something about that instead of—

Mr. Trotter: They are doing nothing.

Mr. MacDonald: Do something about that instead of lamenting that rents are the real problem. When I asked a question of the Prime Minister two weeks ago, I quoted to him a letter that has been sent out by a well-known trust company in the city of Toronto. It invited people to invest in the land just northwest of the city because the Ontario waters resources commission had indicated it was going to invest—what was it, $85 million within the next few years? The trust company was, in effect, saying: Here is a good place to put your money. In other words, you are going to make a quick kill, there is no capital gains tax.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tie in what the Provincial Treasurer has raised in an earlier debate, because in the course of the earlier portion of this debate, we were not getting the exact facts on the record. I am going to quote and put it on the record. I want to make this explanatory statement in advance.

I am not so interested in the involvement of Keith Brown in the deal in Peterborough. What disturbs me with what happened in Peterborough was the escalation of land values in the period of three or four years from $85,000 to something over $500,000 that this government contemplated paying for the same land and backed out because—and I will use the Minister's relatively unprovocative term—of the political storm that broke. But I think, Mr. Chairman, it is well for us to take a look at exactly what happened. I am going to quote on to the record—it will take about five to ten minutes—but it should be there for others who want to read this record as well as the members of the House who may not be familiar with it.

I am quoting from the Scott Young column, which has never been denied in terms of its basic facts. It was found in the *Globe and Mail* on October 11, 1967:

> Mr. Brown said by telephone yesterday that he is somewhat distressed by the local publicity about the deal "because the Opposition parties here have grabbed on to it and are trying to make something out of it. Apart from that I know exactly about my part in the deal and my part is that I do not know and never have met the people who are trying to sell the land to the OHC now. I had nothing to do with it. If I had known what I know now, of course, I would have held on to it. I sold the land too cheap." He said that he first noticed the land in question in late 1964—"when it had been sitting there for 15 years open for anybody to buy. I went to a real estate firm here in Peterborough, Bowes and Cocks, and asked them if they thought I could get it for $75,000. They phoned me, I think the same day, and told me $85,000 was the price. So I went ahead—

I ask you, Mr. Chairman to note this:

> —I went ahead and put $10,000 down and took a mortgage for $75,000. In 1965 and 1966 I made two more $10,000 payments. Meanwhile, I had a couple of offers for it one at $325,000 and one at $350,000—but both these prospective buyers went to the city planner who ran the land down so they did not buy it. The first time somebody came along who would pay better than $200,000 and actually closed the deal, I sold. The somebody who came along was Harold R. Lenhardt, real estate consultant of Eglinton Avenue West. Mr. Lenhardt said yesterday that his position with New Orleans Investment was as general manager.

It is delightful, if I may interject, Mr. Chairman, just to see the magnificent game of land inflation, how casually it goes on.

> "I was up in Peterborough last year looking at another property as an apartment site," he said. "I was dealing through Bowes and Cocks and that deal did not go through, but Harold McGrath of Bowes

and Cocks, who had been working on it for me, told me about the property Keith Brown owned. I looked it over. The planning people there told me the area was about 1,800 apartments short of present need so it looked attractive. The land at that time, as now, was unserviced. But in the autumn of 1966 the Peterborough industrial development organization, which holds property for industrial development on the outskirts of the city, began to build a major sanitary trunk sewer to another industrial property. The sewer abutted part of the property held by Mr. Brown. When I heard about the sewer," Mr. Lenhardt said, "the whole game changed, the land was enhanced tremendously in value. Actually—

Mr. Pitman: By public money.

Mr. MacDonald: You are right. As my colleague interjects, by public money.

"Actually, at the price I paid for it I practically stole it." His negotiations with Mr. Brown were under way, lacking only the final details to close the deal, he said—

See how they line up to the right, Mr. Chairman?

—when a Toronto real estate salesman named Jim Sands came to him with a client interested in the Peterborough land. This was Percy Wright, a Toronto builder who in 1956 was placed in bankruptcy along with his firm, Winston Park Development Limited. "The fact was," Mr. Lenhardt said, "that at the time I was ready to close my deal with Keith Brown I had already agreed to resell to Percy Wright." That was early in 1967. Percy Wright does not appear in the records of Mr. Lenhardt's quick sale. On April 13, 1967, the first letter towards setting up a company called Trent Park Development Limited was received at the Provincial Secretary's office. On April 27, the deal was closed between New Orleans Investments Corporation, that is Mr. Lenhardt's firm, and Keith Brown at the price of $210,000.

Now let me interject here, Mr. Chairman. Keith Brown had put $30,000 in the property —$10,000 originally, and two payments of $10,000 in 1965 and 1966—on the land that he bought for $85,000 on a $10,000 mortgage, and subsequently paid two annual payments of $10,000 for a total of $30,000. He sold for $210,000.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is wrong with that?

Mr. MacDonald: He got $210,000, so admittedly part of it was in mortgages. Okay, let me proceed.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): His signature is on the mortgage.

Mr. MacDonald: $180,000 in three years! Well, part of it would be the mortgage, sure, but let us take a look at the value of the land as we go along. I pick up on the quotation:

On the same day,—

This is when Keith Brown sold to New Orleans Investment Corporation.

—eight days after Trent Park Development Limited received its letters patent, Trent Park bought the land from New Orleans Investment, for $360,799.

So in one day, the property went from $310,000 to $360,000 by a transaction to a new firm that had been incorporated by the Provincial Secretary eight days before.

In all these deals, remarkably little cash changed hands. Mr. Brown put down $10,000 originally and added $20,000 in subsequent payments, plus interest, leaving a mortgage of $55,000. New Orleans Investment paid Mr. Brown $10,000 down assuming the $55,000 mortgage and added a mortgage for $145,000 which Mr. Brown still holds. Trent Park Development paid $14,569 down assuming the two previous mortgages totalling $200,000 and added another mortgage of $146,230.

You see, this is a magnificent game of pyramiding mortgages so that in three years, the property has gone from $85,000 to $360,000.

The cheque used by Mr. Wright to close the deal, was from the law firm of Gordon Keyfetz, Hall, Baker and Goodman. Mr. Lenhardt had two things to add.

This is the delicious part, Mr. Chairman; this is the reason why I was pleading with the Minister to look into some of what goes on here.

Mr. Lenhardt had two things to add: "First, I think that if OHC is getting it for $500,000—

Another $140,000 pyramided presumably what OHC had offered, I do not know, I am only guessing, it would be interesting to have the Minister confirm it.

"I think that if OHC is getting it for $500,000 they are getting a real bargain, based on land transactions that have taken

place around Peterborough recently. Secondly, I recommended to Percy Wright that he might try to sell the land to OHC for housing."

Mr. Lenhardt of course, was in on the deal as he was the man who had bought it from Keith Brown.

However, at the Ontario housing corporation yesterday, both Mr. Suters, managing director, and T. E. H. Grady, his deputy, were away from the office and unavailable for comment. Another official, who declined to be quoted by name, said that he had checked with the men considering the Peterborough purchase. He said: "We are aware of the earlier transactions in the land, but the going rate for that kind of land, unserviced, but with services nearby, is a fair amount higher than the price we offered."

So here is an official for OHC saying it was all a good deal, as a matter of fact, "We offered much less than the going rate in the area." It was so good a deal that the Minister fled in terror from it when the political storm broke.

You see, Mr. Chairman, the thing just does not add up. It is indefensible. I repeat that the important thing to be investigated by this government is that a piece of property that was bought for $85,000, in two years was sold for $210,000. The same day it was sold for $360,000 and OHC offers $500,000. Now if you want to know the reason for the cost of land and the problem of housing there it is. Do not let the Provincial Treasurer get up and say: "We have been good fellows in our HOME programme because we are taking over this burden on the public treasury so that the people can buy homes."

That is missing the source of the problem, which is inflated land values. Instead of paying out $500,000 for a property that was available three years earlier for $85,000, get at that. Then you will not have to use public money to get homes for people in the middle income bracket, to say nothing of the lower income bracket.

I would like to see an investigation, but I repeat that I would like to see the investigation centred on the scandal – the outright scandal—of inflated land values which makes it possible for people to get new companies incorporated in the Provincial Treasury so that they can play games. In three years they get the value of land inflated from $85,000 to over $500,000. In one instance, they inflated it $150,000—from $210,000 to $360,000 in the same day.

Well, the Minister got up and pleaded with us to be considerate. I suggest that it is time for the Minister to be considerate of the proposition that I put to him, because this is the real problem. You want to quit playing games and tackle this housing problem and not say "Oh no" when other people debate it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Nobody is playing games around here. This situation has been belaboured out of every reasonable context here tonight, and I was really directing my remarks to the sensible observations of the member for Oshawa. While this specific situation on its own merits, may not look too good, generally speaking the fact that the government has undertaken to acquire raw land and service it, makes the property for housing much cheaper than it would otherwise have been. This has facilitated the HOME plan and put homes under this programme at least within the reach of people who could not even have contemplated the cost of a home before. I am sure that the hon. member for Oshawa will agree with me on this score, whether his leader does or not.

Mr. Pilkey: Could I make one observation of that point? Let me say that if it is a question of commendation you want for the HOME programme, I for one am prepared to give it to you because obviously it did provide something. But it has not met the need, and just has not done the job.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But it helped.

Mr. Pilkey: It may have helped, but it is becoming more critical. The point I am trying to make is that the HOME programme has not done the job and public housing is falling behind. I was talking to a Mrs. Middlemass the other day in Oshawa, and she said that sometimes it just breaks her heart to see people come to her for housing in our municipality. As I said, that is Oshawa. Can you imagine what it is like in Hamilton, Toronto, London—these larger municipalities? She says that we have nothing in terms of housing. Let us find out what the national economic council has said on this question of housing. I know it is applicable to the whole country, but I suspect very strongly that it profoundly refers to the province of Ontario. This is what they said:

Housing will have to grow faster than all other sectors of the economy to 1970, and perhaps even throughout the '70s. The volume of new housing in the 1961 to

> 1966 period was inadequate to meet Canada's needs. By 1966, a housing shortage was developing in many parts of the country.

That was in 1966, and now it has become more critical in 1968; so we knew about it then, but we still have not been able to resolve these problems.

> This led to low vacancy rates, increased rents, and even faster increases in housing prices, with adverse social consequences, and inhibiting effects on labour mobility. A major element on this situation was a shortage of mortgage funds at a time of high and rising family formation. Interest rates for home builders in 1966 reached the highest level in 40 years.

If it was the highest level in 1966, what have we got in 1968? It rose like a meteor. It was astronomical. I wish we could get back to the 1966 level. The other thing the economic council of Canada points out is that we need 190 new housing units per year, between 1966-1967 a total of 750,000 units in Canada. I want to suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, or to the Minister through you, that we are not meeting that, we are just not meeting it. In addition to that, look at the homes that are deteriorating. What are we doing about that situation? We cannot even keep up to the family formations with new homes, never mind looking after those that are deteriorating in the country.

Mr. Reilly: What is the government supposed to do about it?

Mr. Pilkey: What are you supposed to do about it? The point that I am trying to make—

Mr. Stokes: Make it possible for people to buy new ones.

Mr. Pilkey: The point I am trying to make is that we are not keeping up and yet we are compounding the crisis. This is what is happening. What we have to do is have an urban renewal programme as well. The question of just putting a HOME programme in effect and providing new homes is not enough—there have to be urban renewal programmes as well. As I said, private enterprise is not going to meet that requirement. This is the problem that we are faced with. I would like to see every member of this House go into some of these areas where abject poverty exists, to see the type of homes these people have to live in.

I would like every member to go to some of the pockets of poverty that exist in this province. I am sure that when we came back here, we would change our minds in terms of providing the proper environment and the proper housing, and the proper conditions for these families. It just needs a little compassion for this kind of a situation. We just cannot say that we are all right and let everybody else look after themselves. That is why we are elected to this Legislature.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): You look after yourself pretty well.

Mr. MacDonald: Listen to that smart crack.

Mr. Pilkey: That is why we are elected to this Legislature, and, yes, I am looking after a few other people fairly well too. We just happen to have a better income in this province—

Mr. W. Hodgson: You sure have.

Mr. Pilkey: —in our city and I just hope that I made some contribution towards it. But all I am suggesting to you is that this needs some compassion too. We have to be working in this area as we have never worked before to find a solution. I recall back in the '30s—and I was just a kid at the time—I know what it is to live in these kind of hovels, I happened to live in them.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): Come on now. You are not alone.

Mr. Pilkey: You are right, I am not the only one, but surely we moved from those days, surely we have made some progress in the last 35 or 40 years so that we ought to—in this era of affluence—wipe out these pockets of poverty, and try to provide housing. We have not been able to provide the income so that they have a decent standard of living, either. Surely we can house these people properly. As I said, it needs some will, it needs some determination, and it needs some strong leadership. I want to suggest to the Minister that as you tackle this job you will be criticized, but that should not deter you from forging ahead. It would not be a deterrent from forging ahead. People could be as critical as they want as long as I knew in my own heart and my own mind that I was doing a proper job for the people that needed it. This is what has to be done and if you have to step on a few toes of a few people in this province—then step on them, and let us go forward from there, let us get on with the job.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I was very disturbed by the intervention of the Provincial Treasurer for a number of reasons. First, because he is the Provincial Treasurer and he orders the financial affairs of this province. Second, because he speaks for the majority party that at any moment of time can command 69 votes again 48 in order to have his views prevail. Third, because what he had to say really confuses the search for truth and justice in this thing.

Anyone who is reasonably alert to what is going on in this province cannot fail to notice that the hungry fingers of suburbia—the great metropolitan area that we are creating from Niagara Falls to Barrie, to Oshawa on the east—are stretching in very demanding fashion out into what we call suburbia and ex urbia.

Agricultural land is going out of production. That land is being used to meet urban demands, and its price is becoming inflated. So we put aside the original farmer, like my friend from Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt), because almost invariably he who tilled the land in agriculture gets very little of the proportion of its inflated value.

Almost invariably, middle men come along, as in this example in Peterborough and they reap the great harvest of that inflated value. Now the central thing upon which one should focus in trying to see the truth of this—and which must never become obscured—is that the increased value in land is socially created. There is nothing that any person can possibly do in respect of the land to contribute more than a modicum of its enhanced value.

Society creates that value, creates it in two ways. One is the pressure of the expanding urban population which is a passive form of exertion on the value of the land. Secondly, and even more important from our point of view as legislators, the other great contribution to the enhanced value of land is the provision of public services at public expense. The water resources commission, Ontario Hydro, and The Department of Highways are the three major contributors to the increased value of land from the public purse.

So, accordingly, as the metropolitan area pushes out and inflates the value of that land, you arrive at this position. We have the development in our society of an entrepreneurial elite who control that land, its ownership and its use. What they, in effect, are saying to us is this: If you come to use it for social purposes, then you are going to do it only at the price that we put on it. You must pay our price or else it will not be available to you for the social utilitarian purpose for which you wish to develop it.

Looked at in the abstract as a proposition at that point, without saying more, the reasonable human being is entitled to look at the position of those people and say to them: "Now, in justice, are you entitled to say to the rest of society, you have to stand still and wait for our agreement on the price?"

Any way you look at that proposition the answer has got to be in the negative because what you are doing then is creating a landed elite to whom you are, in effect, giving over not only a great contribution of wealth, but allowing that landed elite to say to society: "This is the way your social forms are going to develop." Well, in effect, you have created another Legislature—a Legislature that is far more omnipotent than this one that sits here.

What is so bad to me in my analytical search for the truth of the thing about the Provincial Treasurer's intervention is this. In the face of rising demands on government incomes, this very year he came in here and said, "We have to raise the taxes in areas A, B, C and D," and they were all regressive taxes. They were all imposed on those least able to pay.

I said this to him last night—he was here—and I made the proposition last night, so I repeat it again tonight. Mr. Chairman, is it not justice for the Provincial Treasurer to say to those who are deriving an unearned benefit, "You are going to contribute a portion of that unearned sum back to society"? As a matter of simple justice, who wants to quarrel with that proposition?

Mr. Stokes: Their answer is all the more power to them.

Mr. Sopha: Now to buttress my argument, if it needs it, if that argument needs to be supported, then I say this: Down at Ottawa, we have the Carter report, which laid down as a fundamental proposition that a dollar is a dollar from whatever source it is derived. This applies whether its source is capital or whether its source is income.

A dollar is a dollar and should be subject to the same measure of taxation. When that report was revealed—I do not think I exaggerate, Mr. Chairman—across the whole of this country there was a reaction of encouragement that finally those who were benefitting from uneconomic rent or unearned socially created value, which is all the same thing, would plough back into society a fair proportion of it.

It is to be hoped—I do not go into that—it is to be hoped that that principle will become a reality.

You have the Provincial Treasurer getting up here, and if we remain silent, then we are likely to be accused of not being able to rebut the proposition he made. But he is the same man who refused to go to these entrepreneurs in land, and say to them, "Well in the short space of time you owned a piece of land, you could not possibly have created very much towards its enhanced value. Therefore, I, as the Provincial Treasurer, acting on behalf of society, come to you and insist that you pay a reasonable part of that into the public purse, back to the society which, in the final result, created the value."

Now I wish he had not departed the House until I made those propositions. I dare say I am no economist, I bow to the judgment of others and the learning of others. But to the Minister of Trade and Development responsible for housing I say that if the Provincial Treasurer approached the entrepreneurs in land from that point of view, and levied the proper tax on them, then the value of land would go down.

That would have a stimulating effect to reduce its value, because the attraction of the large capital gain would be largely removed. There would not be the magnet of inflating the price in the way this land in Peterborough was inflated in a short space of time. In other words, to put it another way—not that I think that anybody here is obtuse in that regard—but, if they inflate the value of land unrealistically, then at least for part of that inflated price, they are working for the government. They are working for society, because society is then going to reap a goodly proportion of that enhanced price.

That philosophy, of course, which is the stimulus for the Provincial Treasurer's interjection, has never developed in any recognizable form in the Treasury board of this province. It has never infiltrated The Department of the Treasury and the civil servants over there.

We have not seen a move toward the obtaining of social tax justice. Indeed, not having the Provincial Treasurer here, the only solace one can have, is that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is here – an important member of the Treasury board—and to say to him, that it is with pessimism that one must recognize that the philosophy of taxing capital gains never occurred to this Smith committee.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is not correct.

Mr. Sopha: Oh yes, that is correct.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is not correct, they discussed it in the report at some length.

Mr. Sopha: He dismissed it. They dismissed it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Get back to housing.

Mr. Sopha: It was not attractive to them.

Mr. MacDonald: Will the federal Liberals implement a capital gains tax?

Mr. Sopha: Some government will.

Mr. Chairman: Votes 407, 408, 409 and 410.

Mr. Sopha: I must conclude my remarks with a feeling of discouragement about it. Now we have heard the interjection of the man who, presumably, for the next three or four years, is going to guide the financial affairs of this province—the interjection of the Minister of Municipal Affairs—and the reliance of the government upon the Smith report. We've heard the studies they are making of it, the briefs they are inviting of it, the select committee they formed in order to evaluate it, and I am prepared to say—and I will take the responsibility; I will suffer all the scorn that comes to me—by and large, weighing the whole thing, with all respect to Lancelot Smith, that estimable citizen of London, that when they got finished, and after the Premier had written to them to finish the report—it is not worth the paper that it is written on.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): It is a second-hand repair job.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, my friend from Huron-Bruce says a "second-hand repair job," but here, of course, sir, the Minister in charge of housing and the Provincial Treasurer, launch themselves into the debate, and in order to distribute the blame for not building the number of houses required to meet the needs of our people, they point to the high capital value of land.

Well, if they are going to rely upon that to excuse themselves, then we have an obligation over here, as Her Majesty's Loyal

Opposition, to get up and state the position that we take in respect of that inhibition. If it truly is a block toward the building of houses, then I say to the Provincial Treasurer, in his absence, here is what we would do. I said this the other day, in the House, and my leader I can tell you found no objection to it, that if we are going to have a capital gains tax in this country, the place we start is with the socially created value in land.

Mr. MacDonald: Which leader, Mr. Trudeau?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Will the hon. member allow me to ask a question.

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am certainly interested in his proposal. I would like to know this. Would he increase the value for taxation purposes of all land? His lot on which his house in the city of Sudbury is located, which has gone up perhaps four or five times in the last ten or 12 years? Would he tax my lot, under my home, and the lot under the homes of people which all have increased four or five times in value, or will he tax only vacant land? And would he tax the land under industrial buildings?

Mr. MacDonald: The technicalities have been met in other countries.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Ah, well let the hon. member tell me, because with every home owner today, the thing that crosses my mind is paying taxes, and this government is trying to provide some exemption for it. I do not know how he is going to bear any further burden. It does not seem to me that one can segregate only the vacant land that has accrued a capital gain, when every lot under every home, in almost every town and city and hamlet in this province—and I know my own situation, the lot on which my house is situated—has increased many times in value.

Mr. MacDonald: So in face of the difficulty you sit back and do nothing.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am interested, but I would like to know how you—

Mr. MacDonald: It is irrelevant to these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Let the hon. member please get my question. I am interested to know how you segregate that capital gain which is there and real from homes and other types of real property ownership.

Mr. J. Renwick: The same way they do it in other countries.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will be interested to hear this. It seems to me there is a problem here and I would like to know the answer.

Mr. Sopha: That is a very germane question and I would only remind the Attorney General, from the outset of my remarks at this stage, that I was really talking to my friend in the back row there, the member for York East (Mr. Meen), who was paying so close attention. He will bear me out that I referred to the socially created value in land economic rent in the sense defined by Spencer — I hope I am right — and later by Henry George: economic rent—socially created value. And I say to the Attorney General that when I speak of capital gains in that context, I am speaking about undeveloped land. Not entirely undeveloped, because Ontario water resources commission has come along and laid mains and the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme), ingratiating fellow that he is, that nice chap from Lanark, has built highways.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Surely we are straying a long way from the estimates of this particular department.

Mr. Sopha: Well, the Provincial Treasurer was—

Mr. Chairman: We are away off the estimates, can we please get back to votes 407, 408, 409 and 419? The member—

Mr. Sopha: I am not surrendering the floor.

Mr. Chairman: Well, the member resumed his seat.

Mr. Sopha: Because you were speaking.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: I have a couple more things to add because I want the record to stand complete about this.

The Provincial Treasurer started this and the matter has to be finished. We cannot walk away from our responsibility. Houses are not being built because land has a high value. I want to add to what I said earlier, that in respect of the difficulties the Attorney General mentioned—and he has given this a lot of thought—of segregating who should pay and who should not pay this capital gains tax, one would have hoped that that much her-

alded, highly regarded report on taxation that this government ordered and has got, that it should have examined those things in greater detail.

But when I read it—and I ask how many, if they were to hold up their hands—how many have read all three volumes of the Smith report? It would be embarrassing. But when I read it because of my particular interest in this as it relates to housing, I walked away from it with a feeling of disillusionment, that they had not really struggled to bare the problem and point the way to a solution.

We are going to have a capital gains tax, we have to have, because that government over there, the Treasury board, which for the moment is a terrible weak body—I have just reviewed its membership and it is terribly weak, the personnel—it is going to need more money and it is going to get it through new forms of taxation, and one of the likely sources that it is going to get it from is from a capital gains tax. And that is all right with me.

Mr. D. M. Deacon: (York Centre): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sopha: That is all I want to say. Go ahead, you have the floor.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the Treasurer said a little while ago that at least the government was trying to do something. My fear had been and still is that unless they really take hold of this problem as a whole and realize that we must provide not for 40,000 or 50,000, the current demand for housing, but we must provide for, say, 100,000 lots in this province, we are not going to solve the problem. To do that we have to create what my colleague, the hon. member for Sudbury, has said, socially created values.

We have to provide revenue to support the cost of these socially created amenities, including the services of roads, highways, sewers, water, schools, education and these various things. One way of doing this, and I suggest the government—and the Treasury board members in particular take a very good look at it—is taking advantage of the recent legislation that the Minister of Municipal Affairs had approved, whereby he does have power over local bylaws.

When they select an area which would be suitable for satellite city developments and they decide to provide the services of the various types I have mentioned to service that area, and thus create a value that the Minister of Trade and Development mentioned concerns him that enables them to shove the prices up, that property that is so serviced should be zoned residential instead of agricultural. The value of the land would therefore be greatly increased for assessment purposes, and the tax revenue from that could be greatly increased.

The approach of the municipality is not critical although I think most municipalities —if the province really wishes to work with them—will co-operate as long as they can see that the development which the province is encouraging to take place will not cause a severe hardship on this existing residents.

If we want to put these lots on the market, and in effect force their sale, when the services are available so that we do not have people hold us up for high prices, we could zone the land and assess it at a high level. The taxes on it would certainly not only add to our revenues and help support the services we are putting in, but also force these people to pay their share, or a good share, of the value increase that the province has put on their land.

I would hope that the government would take a very good look at this method of creating a substantial excess of serviced land and helping to pay for it and putting the burden where it belongs, that is, on the people who are gaining from that socially created value.

Mr. Pilkey: I just want to ask a question. It has some importance, on the question of public housing where an individual is participating in a strike. Under your present rules, as I understand them, he has to continue to pay his rent even though he is on strike and this rent in public housing is wage related or salary related.

During the strike period—and some of them could be rather lengthy, five or six months is not unknown for a person in public housing to be on strike during that period —they have to continue to pay it on a wage or salary related basis even though their salary has been curtailed considerably.

I recognize they know what they are doing and they are prepared to make that sacrifice in anticipation that they are going to enhance their economic and future well-being. The question I want to ask is, once they participate in this kind of struggle and they make a gain because of the struggle that they participated in and the sacrifices they made during

that period, then the housing corporation catches them again on the increases that they get in their wages.

In other words, they are getting them both ways, they are catching them during a period of reduced income and because they make this kind of struggle they catch them again after they make some kind of a victory in terms of increasing their economic standard of living. I raise that point because it seems to me that it really is not fair that you are able to get it coming both ways.

Hon. Mr. Randall: This matter has been brought up before. The situation, as we have handled it in the past, is this: If a man is on strike, he is on strike of his own volition. He has an obligation to his landlord, whether it is Ontario housing corporation or a private owner, the same as he has with the butcher, the baker and the candlestick maker.

What we generally do—I do not know of anybody we have evicted who has been on strike—is make a deal with the man through the housing authority that when he does get back to work he catches up with his payments. But there is no reduction for the money he loses while on strike. I agree with you, when he goes back and his income is up, the geared-to-rent-income-ratio comes into effect.

This is the one we talked about this week where we hope that we could work out a solution whereby when he gets to the market rent, we can charge him five per cent below market until he can get out and get private accommodations.

Mr. Pilkey: Mr. Chairman, the only point I want to make there then, is that I have no objection with him of paying his rent during the strike period. But, as I say, you are catching him the other way as well. If it was a private owner I would not think that he would raise his rent because the fellow made a gain. He would probably go back at the same level of rent when he went out on strike.

Maybe because of economic factors and increased cost of living or inflation—whatever you want to call it—going up, the landlord would increase the rent because of taxes, municipal tax, and so on. But the criteria that would be used to determine the raising of his rent would not be determined on what he won at the bargaining table. In your situation it is determined on what he has won and he has made the struggle for it. I think, on the basis of fairness, that the Minister and the housing authority ought to look at this kind of a situation.

Mr. Chairman: Votes 407, 408, 409 and 410?

The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell the House when Ontario housing corporation will begin the publication of annual reports? I understand that no annual reports have been issued by the corporation as yet, since its creation and I would like to suggest to the Minister that they would be extremely valuable documents in helping members prepare for the estimates of this department. Could the Minister say when annual reports can be expected?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We expect to be able to table last year's report—the 1967 report—within the next month. I hope to have the '66 report within the next week or ten days.

Mr. Peacock: Is it not a statutory requirement, Mr. Chairman, that these reports be tabled?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, it is a statutory requirement when the reports are audited by the auditor—and they are in the process of being audited by the auditor. As soon as they are audited, we can table them.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister, on a different point, if the recommendations of Ontario housing corporation for the construction of family units in Windsor have yet been fulfilled? I refer to the recommendations made in June of 1966 for the construction of 350 family units in each of 1966 and 1967. An additional 50 were recommended in the report of the housing corporation of the city of Windsor released in October 1967. A revision of that recommendation which I believe was delivered in January or February of this year, called for a further 268 units, totalling 1,018.

Now perhaps the revision of 268, Mr. Chairman, includes the 50 recommended in October 1967. If it does, then the total would be 968 units. From what I can gather from the statistics published in the magazine *Ontario Housing*, only 44 units were started in 1966 and 1967. At this point there is a proposal again being issued by the corporation for 267 units, for a total of 607 starts undertaken and proposed, contrasted with a total recommendation of either 1,018 or 968.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I did not get all your facts and figures, but perhaps this will answer your question.

In the city of Windsor, since the incep-

tion of OHC, Windsor council have requested a provision of 782 family and 628 senior citizens units. To date, 462 family units have been provided and are occupied. In addition, 228 senior citizens units have been provided and are also occupied. When added to the 765 units developed under the federal-provincial partnership arrangement, a total of 1,455 units have been provided.

A proposal calling for 270 family units closed on September 25, 1967, and a proposal for 256 units by Essex cabinet makers has not been proceeded with as the city was not prepared to accept liability for the sharing of the cost of the required storehouses for the site, even though this corporation was prepared—and still is—to contribute 50 per cent and is willing to finance the city's 50 per cent share.

A further proposal calling for 64 family and 400 senior citizens units closed on May 15, 1968. This produced four proposal calls for senior citizens units, but not one submission for family accommodation. Financial submissions for 408 senior citizens units are now being prepared for approval and it is anticipated that contracts will be let for these units by the end of August 1968.

In order to meet the unsatisfied requirements of 320 family units, OHC will be issuing a proposal call shortly for the construction of 100 units on land owned by the federal-provincial partnership and the Fontainbleu subdivision and the balance of 220 units on land under control of prospective developers.

I might add that Windsor has the highest per capita public housing programme in Canada.

Mr. Peacock: Mr. Chairman, that does not quite answer the question. I did not ask the Minister how many units had been constructed or started since inception of Ontario housing corporation's programme in Windsor. But I did ask him whether the recommendations of the corporation for the construction of 350 family units in each of 1966 and 1967 had been fulfilled; whether the recommendations in October for a further 50 or the revised figure that may have taken its place. The 270, the Minister says, have been at least started or proposals issued for them.

Now I might explain to the Minister, when the October survey was presented to the city council in Windsor, the representatives of Ontario housing corporation were unable to say whether the 700 units recommended to be started in '67 and '66 had actually been started, and what the balance was that remained to be undertaken.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I understand that the units you are talking about have been started and all commitments asked for by the city of Windsor are either underway or have been completed. And 320 are going out to proposal call now. Another 320.

Mr. Peacock: Family units?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, family units.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I have one brief question for the Minister.

Would he be in a position to say when the deal that is to be negotiated with the township of Long Lac—they made an application for a certain number of dwellings—

Hon. Mr. Randall: I understand we have issued a proposal call for six units and we are negotiating with the builder to increase it to 12. So proposal call has been issued.

Mr. Stokes: Have you any idea when they might be started?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I understand it will be started this year. As soon as we get the proposal back from the builder, they will be starting this year.

Mrs. M. Renwick (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he would comment on how it was possible to operate the Green Meadows development in Guelph, Ontario, with a rent of $65 a month for the two-bedroom houses up until April, 1967? Was it subsidized at that time, or did the project, in fact, carry itself financially? Because it is not a new project—it is 12 to 15 years old, Mr. Chairman. What was the justification of switching over a rent-geared-to-income basis?

It is my understanding that these houses were built at least 12 years ago. I would like the Minister to correct me if I do not have the right information.

Hon. Mr. Randall: This was a full recovery unit. I think as you mentioned, this was converted over to a rent-geared-to-income. In some cases, rents went up and in other cases they were lowered.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have a lot of questions that the delegation from Green Meadows went away with either—

Hon. Mr. Randall: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The delegation perhaps could

meet with us. Could they not meet with us and we will answer all their questions direct? Do you not think that would be better for them, to be at the meeting?

Mrs. M. Renwick: Well, most of these questions, Mr. Chairman, also refer to questions that I would like to ask. I will continue if you wish, Mr. Chairman, or if you wish to adjourn.

Mr. Chairman: Proceed.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Would the Minister correct me if the rents in Green Meadows did not, in fact, increase up to as high as $195.60 a month?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not have those things here. I would have to make a note of it.

Mrs. M. Renwick: On the rent-geared-to-income, what is the philosophy, or the basic make-up of the schedule?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not have this here. I will get it for you.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister how he justifies the delay in offering the sale of houses that are held out to tenants for as long as 10 to 12 months at a time, in this particular case in Green Meadows which we see reflected again in other areas. The tenants stayed on for a long time at the high rent increases in the hope of purchasing the homes, and I would like to ask if the monthly payments that have been received in the past months will apply retroactively to the purchase price when these homes are available for tenants?

Hon. Mr. Randall: In answer to your last question, we are still waiting to hear from CMHC and we have in the meantime frozen the rents as is.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, what bothers a member like myself trying to handle some of these queries is the real philosophy that is evolving in the corporation. I asked the Minister to comment on whether he feels that this is a true basis, to have a percentage of rents which does not take into consideration the true income of the family in relation to how many children are in the family. Large families. If you take just the social planning council minimal requirements for food along with the rent from the income of the wage earner of the family, it leaves relatively little. I wonder if the Minister has taken any time in the surveys to realistically assess the problem, looking at it from the wage earner's point of view? What prompts me to ask this is a letter dated October 24, 1967, from the Minister's department signed by H. R. Mason, executive assistant, in which he says that the shortage of housing is primarily confined to the middle income family.

Now, are there statistics or surveys in the Minister's department which prove this? I think that the Assembly should know about it and if this is not true and we have brought evidence in the last few days that it is not, does the Minister propose to reassess a percentage of rent according to the actual income, budget and the size of the family?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I have already stated in this House that we are reviewing all the rent scales.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Could I ask if there is some sort of research available to us that in fact prompted Mr. Mason to state that the shortage of housing is confined primarily to middle income families? Also could I ask, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would define middle income?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think that I mentioned that middle income, I assume, would be $5,000 to $9,000. These are the people whom we have been talking about the last couple of days. Below that they come in for public housing applications, and as you know there is no category on the public housing applications as far as the income is concerned, but my view is that the middle income people are in the $5,000 to $9,000 area.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Could I ask if there is a board, or some place where a tenant who has a problem and who has been referred to OHC once and received no action, might take his problem?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think that if they would write direct to the chairman of the OHC or myself, I would be very glad to take this under consideration.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I wonder if the Minister would comment then on a specific case? The income of the family dropped considerably for a two-month period and during this time they were still required to pay $142 a month rent. Would there not be a simple way that a TD1 slip could assure someone in OHC that when a man's income has dropped, he cannot pay that much rent that month? I would like to know how this is handled in

the department? This pops up quite frequently, I find.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We do not find it happening very frequently. I would suggest that if the client that you are talking about would let us know when his income dropped, if he has not been reimbursed he will be. If we know about it, they are immediately reimbursed the following month.

Mrs. M. Renwick: There is a system where they are reimbursed the following month?

Hon. Mr. Randall: There is.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Could I ask the Minister to outline it? Having read this particular letter, it would seem that there was correspondence to the housing authority in which they simply kept asking for the month's rent.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The procedure is simply that if a tenant reports that he has had a drop in income, it is immediately reflected in the next month's rent.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, in the Green Meadows development, where should the tenant have referred this change in income?

Hon. Mr. Randall: To the housing authority, but if they have been in touch with OHC, we will follow it through.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Could I ask then if they have on file something that was not followed through from the Krusky family?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know, but if you will give me the name and address I will check it out for you.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): I thought that the philosophy was not to disclose the names of these people.

Mr. MacDonald: What has that got to do with it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The other day you were critical of the disclosure of names.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I do not really care to address interjections, but I think that it is very important to say that I used a letter instead of the name in a case last evening in which the Minister blatantly referred to the family by name, although he too is supposed to be a protector of their privacy.

Could I ask what allowance is made to tenants who in fact are renting or buying their oil or gas burners?

Hon. Mr. Randall: If they had a heating system in there when they moved in, which I am sure that they did, and they decide to put in a heating system of their own, they would pay for their own burner installation. It would be their own property.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I wonder then if the Minister would outline the $21 allowance that he has referred to with the Green Meadows tenants?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I am not sure what the $21 figure is that you are talking about. Will you give me more information and I will see if I can answer your question.

Mrs. M. Renwick: It is the $21 figure that was taken from the ceiling of $561 income to prove that there was, in fact, no tenant that paid 30 per cent. I understood that this was some sort of individual home help allowance for some reason. The rest of the tenants would like to know why they do not get the same allowance.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is my understanding that for some service accommodation there is an allowance; a deductible from rent service scale for services. So it means applying their own services, then the $21 is a rebate.

Mrs. M. Renwick: When representatives from Toronto came to Green Meadows for the yearly inspection, along with the Guelph housing authority manager, they claimed to have licensed electricians to do repairs and installations. The tenants say that they have now learned that these are not licensed workmen doing the repair work. I wonder if the Minister would comment? Is this the mistake of the department or the area manager?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The people are hired by the housing authority in the area, and that is a matter which they could take up with them. If they would like us to follow through, we would be glad to.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, we spoke of the importance of having on the property, a person who has the authority to renovate or order repairs that need to be attended to. Is it required by the tenants to present this need in writing?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not follow your questioning. If you would give me a little more explanation perhaps I could get the information for you.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, in the specific area of Green Meadows, if there were repairs done, should this be done by telephoning or by writing specifically that these repairs are necessary? Or is a telephone call sufficient?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, I think they would take it up with the housing authority and get their permission.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, another question that these people would like answered. They said that yesterday the Minister said that if they do not get an active response from their housing authority manager, they should appeal to Mr. Whaley himself, and yet it stated that at a meeting on April 23, when tenants from Green Meadows wished to present individual grievances across the table, this was refused. What they would like to know, Mr. Chairman, is why.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I do not know why they would be refused. I have already offered tonight myself to meet with the tenants that you are referring to. We would be glad to meet with any of the tenant groups that want to come in. I do not know why they would be refused. It is not the policy of the housing corporation to refuse an interview with tenants.

Mrs. M. Renwick: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would comment on the fact that unit 12 on Vancouver Street, unit 7 on Edmonton, and unit 34 on Mohawk, in Green Meadows development has been empty for some time—certainly since the month of May.

Hon. Mr. Randall: They are rented by the housing authority and not by OHC. I will take note of it and get the information for you.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Since Green Meadows tenants have been informed that those eligible could purchase their homes, how many have been sold to date?

Hon. Mr. Randall: We have not sold any to date, they are still being estimated on and approvals from CMHC are still awaited.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, will they be assessed individually? I understand that there are only about 20 people who can buy homes out of this group, but they would like to know if there is going to be some delay for individual assessment of the homes.

Hon. Mr. Randall: As we said this week, they will be appraised on the basis of their market value and all will be treated very fairly.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to draw to the attention of the Minister, the serious need of considering the family budget according to the size of the family, when he is considering rent according to their ability to pay. I am thinking of a specific family in this development which now has notice to vacate. The income of the father has been in the $500 to $600 a month bracket. The rent is $175 a month. You take away the weekly rent from the weekly pay cheque—that leaves the family approximately $80 to $90 a week to operate on. There are 10 children in the family, Mr. Chairman, and if you take the social planning council's budget for minimal food allowance, it comes to $70 a week. Now it is not much wonder—with weekly expenses such as the fact that this is a man who works on the road and has $12 a week meal expenses; they heat their own home, water and hydro, $5 a week; oil $5; baker, $2.55; gas for car, $8; rent $40.81; and if you add the proper food budget to that—it is quite clear that the rent is far too high. The total food budget being $70 a week, and that is not allowing food for the father, Mr. Chairman—that is allowing for $2.50 a week for the father for breakfasts, presuming the $12.00 a week buys, I hope, two meals outside.

I cannot express strongly enough, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister will only come to grips with the problem the people are bringing to us and we are bringing to him, by realistically assessing the problems of the tenants. I would suggest that a budget be struck from the social planning council minimal food allowance for a family.

It starts off in this family from as low as $4 a week for the younger children. It only goes as high as $6 and $7 a week for the teen age children; $6 a week for the mother. No matter how you cut this particular suit to fit the cloth, it just does not fit as long as the family is paying $40.81 a week, or $175 a month out of total income.

So I just hope that a small item like that might impress upon the Minister that the size of the family has a great deal to do with whether they can, in fact, meet the requirements. Could I ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if the rent-geared-to-income requirements are standardized now throughout the province?

Hon. Mr. Randall: They are standard across Canada.

Mrs. M. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister saw the delegation from Guelph on April 23, I believe it was, he gave them a figure which they could buy a home for per month of principle and interest and taxes. Is this a definite amount, or is it a minimum, a maximum, an average? Is this exactly what they will be required to pay?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I think we pointed out that they were averages and if we established the prices that we were talking about that day, this is what they would have to meet insofar as their monthly payments were concerned.

Mrs. M. Renwick: And the rent freeze, Mr. Chairman—is that province-wide? In the particular case of Green Meadows is there a way that the rental freeze can be changed according to income?

Hon. Mr. Randall: The freeze is on a provincial basis as far as we are concerned. All the municipalities are treated the same.

Mr. Chairman: Does the member have any further questions?

Votes 408 to 410, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Trade and Development.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.25 of the clock, p.m.

ERRATA

Wednesday, June 5, 1968

Page	*Column*	*Line*	*Correction*
3990	2	24 and 39	Remarks beginning at the points indicated on both of these pages, attributed to Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River), were made by Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East).
3991	1	1, 7 and 29	

No. 125



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Presenting report, Mr. Welch 4687

Seizure of bail in the Meyer Rush case, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Sargent 4688

Dr. F. Cruickshank, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Shulman 4688

Careless driving charges in the Gary Godfrey case, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Shulman 4688

Transfers of certain prisoners in the North Bay jail, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman 4689

McIsaac Mining and Tunnelling Company Limited, question to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Martel 4690

Interfering with an accident site before an investigation, questions to Mr. A. F. Lawrence, Mr. Martel 4690

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Brunelle 4691

Recess, 6 o'clock 4726

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests today in the east gallery are students from Our Lady of Grace separate school in Ridgeway; in the west gallery, from Central public school, Brampton and St. Michael's school choir, Toronto. In both galleries, we have students from the Dalewood senior public school in St. Catharines.

Later today there will be students here from Central public school, Guelph, and Bradford public school at Bradford.

We welcome these young people this afternoon.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the report of The Department of Social and Family Services for the fiscal year 1966-1967.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts moves that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it stand adjourned until Wednesday next, June 26, at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): I rise, sir, on a point of order, as mentioned on page 270 of the 16th edition of May, where it says:

> A member has sometimes been allowed as a matter of personal explanation to point out at a subsequent sitting an error in the report of his speech in the official reports and debates.

During committee last night, sir, an issue arose relating to the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Brown). At that time I said that the leader of the NDP should have had the courage to insist that this member and the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis), put their grievous situation to the committee on privileges and elections.

The part that was omitted from *Hansard* today, sir, and which I would like to have corrected, is this: The leader of the NDP said that it was up to the government to do this. My remark—and this is essential—was that in previous episodes of this kind the members affected have themselves moved the resolution that their case be heard by this committee of the Legislature and I think, sir, I would like that included in the *Hansard* today.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member for London South, as usual, is in error. The last time that I happened to be involved in this kind of an episode, the government saw fit to move the motion themselves and take it to the committee on elections and privileges. It was they who moved the motion, not the people involved.

Mr. White: That is completely incorrect.

Mr. MacDonald: I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is just another calculated effort on the part of the member for London South to breach a ruling which you have made and to insist in his mischievous fashion in continuing to bring this matter before the House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that you acted on this.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): What case is the member talking about?

Mr. MacDonald: I am talking about the Scarborough bill regarding oversize water mains.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Grey-Bruce has the floor and he has questions left over from June 12, as well as some today.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): A question to the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. Who is pushing the seizure of the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Grey-Bruce has the floor and I would ask that he be given the courtesy of silence.

Mr. Sargent: You need to teach that man some courtesy over there.

Who is pushing the seizure of $40,000 bail in the case of Meyer Rush? And where the innocent relatives stand to lose their life savings, why cannot the courts take a more lenient stand? In other words, what is the rush on Meyer Rush?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The member is killing us.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): The counsel in my department, The Department of the Attorney General, are the persons who have made application for forfeiture of the bail. When people go surety on a bail bond, they understand, I am sure, that the bail is posted to ensure the return of the person who is charged before the court. All that person has to do is return to the court and the bail obligation is ended. So the matter is in Mr. Rush's own hands. He can easily remove any obligation to his relatives, by returning to the court.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker could I ask a supplementary on this? When the matter of time is involved and there is some doubt as to the man's medical ability to return why are you after your pound of flesh?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am sure the matter of Mr. Rush's medical condition will be taken into account. The evidence that is before the court will be thoroughly reviewed before any sudden action is taken—you can rest assured of that.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the Attorney General explain how legal aid is working when the wrong man can be sentenced to four years in jail, as reported in the *Globe and Mail* this morning? And further, how does the wrongly sentenced citizen who serves time in prison get compensation from the courts? Is there a financial repayment available?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of this and I will take the question as notice. I am not even sure that legal aid was involved in this matter at all, but I shall take the question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The member has further question of the Attorney General from June 12. Did the member ask the one that he placed on June 7 to the Provincial Secretary?

Mr. Sargent: Yes sir, I do not have that, but it has passed now. I will withdraw these questions, Mr. Speaker, they are not timely.

Mr. Speaker: Would you return them to me so that my file will be complete? The member for High Park has a question.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have two questions. First for the Attorney General: it had three parts, but the third part has now been answered so I will just give the first two parts.

On what date did Dr. F. Cruickshank retire as coroner, and what are Dr. Cruickshank's duties as a consultant and what salary does he receive?

Secondly, will the Minister order an investigation into reports in today's *Star*—this question was put in last Thursday—that a Dr. Cruickshank is representing himself as a coroner attached to the Metro coroner's office?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, Dr. Cruickshank retired, ceased to be a coroner, on February 8, 1968, on which date he attained the age of 70 years. That is the statutory age that he then cease. He was later appointed as a consultant in the office of the supervising coroner for Ontario. His term of office under that appointment continues until September 30, 1968. His salary is $15,000.

The answer to the second part of the question is no, there is certainly no need for an investigation into a newspaper report that does not even say that Dr. Cruickshank represented himself as a coroner.

To the third question—even though the hon. member indicated that he had received an answer to that question—the matter of the death of Roger Thornton has been looked into by the coroner and an inquest has been announced to be held on July 15.

Mr. Shulman: Is Dr. Cruickshank's an annual salary?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Shulman: I have a second question for the Attorney General, in two parts. Would the Minister agree that driving between 70 and 80 miles per hour in a 30-mile-an-hour zone constitutes careless driving? If so, would the Minister intervene in the case of Gary Godfrey against whom charges were dismissed by Magistrate W. R. Filson, Peterborough, on July 11, 1968, who

stated that driving at this speed was not careless?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the presiding magistrate had the opportunity to hear all the relevant evidence and observe the witnesses, and he came to the conclusion that the offence of careless driving had not been committed. We have discussed the matter with the Crown attorney who acted in the case, and we have no intention of intervening or taking further action.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Minister allow a supplementary question? Would the Minister agree with the statement of the magistrate as recorded in the Peterborough *Examiner* that driving between 70 and 80 miles an hour in a 30-mile-an-hour zone is not necessarily careless driving?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think that it is necessary for me to agree or disagree with the court. Decisions from time to time are appealed, which I think is evidence of agreement or disagreement. The courts, as a matter of fact, have held in many cases of excessive speed that in the circumstances which surrounded them—and in this charge, I understand the alleged offence took place at 4 o'clock in the morning on a highway where there was no other traffic—excessive speed was not necessarily careless driving.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Negligence does not necessarily exist in a vacuum.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Right.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have several questions for the Minister of Reform Institutions.

Will the Minister arrange a transfer of prisoner Lawrence H., number 101543, from North Bay to the Stratford jail so that his mother can visit him, to prevent the added suffering to the boy and his family produced by incarceration so far from his home?

Question 2: Will the Minister arrange a transfer of prisoner Tom S. from North Bay to a southern Ontario jail or reformatory so that his family can visit him, and to prevent the added suffering to the boy and his family produced by incarceration so far from his home?

Question 3: Will the Minister arrange a transfer of prisoner Richard P. from North Bay to a southern Ontario jail or reformatory so that his family can visit him, and to prevent the added suffering to the boy and his family produced by incarceration so far from his home?

Question 4: Will the Minister arrange a transfer of prisoner Edward R. from North Bay to a southern Ontario jail or reformatory so that his family can visit him and to prevent the added suffering to the boy and his family produced by incarceration so far from his home?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the department is at least as conscious as the hon. member of the value of visits to a person who is incarcerated. When a man is committed initially to our care, among many other factors, the factor of proximity of an institution to his family is considered by a classification committee which decides into which institution he should be placed.

Let us, sir, put this question into perspective. The four men mentioned by the hon. member had already had the benefit of this consideration. These men were transferred to the North Bay jail because they had been involved in a disturbance at the Guelph reformatory; in other words, the primary consideration in their transfer to this jail was the security of the reformatory and the protection of the public.

I am advised that out of the 33 prisoners transferred from Guelph reformatory to other institutions because of the disturbance, five have now been discharged at the completion of their sentence. On Friday, June 14, 1968, the classification board met and examined all the relevant details concerning the remaining 28 men, including the weekly reports on their conduct, which are received from the governors of the respective jails.

The four mentioned by the hon. member were included in this group. As a result of this classification meeting, some of the 28 men have been assigned to new institutions. Their immediate families will, of course, be notified when the transfers have taken place.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has not answered any one of my four questions respecting the four men whom I have inquired about.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Highways.

Would the Minister take steps to change the regulations with respect to signs on Highway 401 denoting villages at interchanges, and is the Minister aware that The Department of Municipal Affairs does not allow the formation of police villages?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has

another question. If he would care to read it I will take them both as notice, for I just left my office at Downsview at 2 o'clock.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, this is to the hon. Minister of Highways.

What steps is The Department of Highways taking to maintain Highway 3 in the town of Essex due to the heavy flow of truck traffic through the town? Since the present condition of the road is so rough, is the department considering a complete resurfacing of that part of the road?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Mines, I believe, has some answers to questions.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, you will remember that yesterday the hon. member for High Park relayed a question originally from the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) respecting the McIsaac Mining and Tunnelling Company Limited, and there was some confusion in our office respecting the last part of that question.

The question that did not reach me yesterday but which has, in the meantime was: "How long have they"—and that refers to the McIsaac Company—"been working this property"—and this property is the Maclennan mine at Bowlands Bay. I am now informed that the McIsaac Mining and Tunnelling Company Limited started shaft sinking at this property in 1965.

There was another question, Mr. Speaker, asked of me on June 4 last, by the member for Sudbury East. He is not in his place but I was wondering if it would be satisfactory if I replied now.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the member for Sudbury East said he would like the answers, if you would reply.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Right. To refresh the memory of the House, Mr. Speaker, the question was relating to the death of Raymond D. Thompson and it was question number 629, and I am quoting now from the question:

> Is the Minister aware that evidence presented at the inquest into the death of Raymond D. Thompson following an accident at the Copper Cliff plant, made it clear that the scene of the accident had been altered in spite of the instructions contained in The Department of Mines handbook, stating that except for the purpose of saving or relieving human suffering, no person may interfere with the scene of an accident until the investigation has been completed?

The second part of the question was:

> Does the Minister intend to have charges laid against International Nickel Company for interfering with the accident site at the Copper Cliff plant which resulted in the death of Raymond D. Thompson?

I indicated in answer to that, Mr. Speaker, that even before the question was asked, I had asked for the final report of the investigating engineer of The Department of Mines, and I also asked for a transcript of the evidence of the inquest. I have now received both of those reports.

I should point out to you that under section 169 of part 9 of The Mining Act, subsection 7, the scene is not to be disturbed where there has been a fatal accident in circumstances such as this, until the local engineer of The Department of Mines has inspected and made his necessary investigations. Here there was a fatal accident, and the inspector did not see the scene of the accident until the production had been resumed and the scene altered by the staff of the International Nickel Company.

However, in persuing the engineer's report, and especially the transcript of the evidence presented at the inquest, I am satisfied that this unfortunate man was seriously injured at the site, but under the circumstances the seriousness of the injuries was obviously not apparent. He was taken away to the first aid room of the plant, and he died in the first aid room.

In the meantime, back at the scene of the accident, production was resumed, the scene was altered. I am assured, however, that this in no way conflicted with the availability of the local engineer to make his investigation to his own satisfaction. I am satisfied from the evidence presented at the inquest that it was certainly not apparent that the accident was a fatal accident.

Therefore, under these circumstances—unless further allegations or further evidence is presented to me—I do not intend to recommend to the Attorney General that a prosecution be made in this case. But I am having the chief engineer of the department inform International Nickel in no uncertain terms that this provision of The Mining Act be strictly enforced in the future by their staff.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 18th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, this is the second occasion on which I have had the privilege of presenting the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests.

Having benefited from my first full year with the department—and a very full year at that—I now have a far greater appreciation of the complex nature of its operation and the great responsibility that all of us in the department have to the people of Ontario.

We are responsible for the management of the 90 per cent of Ontario's land and water that is publicly owned; for the management of the renewable natural resources associated with the land and waters; and for the provision of leadership in the management of the privately owned forest land in the province.

Our land management policy is based on the philosophy that each acre of land has a number of possible uses, which must be integrated in a manner most likely to produce the greatest return for the people. The major land uses include the building of artifacts, such as highways, railways, pipelines, airports and townsites; the production of biotic crops, such as timber, fish and wildlife; and the provision of suitable facilities and opportunities for our people to enjoy a relaxing outdoor recreational experience so necessary to offset today's hustle and bustle.

Our resource management policy seeks to produce from the lands and waters so assigned, the optimum production of timber, fish and wildlife.

This responsibility is translated into thousands of details and innumerable contacts with the people of this province. From the representatives of industry concerned with timber limits, to the boy scout who checks in with us before he goes canoeing in a park. In effect, our work involves all the users of our natural resources, namely the people of Ontario and our many visitors.

To manage these thousands of details requires a permanent staff of 3,500 professional and technical people, all intimately acquainted with the needs of the various groups of people, whom it is our privilege to serve in the manner provided for by these estimates.

In a very real sense, their personal dedication and professional reputation are the warranty for the programmes which I have the honour to present.

Regarding the production of timber—the timber branch. The forest industries of Ontario are extremely important to the economy of the province. They account for about 10 per cent of our industrial employment. They also provide the greatest opportunity for increased development and prosperity in the north.

While the past year has seen no appreciable gains in volume of wood cut, many Ontario companies have undertaken major expansions. This expansion puts our forest industry as a whole in a preferred position to take advantage of the predicted upswing in demand for wood fibre expected in the early 1970's.

Because of these forecasts, I am optimistic that market conditions will soon improve, and that additional major projects will be undertaken in Ontario.

Ontario's forest lands have the potential to provide a vastly increased contribution to our economy. To achieve this increase, however, we must vigorously promote all possible methods of making the products of the forest available to the various users.

In the wood products sector this may involve integrated operations, third party arrangements, re-allocation of timber supplies, expansion of our road building programme, a sales campaign to attract new industry and promote expansion of existing plants.

In connection with this latter point, I might mention that Mr. Murray Morison, chief of our timber branch, is at present in London, England, at the request of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall), to assist his department's representatives in making Europeans aware of business opportunities in the forest products industries in Ontario.

To provide the timber supplies which will be required in the future, and to ensure continued economic growth in the province, my department has for years continued our forest inventory work and has been stepping up our regeneration and stand improvement programmes. Further increases will be made during 1968.

As an indication of the present size of those programmes concerned with the establishment and improvement of the forest on Crown and agreement forest lands, I would like to outline to you certain specifics on the increases that are taking place.

In tree planting we shall be increasing the acreage covered from 56,000 acres last year to 62,500 acres this year. Similarly, the planting of tubed seedlings will increase from 18,900 acres to 22,000 acres. Other treatments to induce natural regeneration will

increase from 46,000 acres to 54,000 acres this year. There will be a slight increase in direct seeding from 11,400 acres to 11,500 acres.

Proposed projects on agreement forests will show a decrease from 4,400 acres to 3,200 acres. The net result of these programmes shows that there will be an overall increase in areas regenerated from 137,000 acres last year to 153,200 acres this year. In addition to this, treatments to increase the quality and volume of existing stands will show an increase from 47,900 acres last year to 71,500 acres this year.

The total area receiving treatments this year will thus be 224,700 acres. This represents an increase of 21 per cent in the area treated and an increase in the number of trees and tubed seedlings planted from 64 million in 1967-1968 to 72 million in 1968-1969.

You will be interested to know that during this fiscal year the department will lift and ship from one of our tree nurseries the billionth tree produced since operations began in 1905.

To further our forest management programmes we are actively engaged in research in a number of fields. These include the development of equipment which would help to automate our planting programmes and include such items as site preparation equipment, new planting machines, and a mobile tubeling production unit.

To help supply the additional demand for wood fibre we must find ways to grow trees faster. To this end, the tree breeding programme of the department is concentrating upon the development of fast-growing poplar and spruce for northern Ontario. The services of one of the world's leading poplar experts have been engaged to conduct this work. In addition, the province is taking a lead in studies of forest fertilizers to obtain a much more rapid growth.

As the quality of the wood products is also of great importance, the Ontario research foundation is under contract to the department to study the actual quality of the wood produced, as related to the end product, such as newsprint and veneer.

We are constantly examining forestry developments in other countries, so that we are always aware of any new techniques that might benefit Ontario. One of my staff has just recently returned from making an intensive examination of one of our more vigorous competitors, namely the southern United States. A report of his findings will be available in the near future.

I am happy to report that the forestry programmes on privately owned land under authority of The Woodlands Improvement Act of 1966 have been particularly popular. More than 200 land owners have had work done on their property during 1967, the first full year of the programme, and 400 or more are expected to sign agreements this year.

By January, 1969, all of southern Ontario will be eligible for assistance under the Act, and by 1970 designated management areas in northern Ontario will also be included in the programme. Agreements with many more landowners are therefore anticipated in the years ahead.

Under the Act, 3,500 acres have been planted and 1,700 acres of immature woodlands have been improved. This year it is estimated that four million trees will be planted and 8,000 acres will be improved in southern Ontario. Both programmes, namely tree planting and stand improvement, provide employment in rural areas. More than $250,000 was spent on the 1967 programme and we propose an increase in 1968.

Our basic objective in using the land for the production of timber, is to provide suitable raw material for Ontario's forest industries on an expanding basis. I am proud to state that my department's timber production programme is being expanded as rapidly as possible to meet the anticipated wood requirements of the future.

In southern Ontario, one of the main problems of game management is to provide hunters with a place to hunt. This arises from the fact that most of the land is privately owned. My department is trying to solve the problem in two ways.

The first is by acquiring suitable areas of land, strategically located, and developing these to provide high quality hunting for waterfowl and upland game. It is most desirable that such areas have a naturally high potential to produce game.

In the past year more than 2,000 acres were purchased and the province now owns 20,000 acres of land which is being managed to provide habitat suitable for wildlife of importance to hunters. Realizing, however, that hunting takes place for the most part from September to February, it follows that such public hunting areas will provide excellent opportunities for naturalists, bird watchers and others who seek outdoor recreation. Such outdoor activities as field

trials for hunting dogs may also be arranged in the future.

This programme is still in its initial stages and during 1968 it is expected that management of public hunting grounds will be intensified at Tiny Marsh, Nonquon, Brighton, Gananoque, Long Point and Luther Marsh. Our aim is to achieve increased production of game and a gain in the overall aesthetic values provided in the land.

Our second method of improving hunting on private land is through a landowner assistance programme wherein relations between hunters and landowners will also be improved and thus hunting can be restored or continued on private lands.

The landowner assistance programme should be well underway in 1968. Experience has shown that many landowners are interested in wildlife and do not object to hunting under the proper auspices. The programme will provide technical assistance to improve land for wildlife and increased protection by conservation officers where land is open to hunting.

The deer range improvement programme on Crown land was greatly expanded during the past year on the basis of earlier pilot programmes, which demonstrated that deer populations can be increased where there is adequate shelter provided by an overstory of evergreens, chiefly hemlock, and a good supply of winter browse. Major programmes were carried out in the districts of Parry Sound, Pembroke, Lindsay and Tweed and extensive programmes begun in the districts of Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury, North Bay, Kemptville, Lake Simcoe and Lake Huron. The eastern deer range lies within these ten districts.

Briefly, deer yard management includes close co-operation between our biologists and foresters to preserve stands of hemlock located in deer wintering areas, and treating forest areas to induce the growth of browse plants such as dogwood, striped maple and many other shrubs.

Priority is given to areas where habitat deterioration has been most pronounced and where there has been a history of excellent deer production. One winter's work will provide beneficial effects for a five- to ten-year period, and the deer populations which centred in the wintering areas will, of course, spread out over the whole of the range during the spring, summer and autumn months. Most of the important wintering areas will receive an initial degree of treatment within the next several years.

The ever-increasing demand made by the public on the fisheries resources of the province, makes the need for sound fisheries management even more necessary now than in the past. An inventory of the many thousands of lakes across Ontario is the first step in such a programme.

The fisheries inventory now being expanded and accelerated, will provide information for each lake surveyed, including the species of fish presently produced, the area, the bottom contours; biological, chemical and physical characteristics of the water and the lake to indicate its capability for producing certain species and quantities of fish.

Over 3,000 lakes had been surveyed in the past by field staff, but because of the tremendous increase in angling recently and higher mobility of anglers, we must speed up our inventory programme to provide direction for an accelerated programme of management. This year will see new emphasis directed to a survey of strategic lakes, which receive the heaviest fishing pressure.

Certain key water areas, which are large and highly important for their fisheries production, or potential, have been selected for intensive fisheries management. On such waters, a team comprised of a biologist, a fisheries technician and temporary assistance concentrate on the problems of developing optimum use of the resource. Such teams of fisheries management units have been assigned in the past to Lake of the Woods, Rainy Lake, Lake Simcoe, Lakes Timagami and Nipissing, the Kawartha Lakes, and the Bay of Quinte. This year, we propose to establish new units on Lake Nipigon and on Lake St. Clair.

To augment the natural production of fish and develop the potential of our waters, we have 16 fish hatcheries across the province, and our programme of expansion and modernization of these facilities is proceeding as planned. Recently I had the pleasure of officially opening the Normandale rainbow trout rearing station in Norfolk county. The renovation of that station makes it possible for us to double the production of rainbow and brook trout (in pounds) and quadruple the number of rainbow trout eggs produced for the whole province.

At the same time, the construction of new ponds for the production of 500,000 splake at the Chatsworth rearing station is just about complete. We expect that the renovation of our important North Bay trout rearing facilities, which will increase production

two to three times will be completed by this fall. Concurrently an experimental fish culture and training station to be located at Saulte Ste. Marie is planned and off the drawing board, while a new hatchery to serve future needs in southeastern Ontario is in the initial planning stages.

We are keenly aware of the serious economic difficulties encountered by the commercial fishermen of this province and we are endeavouring to provide practical assistance. In Lake Ontario, for instance, we are embarking on an exploratory fishery this summer and fall, to locate stocks of fish, and test trawls, or other fishing gear for an economic method of harvesting. In addition to nets, we will be using electronic instruments to locate fish concentrations.

We are also continuing our investigations of new species or kinds of fish for the Great Lakes. The introduction of kokanee salmon to Lake Huron has shown encouraging results. Spawning adults have returned in substantial numbers to streams on Manitoulin Island and the Bruce Peninsula. The first planting of fifth generation splake will be made in Georgian Bay in 1969, and they should become adults when the effects of lamprey control there are first felt.

The foregoing have been some of the actions taken by my department to optimize the production and use of the game and fish resources of Ontario.

As many will recall, we experienced serious forest fire conditions early in June of last year. The communities of Sioux Lookout and Chapleau were endangered, and their evacuation was necessary as a precautionary measure. During a short period of only a few days, 344 forest fires were reported and the area burnt amounted to 50,000 acres. Uniquely, the extreme danger condition existed at the same time in all 22 forest districts, which required our seeking outside help.

I take this opportunity to express the gratitude of my department to the United States forest service, the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba and the Canadian armed forces for providing assistance during this crucial period. As I have announced earlier, we were able to return the favour to Alberta during May of this year.

In general, however, Ontario experienced a relatively light fire season in 1967. We had 1,465 forest fires which burned over an area of 63,505 acres, which is well below the average for the last 10 years. As of June 1, this season, we have taken action on 847 fires, approximately twice the normal fire occurrence for this period, yet have limited the acreage burned to some 8,700 acres.

Last year tests were made in the province using various fire detection systems on different areas totalling 50,000 square miles. Some systems included fire towers only, others included aircraft only and still others included a combination of towers and aircraft. The purpose of the tests was to determine if it were possible to improve our fire detection system by greater use of aircraft. The results to date have been very encouraging.

The infrared aerial scanner—which I mentioned at this time a year ago—was tested on an operational basis during the 1967 season. It was used successfully to map the perimeter of burning fires. In addition to the detection and mapping of incipient fires, it is very useful for detecting hot spots during the patrol stage of large fires.

The study of our future flying requirements, to ensure that we have the most modern aircraft and the most appropriate fleet composition possible, was started by the Ontario research foundation in 1967. We expect to have their recommendations by the end of this year. The study of our entire communications network is also being handled by the foundation.

Our aircraft fleet has been further updated with the addition of 13 new Turbo-Beavers. Eight were purchaser last year and five more this spring. When the last standard Beavers have been retired, our fleet will consist of 28 Turbo-Beavers, ten standard Otter, two Twin Otters and one Widgeon. All float aircraft are fitted with water bombing systems.

Continued emphasis is being placed on increasing the skill of our fire-fighting staff through special training programmes. In addition, we have given basic training to some 1,300 northern Indians and 528 are now employed on our regular fire crew teams or some other aspects of resources management.

Our fire suppression forces have been reorganized into a system of seven-man fire attack crews. Each crew consists of two forestry technicians and five seasonal rangers. Some 120 highly trained crews have been selected and organized on a highly mobile basis, ready for action wherever required.

We are spraying by air, a 250,000-acre area 60 miles west of Port Arthur to control a recent outbreak of the spruce budworm. It is interesting to note that the well-known insecticide DDT will not be used, but rather two new chemicals which have proven to be

harmless to fish and wildlife when used at the proper dosage rates.

My department is fully aware of the importance of protecting the natural resources of this province as the foregoing highlights show.

In connection with planning for public lands and the development of lakes for recreational use, 85 lake development plans were completed last year and a similar number are scheduled for completion this year. These are plans prepared prior to development of summer cottage sites and include areas designated for public access points and Crown reserves.

Where feasible, summer cottage roads of "township standard" are included in these development plans. This year, some 30 miles of cottage roads are proposed for construction, providing access to 15 lakes slated for cottage development. Road costs under this programme are recovered through increases in the purchase prices of the lots serviced. Maintenance may be undertaken by local roads or statute labour boards, or by municipalities.

Staff training in public lands administration has been furthered with the inaugural last year of a three-week land administration certificate course at the forest technical school at Dorset. The course will be given on a yearly basis until those involved in this area of the department's administration have completed it, and from then, on an intermittent basis only.

Under the Canada land inventory programme, the recreational capability of more than 10,000 lakes was assessed during the past year. This programme is continuing.

A general plan for the North Georgian Bay recreation reserve has been completed. Detailed studies in areas selected for further development are being undertaken this summer, to enable the site layout for this development.

This year, under a new programme, municipalities are being assisted in obtaining surveys and title to Crown land occupied by roads servicing summer cottage lots. Within our means, this will be accomplished by sharing the cost of boundary or right-of-way surveys.

Under the retracement survey programme, begun in 1961, about 300 miles of township boundaries will be re-established this year, bringing the total length retraced to 2,000 miles.

My department has nearly completed a study of a co-ordinated 10-year resource management road construction and maintenance plan for northern Ontario.

During the past year, about 53,000 acres of private land were acquired for parks, water access points, recreation areas, wildlife production areas, and for timber production. This represents, Mr. Chairman, a 42 per cent increase in land purchases over the previous year.

For the eight ARDA projects involving land purchases, almost 70,000 acres have now been acquired.

The Department of Public Works is carrying out negotiations with property owners on 100 active projects, for the purchase of over 300,000 acres of land.

As regards the outdoor recreation—the parks branch. The parks classification system, announced a year ago, provides different types of recreational areas to satisfy the various needs of the people of Ontario. Public reaction to this classification of the park areas has been most gratifying.

A number of areas, formerly classified as wilderness areas, will become provincial parks of the nature reserve class. To ensure continued planning for this type of park, I have formed a consulting group comprised of representatives of educational and naturalist groups.

Polar Bear park, which was recently established at the Junction of James Bay and Hudson Bay in northern Ontario, is an example of the primitive type of park. Its primary use will be for educational and scientific purposes, with practically no development permitted and therefore very limited expenditures will be required.

For canoeists, several parks will be established within the Wild River classification, including such proposed areas as a part of the Mattawa and Winisk rivers.

To ensure that our parks programme will meet the needs of the people of Ontario, we are presently collecting information which will enable us to prepare a master plan for outdoor recreation. This study of outdoor recreational needs, while providing a basis for regional planning in Ontario, also fits into a nation-wide study in which both the federal and provincial governments are involved.

In a few years when the study is completed, the information will be available to all levels of government within the province. The master plan will show the projected needs for outdoor recreational facilities of all types

—and in considerable detail—for the years up to 1980 and in a general way beyond. This outdoor recreational plan will form a major section of the master tourist plan being prepared by The Department of Tourism and Information.

To enable the people of Ontario to make greater use of the recreational potential of our many lakes and rivers, we are expanding our programme of providing access facilities such as roads and access points. At the present time there are 381 access points which are maintained for this purpose.

The number of such points is increased annually as our staff recommends the need and as funds are made available. During the last two years, there has been put forth a considerable effort to improve the level of maintenance of such areas with total expenditures for the current fiscal year estimated as $300,000. For the use of the minor access points, no direct charge is made to the users.

The extent to which provincial parks were enjoyed by the residents of and visitors to Ontario during the 1967 season is indicated by these following figures:

1. The total number of visitors last year rose to 10,192,533, an increase of 4.1 per cent above the previous year.

2. The number of camper-days rose to 2,805,143, an increase of 5.7 per cent above the previous season.

3. The number of persons attending interpretative programmes, such as exhibits, nature trails and lectures increased to 579,850, an increase of 6.4 per cent above the previous year.

All of these percentage increases indicate that park use is expanding at a rate well in excess of our rate of population increase.

Within the provincial parks, the construction of camping and picnicking facilities is continuing at an accelerated pace. Again this year emphasis is being given to water supply and sanitation. When the park season opened this spring, 26 parks were equipped with trailer sanitary dumping stations. By the end of the season we propose to have 80 parks so equipped.

Because of the increased demand for improvement in the facilities provided at our parks and because of increasing operating costs, the spread between revenue and expenditures has greatly widened.

Facilities are being completed to enable the operation of two new provincial parks in northern Ontario. These areas afford excellent boating possibilities and have been for some years favourite areas for anglers. The first is located at Missinaibi Lake, 50 miles by access road north of Chapleau. The second is at Wakami Lake, reached by access road 40 miles northwest of Chapleau.

Very major efforts are being put forward this year in the development of five areas in the province as park sites. It is hoped that the opening of these areas to public use may be possible next year.

In order to provide the desired facilities as requested by the people of Ontario, and at the same time maintain the principle that revenue should at least cover operating costs, we have had to increase the entrance and camping fees for 1968. It should be noted that the family who only casually picnics in our parks this year pays the same one dollar entrance fee per car as was the case last year.

We are confident that the study to determine future needs, and our master plan for outdoor recreation, will ensure the people of Ontario of an opportunity to fulfil any of the varied outdoor recreational experiences that they may seek in the years ahead.

To manage the renewable natural resources of this province requires personnel with exceptional skills and training. In 1945 the Ontario forest technical school was established at Dorset to provide in-service training for our employees and for sponsored employees from the forest industries. The basic 33-week course which extended over each calendar year comes to a close at the end of 1968. By then the school will have graduated 1,600 forestry technicians, 1,200 of whom are employed by my department.

Because of the rewarding type of work available to graduates, interest in the course had greatly increased up to 1967, when we had 450 applicants for the 150 positions available in the 1968 course.

Fortunately at this point, when we were faced with a need to expand the school, we realized that this course could be handled most advantageously by certain of the community colleges which were rapidly developing in various parts of Ontario.

And last Saturday at the Sir Sandford Fleming college of applied arts and technology, 86 students graduated in the first year of the forestry technical course. I am very proud of the assistance my staff have given in the organizing and teaching of this course.

Three of my staff have since decided to continue in this very rewarding vocation. By this fall, three such courses will be available

at strategic locations in Ontario, namely, Port Arthur, Sault Ste. Marie and Lindsay.

Our school at Dorset will continue, but will revert to its original function of providing advanced and specialized in-service training in resource management, and some post-graduate work.

Our junior ranger programme continues to appeal to the seventeen-year-olds and provides an excellent opportunity to introduce to them the opportunities of a career in resources management. We have again this year employed a small number of French-speaking junior rangers from Quebec to further the bicultural exchange programme. These boys are located at the Racine Lake camp in the Chapleau district.

You may be interested to know that my department has provided summer employment for over 3,000 students this year.

And, Mr. Chairman, in these remarks I have endeavoured to give you an outline of some of the activities and developments of The Department of Lands and Forests for the past year along with our aims and programmes for the coming year.

I am fully aware that the economy of this province today, and in the future, is, to a large extent, dependent on wise management of the resources under the jurisdiction of my department. Thank you.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Madam Chairman, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise as the Liberal critic of The Department of Lands and Forests. I would like to say at the outset that the Minister of Lands and Forests is one of the few men on that side of the chamber whom we on this side can refer to as a true gentleman. I would like to thank him for his courtesy to me and the co-operation that he has given me in the past few months.

I would like to state in my following remarks that my criticisms are aimed not only at The Department of Lands and Forests but at the entire government opposite, which is responsible to a large degree for the shortcomings of this department. The Treasury board, composed of members of the Conservative Cabinet, must take a large share of the responsibilities for the failings of this department.

I would like to congratulate the Minister on his hunters' safety programme and also those conservation clubs in the province that have taken an active part in this programme. I would say also that the conservation officers of this department deserve a great deal of credit and the thanks of the people of the province. In a great many cases they are overworked and underpaid but, unlike a great many people, they have a great love of their jobs and this reflects credit on them and on this province.

Madam Chairman, I wish to preface my remarks concerning this department with a discussion of the policy of this department and of this government in regards to the residents of this province and the non-residents. I would preface these remarks by saying that I am not anti-tourist or anti-American, or a Yankophobe, if I may coin that word; I welcome foreign visitors to our province and while they are here I believe they should be treated as guests. But I suggest to you, madam, that they are guests and that we as Canadians and residents of Ontario are the hosts and owners of the house.

I suggest that this government has gone overboard in catering to the American tourist in this government's unseemly haste to reap the rich American tourist dollar. In doing this they have neglected and ignored the Ontario resident. I say we have literally given the country away to American tourists at the expense of the Canadian. When one invites a guest into one's home, one does not invite him to walk into the refrigerator and to help himself and walk out again. When a guest abuses and misuses one's hospitality, then he ceases to be a guest. I suggest that it is time that in our tourist industry and in our hunting and fishing, we first consider the Canadian, the Ontario resident, before we make provisions for the American.

In connection with this general policy, I would like to talk about the proposed resident fishing licence, the American-based commercial airplane operators, and the private American aircraft flying into Canada, some of which I discussed in my reply to the Speech from the Throne. When the good Lord made the earth he made it three-quarters water and one-quarter land. Obviously he meant for man to fish three times as much as he ploughed. We have in this province a wealth of lakes, woodlands and streams.

We have some of the best fishing country in the world and I state flatly at the outset, that I am against any imposition of a resident fishing licence at this time. My party, the Liberal Party, is against a resident fishing licence. I call upon my colleagues from all sections of the province to stand and say, "My people are against the additional tax

of a fishing licence." I call especially upon the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier), the member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) and the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) to rise in their places and say, "I am against this fishing licence." My colleague from Port Arthur (Mr. Knight) agrees and indeed has spoken against a resident fishing licence.

All of us as members have received a great many letters and forms stating that the residents of our area are against a resident fishing licence. I would read into the record a notice that has appeared in the papers in my district. It reads:

> Ontario resident anglers, take notice: If you object to an Ontario resident angling licence, read, clip and mail this letter at once to our MPP Pat Reid:
>
> Hon. Rene Brunelle,
> Minister of Lands and Forests,
> Parliament Buildings,
> Toronto 5, Ontario.
>
> Dear Sir:
>
> Having read in the local paper your wish to burden the Ontario resident angler with a fishing licence, I take strong objections to this. Fishing without a licence is the only freedom we have. We, the Ontario citizens, are at present overtaxed and over-licensed; our conservation officers are too few and overworked and such a licence would only make it more difficult for them. One-half of such a licence fee would only be used up in administration and we would realize very little from it. Ontario waters will produce enough fish for the Ontario angler. We, the Ontario residents, are subsidized in many things at present; we do not want to subsidize the tourist industry.
>
> Respectfully submitted.

I might add, Madam Chairman, at this time, that written in ink on this letter is:

> I recommend doubling the licence of visiting Americans who violate the rights that we give to them.

I would like to read into the record at this time some of the other newspaper articles that have appeared in papers across the province. The first is from Sault Ste. Marie, and the title of the article, "This is outrageous." The article says at one point: "This is without doubt the most irritating and useless legislation ever conceived in this fair province." From one of the Lakehead papers comes, "Licence fee boost unfair to residents." And there are many more. I have here on my desk—and I am sure that the Minister has received the same—many letters from constituents and forms protesting the imposition of a resident fishing licence.

The Minister has put forward three reasons why we should have a resident fishing licence in Ontario. The first reason is that Ontario is the only province without a resident fishing licence. This is true, but two points should here be made: (a) That with one fell swoop the Minister has given Ontario the highest resident fishing licence in Canada; (b) The argument that we are the only province without it, therefore we should have one in this particular case, is specious. That is like saying every other person in the room has a wart on his nose, therefore you should have one.

The second reason the Minister gave was that the revenue from the fishing licence would be used for an increased conservation programme. I might say at this time that we were told of this only after the Minister had received a great deal of mail and read a great many editorials which were not in favour of a resident fishing licence. As the Minister well knows and as we have been told often in this chamber, the revenues from different departments go into a consolidated revenue fund. There are no funds earmarked for special projects. The Minister must go before the Treasury board, composed of Cabinet Ministers, plead his case and then perhaps he will receive a larger share of the budget of this province.

There is no guarantee that by collecting a fishing licence from the residents of this province, the conservation programme of this department will be increased any more than they normally would be. This whitewash of the Minister, this apology to the Ontario residents for the fishing licence will not wash; it is unacceptable.

Let us look at what amount of revenue will be raised by imposing this tax burden on Ontario residents. The Minister counts 1.5 million Ontario residents who fish in the province. I would suggest that if this licence is made compulsory, 250,000 to 500,000 people will not fish in the province. Let us therefore work with a figure of one million fishermen. At $3 a head, this comes to an increased revenue for this department of $3 million. If we use the Minister's figure of 1.5 million people, we come up with a figure of a $4.25 million increase in revenue.

Madam Chairman, that $4.25 million is less than one-twelfth of the total budget of

this department. In regard to the total budget of the province, it is less than .18 per cent of total expenditure of this whole province. For this small sum of money this Minister and this government wish to impose a further tax burden on the people of Ontario. I would suggest that if we increase the non-resident fishing licence by $6, making a non-resident fishing licence $12.50, we would raise almost the same amount of revenue as we would by taxing the Ontario taxpayer.

It might be said at this point that when the fishing licence was originally proposed, there was no mention of the non-resident fishing licence being raised. It was only during my first speech in the House that the Minister suggested that perhaps a non-resident fishing licence might be raised to $8.50. Again, an Ontario resident gives up $3 while the non-resident gets away with a $2 increase.

The province of Quebec, as I have stated before, has a non-resident fishing licence fee of $15.50; British Columbia charges a non-resident $10. I suggest to the Minister that we raise the non-resident fishing licence to a mean between these two provinces, of some $12.50, and forget about taxing the Ontario resident.

I further suggest that increasing the non-resident licence will not discourage the kind of tourist that we want in this country. The only kind of tourist it will discourage are those who bring all their own equipment, their own gasoline, their own food, their own liquor, and spend nothing but the cost of a fishing licence in this province.

When a tourist comes to this province, especially in the northern areas, he comes to fish and he fishes intensely, determined to catch his limit every day. I would think it could be proven that the average tourist fisherman would certainly be getting his money's worth even if he still had to pay $12.50 for a fishing licence.

The Minister has stated that fishing and hunting bring an income of some $500 million into the province of Ontario. I believe this figure is based on a study by Peter Klopchic, using a multiplier of two. It should be remembered and I draw the Minister's attention to my opening remarks, that the Ontario resident in hunting and fishing, buys his equipment in Ontario, pays taxes on that equipment, pays a gasoline tax which has been raised this year by this government, pays a cigarette tax which has been raised this year by this government, besides paying income tax to the province of Ontario. For all the paying he does and the support he gives the economy of this province, he is thanked by being slapped with a $3 fishing licence.

This department and this government, in their attempt to squeeze the last dollar out of the long-suffering Ontario taxpayer, will not even exempt the old-age pensioner from having to pay for a fishing licence. In the state of New York, people seventy years old and over may procure a fishing licence free by merely showing their birth certificate.

In the state of Minnesota, an old-age pensioner may purchase a perpetual licence for $2.50. In other words, he purchases it once and it is good for the rest of his life. But what do we hear from this government—they shall pay. These people who have made this province and this country, many of whom take pleasure in the outdoors and dropping a fishing line into a lake, who have contributed to this province their lives and certainly their money and are in the twilight of their years, are going to be forced by an unfeeling government to pay the sum of $3 to continue to enjoy something they have enjoyed all their lives.

I say to this government that to them $3 may not appear to be very much money, but to an old-age pensioner $3 is a great deal of money. I urge that if this government, which must take responsibility for this action, is determined to force this fishing licence on the people of Ontario, that the very least they can do is to exempt the old-age pensioner.

In the conservation meeting, the Minister stated that if we exempted women and old age pensioners, it would mean a loss of revenue of $280,000. To this government $280,000 is peanuts. A government that can afford to pay $1.8 million to the breeders of horses surely can afford to exempt women and the senior citizens of this province from a $3 fishing licence. How often does a woman go out fishing? Possibly once or twice a year. With this fishing licence she will never go, and the Minister must take responsibility for this.

The third reason that the Minister has given for the need of a fishing licence is that the user of the resource should be made to pay for it. I have already suggested that anglers and hunters provide a growing income to the province of some $500 million through taxes and equipment they purchase.

I would suggest that they are already paying for the use of this resource. But further I would recommend to the Minister that he make necessary and immediate reading a speech given by J. Hatter, director of the

British Columbia fish and wildlife conservation authority entitled, "Consideration in budgeting for fish and wildlife management". Mr. Hatter makes three particular points that I would like to summarize for the Minister:

1. From Mr. Hatter's speech: "Budgets should not be confined to any particular level in relation to direct income from consumers of the resource."

2. Mr. Hatter goes on: "Charges should also be made to the non-consumer." He states that "those in effect who do not hunt or fish should also be made to pay their fair share because of the income that is derived indirectly from this resource."

Therefore, I suggest to the Minister, that this idea of the users of the resources paying for it is a false one and I suggest he read Mr. Hatter's article.

3. "That is budgeting for fish and wildlife management costs should exceed revenues." I repeat that for the benefit of the Minister, costs should exceed revenues, and yet this government, this Minister, is trying to make the revenues equal costs. In other words, the revenues to be derived from fishing should not equal the cost of tending to that particular resource. If the Minister does not have a copy of this article, I would be happy to lend him mine.

So much for the Minster's arguments in defence of a fishing licence. But there are good and valid reasons why he should not impose a fishing licence. As I have already stated, the American tourist should be made to pay his fair share of the costs of conservation in this province, especially if we follow the reasoning of the Minister.

The Ontario resident already pays a great deal towards the budget of fish and wildlife, both through the taxes he pays and the equipment he buys in Ontario.

Further, I suggest that we, as Ontario residents, have a right to be able to fish, free of charge, in our own waters. I was happy to note that, when earlier in the session, I asked the Minister if the Indians' hereditary rights in regard to fishing would still be observed, he said "yes". I suggest that fishing is the only freedom that we have left in this province, indeed in this country, for which we are not taxed. I would think that this would be a feather in the Minister's cap if he could keep it that way. I believe it was the hon. Kelso Roberts who said: "We will have a fishing licence in this province only over my dead body."

I would not want this Minister remembered by the people of Cochrane North and by the people of this province as the man who imposed a fishing licence upon them.

This fishing licence, Madam Chairman, is especially repugnant to the people of northern and northwestern Ontario. As citizens of this area, we feel that we have a special right to fish in the waters adjacent to our communities. We do not feel that we should have to produce a fishing licence on demand when we have enjoyed for years the right and privilege of fishing in what we consider our own lakes.

By reason of geography, the people of northern Ontario do not enjoy a great many advantages that the people of southern Ontario do. We are not able to enjoy the Royal Ontario museum for instance, or the Stratford festival and other such projects that this government subsidies and subsidizes heavily.

But we do not complain about this and all we do want is to be left to enjoy our fishing. Has the Minister considered how much extra time and the resulting cost that will arise by conservation officers having to check into residents for fishing licences? I say the whole idea is badly conceived and should be dropped forthwith.

I again remind the Minister and he is a resident of northern Ontario, that he will appreciate the enjoyment that we derive from fishing; we enjoy the lakes, the trees, the sun sparkling on the water, the exciting tug on the other end of the fishing line. I am reminded, if I may of a poem that I read a few years ago, and I would change a line slightly:

> For some may swing the axe
> And some the pen or peavey pole,
> But every man deserving pants
> Has fishing in his soul.

I would hope, therefore—and I ask the Minister to reconsider his decision in regard to this fishing licence. I hope he will not implement this fishing licence for he alone must take responsibility for this most unpopular measure. The people of Ontario have said "no" loudly to a fishing licence; I hope the Minister will heed that "no".

I would recommend one last thought to the Minister and that is the cost of administration of collecting and processing these non-resident licences. If we were to increase the non-resident fee, the cost of administration and issuance would already be covered and no money would be lost in administration. But once again, I urge that the Minister reconsider this policy and not impose this fishing

licence on the people of Ontario. I am almost moved, Madam Chairman, to move that this Minister's salary be lowered to $3, not to $1 as per usual, but to $3 so that he at least may be able to purchase a fishing licence.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He gives himself a complimentary one.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Madam Chairman, I would like to make a few comments in regard to the policy of this department regarding parks. The Treasury board, and they must take some responsibility in this, must really have put the screws on the Minister this time. The department has now doubled the fee to $10 for a season's pass into our parks of the province. I would like to read a couple of headlines from various papers throughout the province: Increased Park Fees Rapped; Great Outdoors Tax Irks Campers—Now They Plan to Boycott Parks; Licence Fee Boosts Unfair to Residents, and so on. I say, Madam Chairman, who does this fee hit? It hits the average man trying to get along on a small salary, with rising inflation and an ever-increasing tax burden. One of the few pleasures that a man and family, without a great deal of money, could enjoy was a day or a weekend in a park at very little expense. It gave a man and his family a chance to get away from their small home or cramped apartment, away from the pollution of the city or town, way from the congestion and exhaust fumes from too many cars. It gave a man and his family a chance to get out into fresh air to enjoy the beauties of nature, to be alone with his family without the interruption of television or ringing phones. It gave a family a chance to meditate and to enjoy the natural riches of his province. But the Minister again, in one fell swoop, has put this inexpensive recreation out of the reach of the small man and has made camping and the enjoyment of our publicly owned parks a luxury commodity. I suggest to the Minister that he review all these proposed fee increases within the department and keep in mind the average Ontario resident who does not have a great deal of money to throw around, who must watch his money carefully and who cannot afford these increased fees.

A recent article in one of the weekend magazines of a daily newspaper of this city concerned camping across Canada. It may be noted there for all to see—and not just the residents of Ontario, but the whole country—that Ontario has the largest camping ground fees of any province in the country. Ontario may be a place to stand and a place to grow, but it is certainly not a place to camp. I suggest to the Minister again that he review his policies. If increased revenue is that necessary, I think it is time we instituted a two-price policy; one for Ontario residents and one for foreign tourists who, if they can afford to travel this far, will certainly be able to afford an increase in the cost. I think it is time we gave the Ontario resident a break.

Madam Chairman, we have a problem in northwestern Ontario but it is one that involves all the people of Ontario and again it relates to my opening remarks as regards this government's attitude to the residents of this province and to residents of a foreign country. We in northwestern Ontario have a problem with United States based American commercial aircraft. We have a somewhat related problem with private American aircraft. The problem simply stated is this. American commercial aircraft are exploiting Canadian and Ontario resources without contributing one penny to the economy of this province. This government has allowed American operators to fly fishermen and hunters into this province, bag and baggage. These American fishermen and hunters have contributed only the cost of a fishing licence or a hunting licence to the economy of this province. This has been a problem in our area for a long time and yet this government refuses to take any action to stop this practice and let it be known at the outset that this is a provincial responsibility. We cannot blame the Americans for exploiting the resources of this province because it is this government that allows them to do so. It is this government that must take the responsibility for the situation that exists in northwestern Ontario.

The money that is made by these American tourist operators exploiting Canadian resources would be more than a large enough increase in revenue so that the Minister would not have to impose any kind of a fishing licence on the residents of Ontario.

This government has been petitioned by the chambers of commerce of northwestern Ontario and of Fort Frances in particular. I would like to read into the record a resolution of the northwestern chambers of commerce, sponsored by the Fort Frances chamber of commerce, as it was submitted to members of the Cabinet in March 1968.

> Despite protests from the northwestern chambers, the Ontario chamber and the Canadian chamber, there has still been no action taken by any level of government which has made any significant contribution to alleviating the situation existing along the Ontario-Minnesota border. Last

fall the air transport board very piously announced that one U.S. operator's licence had been suspended for illegally moose-spotting. As it developed, the licence has since been restored and the period during which he was prohibited from flying was during the freeze-up weeks when operations ceased in any case. It is apparent to us that no branch of the federal government is in the least concerned about this problem.

We therefore have only the government of Ontario to turn to, and we beseech The Department of Lands and Forests and The Department of Tourism and Information to develop some form of control over foreign-based commercial aircraft flying whenever and wherever they wish in direct competition with Canadian operators. The U.S. interests are simply laughing at us, and Canadians are being made to look like simpletons.

And it is that government there, the Conservative government of this province, that must take responsibility for this situation. A similar resolution was made in September, 1966, and I read this also into the record:

That this meeting reconfirm our conviction that the provincial and federal departments concerned should continue their efforts to correct a situation that could virtually get out of hand

I say to you, sir, through Madam Chairman, that the people of northwestern Ontario are fed up with having their resources, their game and fish, exploited by our neighbours to the south.

In this connection, Madam Chairman, I would like to read into the record a letter I wrote to the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), the Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld), and to the Minister of Lands and Forests. I might say, Madam Chairman, at this time, that I received a reply from the Minister of Lands and Forests, for which I thank him. But I say to the Minister of Lands and Forests that his answer was not satisfactory. But at least he had the courtesy to reply. This is the memorandum:

I am writing this memo to your three departments because I believe it will be necessary for close co-operation between all three departments in order to come to some kind of conclusion to clear up the problem that will be contained herein. The problem is concerned with American-based commercial aircraft operating from Minnesota into Canada, especially in the Rainy River district, but in all of northwestern Ontario generally. These American aircraft are allowed to operate in Canada under class 9-4 licences issued by the federal government in Ottawa. These licences allow American operators to fly parties into Canada, and also apparently allow them to leave canoes and other camping and hunting equipment in Canada for the duration of the hunting season.

Apparently American operators are not required to pay any duty on this equipment. This, of course, causes unfair competition to Canadian operators who must pay duty on the equipment they use in outfitting tourists. Neither the federal government nor the Ontario provincial government receives any revenue from the exploitation of our hunting and fishing, save the cost of the fishing and hunting licences to American parties which, of course, are paid by the tourists themselves and not by the American operators.

A similar matter in this connection is the ability of an American operator to purchase a licence for $50 from The Department of Tourism and Information to set up a tent camp in northern Ontario. For the amount of revenue that they derive from these fly-in tent camps, $50 is surely a very small price to pay. I believe that it is time that the policy of this government in this regard should be changed in two vital aspects:

1. That American-based aircraft be either prohibited from exploiting Canadian resources the way they are doing presently, or that they be required to pay a very high licence fee for the privilege of using Canadian resources.

2. I would suggest most strongly that American-based operators no longer be allowed to leave their equipment in Canada over the tourist season.

I realize that a part of this particular problem is that aviation is under federal jurisdiction. I do, however, believe that the provincial government, by initiating action and requesting the federal government to do something about this situation, would help to clear it up. I am aware of, and have a copy of the decision of the air transport board, Ottawa—decision serial No. 24648 at Ottawa, Canada, August 1, 1967—in regard to this matter, but I believe that it is in the public interest of the people of Ontario that present regulations regarding American operators be changed.

I enclose a copy of an article from an American magaizne called *Outdoors* that

> will give you a good indication of the type of operation that I have described above. I have support for the above suggestions from members of all three parties. I would be happy to discuss further with you or your staffs any aspect or ramification arising from this memorandum.

I mentioned in that memorandum some of the things that are being written about fishing in Canadian waters, and these articles are appearing in nation-wide sportsmen's magazines in the United States. They are in effect commercial promotions for American-based operators. I will not read into the record the name used in these articles because I do not wish to give that gentleman any further publicity. The title of the article is, "Fly-in Fishing for Everyone," and the sub-title is, "This Memorable Float Train Trip into Southern Ontario, Including the Hauling of Everything from Tents to Canoes and Surprisingly Easy on the Budget Too." And well it might have been; it was done at the expense of the Ontario taxpayer. Let me quote a few lines from the article:

> Bernie, I knew, would handle all the details at his end since his business is canoe-fitting. I will not mention the place. All I had to do was get there. We had fished before near his camp but this time he wanted to fly a complete outfit of canoe camp equipment into Bright Sand River, some 150 miles north of the Canadian border. Notice if you will a complete outfit of canoe camp equipment. Further on, since Bernie was outfitting everything from soup to nuts, I had no worries. Bright Sand River is nearly 100 miles north of Atikokan. There are no roads and it is difficult to reach by canoe. The whole area has been fished very little. Yet it is close enough to United States population centres in the east to make a fly-in trip on a reasonable budget. From Ely—the name is censored—flies in many parties for the day only. The cost depends on the size of plane used and distance travelled. There are trips for as little as $50 or they may cost well into the hundreds of dollars. Of course trips for as many days as desired can be arranged. Canoe outfitters supply everything, food and all camping equipment including a canoe for about $7.50 per day per person.

Imagine that, if you will, how cheaply one can take a canoe trip in Canadian waters, outfitted completely by an American operator. But what about the Canadian operator? How can he compete with this kind of unfair competition? You know very well, sir, that this would never be allowed to be reciprocated across the border.

What benefit does the province of Ontario derive from all this? And yet this is the government that has the nerve to say to the resident of Ontario: "You must pay a $3 fishing licence—you must pay a $10 parking fee per season." Again, near the end of the article, I quote:

> There might be a delay tomorrow if you wait for the Beech," explained the pilot, "I can take all four of you right now if you leave your gear here." As we took to the air I looked down on our camp site. The equipment stood ready for use.

And you can bet your bottom dollar that there would be another American party in there using that equipment in the very near future, again at the expense of Ontario residents. The province of Ontario received $6.50 for a fishing licence and the American operators garnered a profit of I-do-not-know-how-many dollars—and we are trying to promote tourism in this province. We say how much the tourist dollar brings in.

I would like to know from this Minister how much of the tourist dollar goes out when practices like this are allowed? You are supposed to be helping Canadian and Ontario businessmen, and yet you allow a situation to exist where foreign-based operators—our neighbours to the south—are able to exploit Canadian resources at the expense of Canadian operators.

I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that that equipment would be used again. And this exploitation of our natural resources by American-based operators would continue without any benefit to Canadian citizens. These people who are allowed to get away with this are operating in direct competition to the Canadian operator who pays taxes in Ontario, who provides employment, who lives in this province and who is trying to make a living. To stop the exploitation of our resources by non-residents, this department must come up with a formula which would require visitors to our province to use Canadian equipment, to stay at Canadian resorts and to contribute monetarily to this province for the benefits which they derive.

I would read into the record just to underline the fact that this is a provincial responsibility from the report of the air transport board No. 487 and it states:

> In the area of northwestern Ontario, the board is of the opinion that compaints to date fall almost entirely under the jurisdiction of departments other than the air transport board and more specifically within the jurisdiction of the departments of the province of Ontario. As previously outlined, the air transport board arranged a meeting with representatives of the various departments most concerned with the alleged problems with a view to obtaining a coordinated approach. The board considers it has proceeded as far as it can be reasonably expected in directing the complaints to the responsible authority, in this case, the province of Ontario.

We have a somewhat related problem, Mr. Chairman, in regard to private American aircraft being allowed to fly hither and yon in our northlands with no control over their egress from this province.

This has allowed them to fly into our fishing waters, in hunting areas, many without even having a fishing or hunting licence. It is almost impossible to keep any kind of check or control over them. This practice too must be stopped and it must be stopped immediately. I offer the Minister of this department a few suggestions as to how these practices should be stopped, but I say to him and I say to the government opposite again, it has been their responsibility for the last 25 years, when these practices developed and it is their responsibility to stop them now.

I would suggest first of all that American commercial aircraft should not be allowed to operate in the fishing and hunting business in Ontario at all. If this is impossible to do then I suggest licensing them so heavily that they will not find it profitable to exploit Canadian resources the way they have been doing in the past.

In regard to private aircraft, I suggest that only wheel planes be allowed to land at air fields. This would prevent aircraft from flying unknown into our lakes and out again. I would suggest if this is not possible, that it be made mandatory for all those purchasing fishing and hunting licences to check out with a conservation officer before leaving the country.

I would suggest further that all those exporting game or fish from this country be required to purchase an export licence for that fish or game. I reiterate that this is a responsibility of this government. This government's policy must change in regard to Americans and Canadians and we must start giving Canadians first chance to develop and to use the resources of this province.

I would like to make a few remarks concerning the purchasing policy of this department. As I understand it, when the department requires vehicles, various dealers within a given area are asked to submit bids. I think this is a fair system. I think it bolsters the economy of the particular area by providing income to those in that area. I say the system of bids is a good one—as long as everyone gets a bid. I should like to read into the record a couple of letters I have received:

> Our company was incorporated June 6, 1950. Since that time we have not sold a single vehicle to either the Ontario Department of Highways or the Ontario Department of Lands and Forests. During this same period we have not been allowed to tender on the local requirements of these departments. When we complain about this matter we are told very frankly that we are not on the list of approved suppliers and therefore are not entitled to quote.

It might be stated at this point, and will come as no surprise, certainly to those members opposite, that it was about this time that this particular constituency became Tory. I read from the second letter:

> We had one bid from The Department of Lands and Forests in November, 1960; we were successful and sold them one unit in the name of Orbit Motors. Since then we have never received a request to bid or to price a unit. As you remember, I was told by Lands and Forests that our name was not even on the list.

I say shame to this government that they should, in this day and age, resort to and continue that kind of practice in this province of Ontario. There they sit opposite—the pillars of the business community, those bastions of free enterprise, those defenders of the faith of competition. They suggest that our society is based on the fruits of the capitalistic system. Their watchword is competition —and yet competition for whom? It is competition if you are a Conservative, and the way they compete is: "Joe, you get the contract this time and I'll get it next time."

Who loses out in this? Firstly, and most directly, those people who do not see fit to support the Conservative Party. Secondly, the residents of Ontario who are not getting the necessary supplies at the cheapest possible price. I salute and I congratulate those who have had the courage to stand by their

political convictions and have not given in to the economic pressure exerted by this government. In thinking of this particular problem I am moved to write a political couplet:

> They told us in the election, vote Conservative or you'll be sorry,
>
> You know the government only buys supplies and things from a real true blue Tory.

I ask the Minister to stop this patronage type of politics. It is unworthy of him and it is unworthy of any government in this day and age. I would ask the Minister to take immediate steps to see that these two companies that I have referred to—and all others that I may not be aware of—are given an equal opportunity to bid on any further requisitions required by his department.

I would like to spend a few minutes discussing the timber and research branch of this department. By way of introduction I might say that Crown land is a provincial responsibility. Ninety per cent of Ontario's forests lie on Crown land and are, therefore, held in trust by this government for the people of Ontairo. The British North America Act, clause 92, section 5, gives to the provinces the management and sale of public lands belonging to the provinces and the timber and wood thereon. The priority rights of the provices in land and timber resources carry with them the right of the province to sell land, or otherwise enter into agreements concerning such natural resources. The province—in 1960, I believe it was—in amending The Forestry Act, took over the responsibility for the regeneration of forests.

The most important and notable thing about the forest is that it is a renewable resource. Unlike mining, where the ore is scooped out of the ground and nothing is left but a big hole, the forest once cut down can grow again and once more provide employment, material and beauty.

Forest industries are especially important in Canada and to the province of Ontario because they provide one of Canada's greatest exports and bring in much needed foreign currency to help correct our balance of payments. It is obvious, therefore, that we should be doing all we can to preserve and conserve and expand our forests and our forest industries.

But what is this government doing about all this? At the moment only 50 per cent of our allowable cut is being used per year in Ontario. Our efforts at silviculture, the regenerating and tending of forests, have in the past fallen far short of what they should be. Our efforts—at least certainly the money expended on research—is pitiable, to say the least. The forest is a renewable resource but only about 64 per cent of the forest will renew itself without any artificial help. Therefore, this government and this department must step in to ensure that the rest is accomplished. According to the report of the forestry study unit, this government has not even reached the minimum level of regeneration required to keep even with the growing demand in this province.

Certainly, if we are not achieving the minimum, we cannot achieve the optimum that the forestry study unit suggests. The Minister is condemned by his own words in *Hansard* of last year, and I refer him to pages 3493 and 3494. Last year this province had approximately 80,000 acres of forest regeneration less than it should have regenerated according to professional foresters' forecasts.

I refer the Minister again to the forestry study report, to table 38, page 220, entitled "Artificial Regeneration—Estimated Annual Needs and Amount Crown Land 1966." I need not go through all of the details, but the table says estimated area need, artificial regeneration—and artificial regeneration is defined as including any silviculture treatment involving the expenditure of money to secure regeneration—was 230,000 acres. The estimated area regenerated was only 100,000 acres for 1966-67—and there is a footnote to the effect that this 100,000 acres is estimated only and includes no allowances for losses and failures—so that this department is falling over 100,000 acres behind enforced regeneration.

What a poor record, what a very poor record for this department and for this government, especially when we consider, Mr. Chairman, the revenues that this department receives from stumpage and forest protection fees. The study concludes that silviculture costs by 1970 would be $8.6 million but stumpage fees and forest protection revenues will be $16.5 million and that is probably before the increased forest protection fees. These figures, therefore, suggest that the money is certainly available and should be made available for a large increase in the regeneration of our forests so that we will be able to meet the demands of the forest industries by the year 2000.

I suggest that the Minister pursue a much greater policy of selling our forests and our forest products, that the department become

more aggressive in its search for new industries and new materials in the province.

In the newsprint association of Canada's *Report*, newsprint data 1967, page 28, there is a table entitled "New Capacity Projects and Prospects." It says this list is compiled from public announcements and other sources believed to be reliable. It may be incomplete because plans are not always reported publicly in advance of construction.

But the interesting thing about this is that new capacity projects and prospects are planned in this way. Alberta has one projected, British Columbia has four, Manitoba one, New Brunswick two, Newfoundland three, Quebec five and Ontario one.

Why—if we are now only using one-half of our allowable cut—when we have great stands of prime timber in this province—why is it not being used? Why are we behind the other provinces of Canada? I said that this government is responsible for this situation as it exists today. I suggest to you that in this province we have a wealth of natural resources but a poverty of policy. What developments can we see of these resources in this province?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about the research programme of this department—I could almost say the non-research programme of this department. The total budget for this year is $1,148,000—not much of an increase in relation to the importance this branch within the department should have.

As a matter of fact the budget of the research branch is down one per cent from last year, and makes up only one-fiftieth of the total budget of this department.

In one of our greatest industries, the forest industry, very little, if any, research is being done. The Agriculture department, even the Highways department, is spending vast sums on research, and yet this department is doing a paltry $1.5 million worth of research. I would think that in this day and age this is a paltry sum to be spending for research in view of the dividends that could be reaped from an all-out research policy.

There were a number of research projects recommended by the forestry study unit and I am sure that the Minister is aware of them. But these were in relation to the timber branch alone. I fail to see how such a measly budget will be able to do the required research in this province. It might be stated that this research budget is not just for the timber branch, but for the game and wildlife branch also. We need more research to exploit the resources of this province.

Mr. Chairman, I will have more to say on these subjects that I have raised in my opening remarks, on each of the individual estimates. I will be talking about the removal of the provincial land tax or municipally owned recreation centres, and on depressed farm areas.

I will be speaking on forest access roads—especially the desirability of such a road between Highways 11 and 17 from Atikokan to Ignace, or from the Fort Frances end up to the northern highway.

I will have something to say about the department building a walleye fish hatchery in Rainy River district; and I will have something to say about wolves.

But in these concluding remarks of my opening statements, I would ask the Minister, once more, to please not impose a fishing licence on the residents of Ontario; to please do something about the American-based commercial airplane operators exploiting Ontario's natural resources. Please clean up the purchasing part of your department; and please increase your silviculture and research programme. The responsibility for all these programmes is yours, and this government's, and they must be carried out in the best interests of the people of Ontario.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Chairman, I consider it a distinct honour to be the critic for the New Democratic Party for The Department of Lands and Forests estimates. I subscribe to a great many of the things that the hon. member for Rainy River has spoken on this afternoon. I have made my position clear on the fishing licence and the increase in the park fees; and the increase in the hunting licences. There will be no doubt, by the time I sit down, of where I stand and where the New Democratic Party stands on those two particular issues.

Now, as the name of the department implies, it is responsible for Crown land retention and disposal to ensure that maximum social and economic benefits are obtained by proper and wise use of the land. It is the responsibility of this department to develop, implement, and maintain land-use plans which take full advantage of land potential, having regard for the needs of our people on a regional and provincial basis. According to the annual report of the year ending March 31, 1967, 40 per cent of the lakeshore areas, and all of the inventories for the portion of Ontario below the 43rd parallel, were incomplete.

Under the recreation and land inventory sector of the Canada inventory plan we are

able to determine which Crown land should be retained for public use, and can assess which areas of private land should be purchased for public use. Since 1962, this department has acquired 93,356 acres of land for water access points, recreational use, timber management, wilderness and nature reserves, and wildlife management purposes. I see the role of the department as one which would encompass the orderly use of all land in the province.

After many years of mismanagement by his predecessor, the Minister has come to realize, that unless all available land is put to the best use possible, not only from a recreational point of view, but for social and economic benefit, we will fail to achieve the best land use. A provincial plan, with the initiative taken by The Department of Lands and Forests, in co-ordination with other departments, such as Agriculture and Food, Municipal Affairs, Trade and Development, Energy and Resources Management, Highways, Transport, Mines, Tourism and Information and Health, should be set up.

It makes very little sense to spend millions of dollars each year to purchase private lands for recreational use if we fail to assure ourselves that choice arable land in southern Ontario will be retained for agricultural purposes. It is equally irresponsible to spend millions of dollars buying up land for parks and beaches if we allow industry to locate in areas where pollution and changing environment render these areas useless for the purpose for which they were intended.

We must have a provincial plan to resolve conflicting demands on our land resources. If we fail to take immediate action to determine what criteria we are to use, what priorities should be established for proper land use, then chaos will result. Population growth in southern Ontario is such that it will nearly double every 25 years. We must plan our development so that the land will be put to the best use possible and to that for which it is best suited. Planning is essential.

I see this department as one which will make use of information which is already available and compile additional data to assure that decisions made now will be compatible with future land requiremental control. We are already losing valuable farm areas to urban sprawl, industrial development, transmission, pipelines, and transportation corridors. We are losing many of our recreational areas because of pollution, and location of industry on sites which are better suited for other uses.

We have reasonable and good information about our land resources, their potential and capabilities, and sufficient information about our physical and human resources, our renewable and non-renewable resources and the particular problems that each area or district of this province has. Let us begin to plan for an orderly use of land in this province, which has been so richly endowed. As Professor Norman Pearson said:

> Time is not on our side. We do have enough data for us to make a beginning, and what is needed is a determined effort to ask ourselves what all this inventory means and what all the trends and forecasts imply. We need a great deal of think time, clear-sightedness, a willingness to look at unpleasant facts, a willingness to forget some of the limits and traditional boundary lines between disciplines and special departmental interests, and a willingness to try and see things whole, to see the implication in terms of the environment of the physical, social and economic and political forces now acting for good or ill in Ontario.

We must ensure that Ontario is a pleasant place in which to live; ensure that resources are not wasted, and if sacrifices are involved, we get something of value for the sacrifice.

There is a strong indication that the shortage of public parks and recreational lands will be severe in 20 years. There is very slow progress in dealing with pollution and other misuses generated by our society.

I call on the Premier (Mr. Robarts) to set up an interdepartmental committee under the Minister of Lands and Forests which would be responsible for determining which land should be set aside for farming and what are the limits to which urban sprawl should be tolerated.

We should determine what land is to be set aside for forestry, for mineral reserves, for recreation, conservation, nature and wilderness reserves.

This committee should determine the most suitable sites for heavy industry and for large industrial complexes. When government is called upon to provide services such as highways, railways, power grids, docks and harbours, it should be consulted as to where industry should locate. This is the role that should be played by The Department of Lands and Forests through its lands and surveys branch, land acquisition and planning sections, surveys and engineering sections, and through proper planning of

access roads, recreational facilities and park development.

I notice in the Minister's remarks, opening up the estimates for this department, the recommendations of the Brodie report were quite conspicuous by their absence. It was a report that had been anxiously awaited for quite some time. It brought in some 70 recommendations; 26 of very little consequence have already been implemented, according to information made available to the House a short time ago. This government's favourite substitute for action is to set up study units or public equiries.

The forest industry is a prime example. I would be the first to recognize that sound policies must be based on knowledge, but The Department of Lands and Forests has been conducting investigations of the forest industry for 20 years. Meantime, thousands of people in northern Ontario whose standard of living depends on proper forest management have suffered, and our total output has been lower than what it could have been.

The most recent survey by the forestry study unit, appointed back in 1964, has produced 70 recommendations after nearly three years of research and the time has come for action. The most important recommendations relate to the promotion of integrated operations on Crown timberland. The study unit found that some of the holders of large timber limits are not permitting the full economic use of all species on their holdings, and have urged more vigorous steps to see that timber suitable for sawmills gets to them and is not ground up in pulp and paper machines.

I am calling for immediate implementation of the study unit recommendations that measures be adopted to promote a proper sharing of timber in licensed areas among the various kinds of users. I strongly support the further proposal that any licensee who is not making full utilization of the allowable cut in his area during the next five years, should be required to release to the Crown a part of the licence containing an allowable cut equivalent to the unused allowable cut. Only when forest management planning is co-ordinated with overall economic policies will we get the optimum use of our rich forest resources for the benefit of the people of this province. For too long, this governmnet has left the large licence holders in the driver's seat. As a result, many northern communities have stagnated with uncut mature timber at their doorstep.

Another area in which this government has failed, is in the development of an overall land use plan. We are letting urban sprawl swallow up precious agricultural and fruit land. This must not be permitted to continue. The government gives lip service to planning but has failed to take the first step, which is to institute a provincial land use plan that will take in the social and economic needs of all of the people. In northern Ontario, the economy of a large number of communities and thousands of people depends on our forest resources.

With regard to the 70-odd recommendations of the Brodie forestry study unit, the ones that I consider the most important and the ones that this department to date has failed to take action on are numbers 40, 42 and 51. If we are to be assured of a proper forest management policy it is absolutely essential that these recommendations be implemented forthwith. Irreparable harm will be done to many towns and villages in northern Ontario unless an integrated woods operation programme is adopted for complete utilization of all timber.

Prime licence holders are chiefly interested in pulp and paper and are only concerned with those species which are essential to their operation. Other species are allowed to rot or overmature while sawmill operators and veneer plants plead for ample timber supplies. Just to give you some indication of this, I would like to read into the record a letter dated Nipigon, June 17, addressed to the hon. R. Brunelle, Minister of Lands and Forests, Queen's Park, Ontario:

Dear Sir:

A new company, Multiply Plywoods Limited, has been formed by a group of Nipigon and area businessmen to try to reopen the Nipigon plywood plant early this summer. The timber needed to make this feasible was requested in a May 23 letter to Mr. L. Ringham, and this was discussed with Mr. Bayly in his office on May 30.

Good progress has been made in negotiations with the industrial development bank, and in raising shareholder commitments for this project. Markets are improved compared to the past two years, the plant is ready to run and a majority of the trained staff and employees are still available. We are also negotiating for a line of credit from a chartered bank, and it now appears that the key to the re-

opening of the plant will be the timber supply.

I have discussed this with the responsible men in the three pulp companies whose limits are involved in our timber request, and they have indicated that a reserve of poplar and birch, of veneer grade as requested, is acceptable to them, subject to the previous agreements with Northern Plywoods Limited being withdrawn. Therefore, it appears to me that the hardwood timber to operate the existing plant is available.

However, the supply of softwood veneer logs for the anticipated expansion of the plant is equally important, and as yet there is no basis for stating to financial concerns or shareholders that there is room for expansion. I understand from Mr. Ringham that your department is working on estimates of softwood of veneer size, and we are encouraged that this is proceeding.

A decision as to the availability of the timber requested is needed from your department, and I am writing at this time to ask when this decision will be made. We ask that it be made as soon as possible, because the labour and market situation is changing rapidly.

If The Department of Lands and Forests can state that poplar and birch veneer logs are to be reserved for the Nipigon plywood plant as requested, and that sufficient softwood of veneer size is within the economic range and allowable cut and is to be made available to the plywood plant, then Multiply has a basis to proceed with its financing and to negotiate in future with the licence holders for softwood logs. If, on the other hand, the department states that there is not sufficient timber for expansion, then it is doubtful that there is a basis for reopening the plant, and this also should be decided as soon as possible.

Yours very truly,
Murray Atkinson, vice-president,
Multiply Plywoods Limited.

If the Minister wants to see expansion related to the forest products industries in northern Ontario, it is absolutely essential that the timber requirements of these small operators be met.

Ontario has only 17 per cent of wood-industry establishments all across Canada, but has 35 per cent of paper and allied industries in Canada. Of all forest-based industries in Ontario, sawmills make only 5.4 per cent of the total. Yet Ontario imports lumber. Veneer and plywood mills make up only 2.8 per cent of all forest-based industries in Ontario, and we import plywood. According to 1965 statistics comparing the allowable cut to the wood used, they used 75 per cent of the allowable cut of spruce. They used 32 per cent of the allowable cut of jack pine. They used 15 per cent of the allowable cut of balsam and other conifers. They used 4 per cent of poplar and birch. In total, for all species, only 32 per cent of the allowable cut is being used.

Surely this is clear proof that we are not taking full advantage of the renewable resources available to us. At a time when towns like Geraldton, Nipigon and Beardmore are struggling for their very existence, improper forest management should not be tolerated.

With regard to the revenues that are generated from that and which accrue to the timber branch of The Department of Lands and Forests, we have compiled a table here showing figures for 1965-66 where the total revenue—including the logging tax—in that fiscal year was $17,732,000. Our expenditures for that year were $19,505,000. In 1966-67 our revenues were $16,856,000. Our expenditures in that branch were $24,695,000. In 1967-68 our preliminary estimates of revenues was $19,125,000, and our expenditures estimated at $27,051,000. For 1968-69, estimated revenues $19,113,000 and we will have expenditures in the timber branch of roughly $30,865,000.

So in 1965-66, after deducting federal payments, percentage of revenue to expenditures will only be 97 per cent. For 1966-67 it will drop to 71.72 per cent. For 1967-68 it will be 73.98 per cent. Estimated for 1968-69 it will only be 64.33 per cent.

In his remarks regarding the amount of money being spent for fish and water life, the Minister says that these things must carry themselves as individual entities. He says that the operation of parks should be met by revenues from that source. I suggest to the Minister that if he is going to follow this through in his own department, possibly he should take a look at the revenues and expenditures of the forestry operations of his department.

Another area that I would like to discuss briefly, Mr. Chairman, is that this department has an opportunity to contribute to the well-being of our Indian population in northern Ontario.

In *Hansard* on April 1, the Minister stated that some 26 recommendations for the forestry study unit had been implemented; in particular recommendation No. 57. Now if I might just read recommendation No. 57:

> That where there is a surplus allowable, cut proposals for its use be requested and the allocation made on the basis of the merit of the various proposals.

If an industry ceases to require or use its allocated cut, the allocation should revert to the Crown. It should not be considered a saleable asset, thus the province could maintain control of the disposal of Crown timber for the best attainment of provincial economic goals. A change in the allocation would require a revision of the management plan and the approval of the regional director and the chief of the timber branch.

Now there are several Indian bands in settlements who have assured me that they would welcome a chance to be gainfully employed on a winter works programme on licenced land where prime licence holders have not seen fit to cut. One such location is on Lake Nipigon near Macdiarmid. It is estimated that there is anywhere from 30,000 to 50,000 cords of wood within easy access of this band. These people would welcome an opportunity to take a contract, or an agreement, or you could set up a Crown corporation, such as was done around Kenora, with the Widjiitiwin plan.

I am sure these people would feel much better earning their own living on a project set up under a Crown corporation rather than be dependent upon welfare, and I commend that particular course of action to the Minister.

Getting to the increased cost of parks, the operation of park and park admittances, and the increase in hunting and fishing licences as announced by the Minister: The $5 million additional revenues expected from the increase in park fees, fishing and hunting licences must be returned to the people of Ontario through better recreational facilities.

If the Minister is really serious about instituting a licence fee for resident fishermen, he must give them some assurance they are getting something for their money. To cite a comparison, consider what is being done by the American authorities on the south shore of Lake Superior and what is being done by this department on the north shore, with regard to restocking of lake trout.

During the period 1950-1966, inclusive, the American restocking programme was 26,638,000 lake trout, as opposed to 4,839,000 by our Department of Lands and Forests. The cohoe salmon programme introduced by the state of Michigan appears to be enjoying a good deal of success, while this department has adopted a wait-and-see attitude. With the increase in park fees, Ontario now ranks among the most expensive camping areas in North America, and is certainly the most costly in Canada.

Campers making use of the provincial parks receive very little for their money. For the same fee a person can go to a privately owned camp site where he will have access to running water, flush toilets, hot showers, electricity and quite often even a laundromat. Not so with the provincial parks.

Here there is no running water and very few flush toilets. Only 195 of the more than 17,000 park sites have electrical hook-ups. A recent survey in the United States indicated that within two years, 3 million recreational vehicles will be rolling on North American highways. This new breed of family campers will require more amenities and have indicated that they will boycott our parks in protest against poor facilities and higher rates.

I do not like to rehash what the hon. member for Rainy River said. I think he outlined in great detail the feeling of the people in northern Ontario with regard to the increases in hunting licences that come into effect this September, and the announced implementation of a programme to have a $3 fishing licence imposed on everybody over the age of 19 starting on January 1, 1969.

I think he expressed the sentiments not only of the people of northern Ontario, but indeed of every resident in Ontario with regard to the imposition in particular of a resident fishing licence. I think he did quite well in explaining the choice position American tourists find themselves in when they come here. They are not paying their fair share. They bring most of their supplies and provisions with them, to the detriment of the merchants and those people trying to make a living in northern Ontario. They contribute very, very little to the economy. I suggest to the Minister, and I have already done so on many occasions privately, that if the Treasury needs additional sources of revenue, they look somewhere else—rather than imposing it on the people of Ontario where the last vestige of a heritage they considered was free has now been taken from them.

I would also like to add my sentiments to those already expressed by the member for Rainy River and exhort the Minister to re-

consider. As I say, if he needs another source of revenue, he should look elsewhere rather than imposing a $3 fishing licence on the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the two hon. members for their very worthwhile suggestions. I will try to reply to the various matters they have brought to my attention. I am sure I will probably miss some points, but I know they will remind me of those I have missed.

First may I say that with reference to the angling licence, that this was a step we were somewhat reluctant to take. We gave this a great deal of consideration and there is no doubt there are certain parts of this province at the present time where stocking is required.

However, we take the view that we are looking for today's needs and future needs and there has been some question as to whether the money we will be taking in will compensate for the cost of the licences and how much we will be spending.

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that this year we will be spending in fish and wildlife $9.3 million, and we will be taking in $7 million. Now, how is this money to be spent? We are doing 700 lake surveys this year. In the past we have done about 400. We should be doing at least 1,000 lake surveys. And the purpose of these lake surveys is to find out the species of fish, the chemical analysis of water, and to find out just exactly what type of fish should be restocked. We are spending a tremendous amount of money in our hatcheries. As was mentioned, we have 16 hatcheries and we are producing about 5 million fingerlings and 45 million egg frys —and we should be producing a lot more. As I said, we are not looking for the needs of this generation but for future generations. Not only is our population increasing, but the number of people who are fishing is increasing, and the number of hours they are now fishing in the winter time, using snowmobiles is increasing. Before this, very few people would fish in the winter time and all projections are that in outdoor recreation, fishing will increase tremendously.

Coming back to my very good friend, the member for Rainy River, some of the northerners—and I come from the north—feel they have fishing at their back door. It is quite true, but people from southern Ontario find they have to travel many miles to go fishing. In northern Ontario also, I would like to mention that this year in Bill 115—I believe it is—we will be providing access to certain roads on company limits. This is for hunters and fishermen. This will cost money. And again the revenue from hunting and angling licences will be used to provide access to a lot of these choice areas.

So there are many reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I feel an angling licence is justified. According to the Smith committee report—and most of you have studied it—I believe in the Smith committee report it says that our programme should be based on at least a four- to five-year period. For this reason, we thought we would charge a $3 fee instead of charging, say, $1.50 or $2, and then maybe a year or two from now adding another dollar. We thought it best to charge an even $3 and hope that this will remain for several years, based again on the Smith committee report that we would programme our rates for at least a four- to five-year period.

The cost of administration, Mr. Chairman, will be very small. We have conservationists at the present time who are checking on people to find out if they are residents or non-residents. At the same time, these same people are checking fishermen as to limits. We feel that very few additional conservationists will be required. As to the cost of a licence, I believe it is somewhere from four and a half to five cents. The cost of administration will be quite small.

Also with regard to conservation officers, we appreciate the feelings that they are working very hard. I forgot what the hon. member said, whether they were underpaid or not. This is continually being revised and we hope there will be increases—but as far as being overworked—this we cannot guarantee because they are working long hours.

With reference to the non-resident, we used to charge $6.50 and we have raised this by $2 to $8.50. I know many of you feel this is not enough, that we should charge the non-residents—who are predominantly Americans—considerably more. There are many views on this. The tourist industry in Ontario is the largest tourist industry in Canada and if we charge too much on our non-resident angling fees many of these people may go to Quebec or Manitoba or to other provinces. That is why we feel that we would like to keep the fee at a reasonable rate in order to attract them to come here in larger numbers.

As far as the old people are concerned, we are very sympathetic and this is receiving consideration. We agree that costs should exceed revenues. Our capital programme this year for land acquisition, hatchery expansion and so forth reflects this.

With reference to parks, I would like to mention that our costs have substantially increased. As you may know, last year we took in $2,191,000 and our expenditures were $3.8 million. Why have our expenditures increased so much? I would say for three or four reasons. One is wages. Wages have increased substantially, somewhere over 30 per cent during the last three to five years. People today want better sanitation; they do not want to go to an outdoor privy. Therefore, we are building comfort stations and these cost thousands of dollars. And also people today are much more demanding. In many of the parks today they are demanding very definitely that the roads should be paved. We are doing this in certain of our parks and will be doing more of this. This costs money.

I would like to mention that also we are using our parks, some of our parks, on a 12-month basis. Today, with the interest in winter recreation and snowmobiles, we will establish snowmobile trails as time goes on. We have done this last year in two of our parks and the annual park licence entitles a person to use the parks 12 months of the year in those parks that are open.

I was very surprised on Saturday when I went to Lindsay—as I mentioned in my opening remarks—to the graduation of the forestry technical students at Sir Sandford Fleming College. There is a nice park, the Balsam Lake provincial park, and the park attendant told me that the attendance this year was 50 per cent higher than last year. Of course, we have had some very good weather, but I mention this because all our projections this year are based on the premise that our parks will be used substantially more than last year.

Also with reference to trailers, it was mentioned I believe, by someone that—as many of you may know—more than 50 per cent of the people who are using our camp sites are using trailer facilities. We had 26 camp sites with trailer camping facilities last year. At the end of this year 80 out of 96 provincial parks will have trailer facilities.

As far as electricity is concerned, what you say is quite true. Today people want electrical outlets and we are studying this. When I say studying, we are trying to find means to providing more electrical outlets at a reasonable cost in certain of our parks.

I know the member for Rainy River is very concerned about aircraft control and I can appreciate your problems in the Rainy River area where you are so close to the American border—and I guess it applies to the Lakehead. I know it does not apply to my area, northeast Ontario, but I would like to remind the hon. member that we have looked at this very closely. When I say looked, I mean we have done things and, Mr. Ringham, the regional director of northwestern Ontario, has been to Ottawa.

We have worked very closely with The Department of Tourism and Information on this very important matter and I would like to just bring you up to date. As you may know in Canada, aircraft come under the air transport board of the federal government and there is nothing in the federal law which requires an aircraft to check in Canada before leaving Canada. I wrote to the Hon. Mr. Hellyer in May. I will not read the letter, it is a little long, but I would just like to bring this matter to his attention and I will read you his reply. It was dated May 14 from Ottawa:

> Dear Mr. Brunelle:
>
> This will acknowledge your letter of May 7, 1968, concerning problems associated with the use of aircraft for hunting and fishing in remote parts of the province of Ontario.
>
> I have carefully noted your remarks with respect to the need for additional controls over such flights and I will be looking into this matter. After I have had further opportunity to give further consideration to the points you have raised I will be in touch with you again.

The federal government is giving study to this matter. Now where do we come in? The Department of Lands and Forests, of course, looks after the regulations in The Game and Fish Act, and we have done many spot checks during the past year, and we have brought people to court for violations under The Game and Fish Act. Also, as you may know, in provincial parks it is forbidden to use aircraft to land on certain lakes. I am told that this is contrary to federal legislation. The Provincial Parks Act prohibits landing in a provincial park except at a licensed airport. The federal department has claimed this legislation is unconstitutional, and in reply to a request for adequate federal legislation to control aircraft, suggests that the proposal interferes with the basic rights of aircraft operators.

I would like to say again that we are working closely with The Department of Tourism and Information. There are certain things that you may know. We have intensified our

check control; we are doing more of this. Aircraft today need a land-use authority permit and we are giving further consideration to what other steps we could take. So the matter, I would say, is under active consideration. It is a real problem in northwestern Ontario and I am optimistic that with the help of the two levels of government concerned, the federal and our own people, we can come to a satisfactory arrangement.

With reference to the tenders of vehicles, may I say first to the hon. member that if he would tell those dealers in his area, who are interested in tendering, to write to us, we would be pleased to put their names on our list. As you know, our procedure is that we obtain quotations from three or more dealers depending on the size of the community, and also there are certain types of people who are preferable in certain areas. When the terrain is very rough it is preferable to have a certain make of vehicle which has good ground clearance. I would also like to mention that in certain areas what is very important is not only the purchasing of the vehicle but in finding places where the vehicles can be serviced. This also has a bearing. So I would like again to remind the hon. member that we certainly have a very open-door policy and would be pleased to consider any of his dealers.

With reference to regeneration, we feel we are doing a fairly good job. For instance, in 1962, we were regenerating 7,500 acres and in 1968-1969 this year, we will be regenerating 153,000 acres. I agree with those who have spoken that we should be doing more and we will be doing more. We are intensifying our regeneration programme where we are getting more mechanical or more automated with tubed seedlings. For instance, this year we are planting, I believe, 22 million tubed seedlings, quite an increase. This programme only started about four years ago and we are becoming more and more automated. I feel that we will be able to substantially inrease.

With reference to research, I would like to mention that last year we were spending on research $1,444,400. This year we will be spending $1,661,600, and this is an increase of 15 per cent—$217,200.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): How much did you say—$1.6 million?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This year we are spending $1,661,600.

Mr. Sopha: Well it is not in the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This is under votes 1106 and 1110. Vote 1110 is the vote on basic organizations and that is where most of the expenditures come—in the field organizations. So this year we will be spending $1,661,600.

I know some of the members feel we should be doing more and I agree that today research is certainly a very important function. We are working very closely with the Ontario research foundation and we are also working very closely with the University of Toronto which is doing wood quality studies for us. Also, with the University of Toronto under ARDA programmes we are doing forest productivity studies, and again with the University of Toronto we are doing pre-breeding studies at pre-breeding establishments throughout North America and Europe.

Force fertilization also is being studied. This is a field that we are most interested in, as the hon. member for Sudbury knows, since it takes somewhere between 60 to 100 years to grow a black spruce tree and therefore we must try to find means to stimulate increased growth. Also at the University of Toronto we are doing seed research, so we are doing a fair amount of research in conjunction with the university and the Ontario research foundation.

Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering whether there are other comments that I may have omitted in reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Rainy River.

With reference to the hon. member for Thunder Bay, he brought two or three matters to my attention. With reference to the forestry study unit, this is a very important study, and we have implemented 26 recommendations so far. Nineteen are under consideration and will be implemented as soon as conditions permit, and the balance, 25, are still under very active study.

He referred to recommendations 40, 42 and 51. With reference to 40, this is integrated operations, I believe. This is certainly one of the most important ones and may I say that this question of utilizing our limits to the fullest possible degree is one that we have given a lot of thought to in the last six months. I have written to all the Ontario pulp and paper company presidents and we have met with them and we will meet again. I have met with the Ontario lumber association, and we have met with many others. What we are doing with one of the recommendations—I believe that it is No. 42 with

reference to the allowable cut—whenever the 21-year licences come up for renewal with the major pulp and paper companies, there is a clause which says at the end of three or five years, depending on the condition, that the surplus unused allowable cut may revert to the Crown.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Maple-doram stated that 10 years ago.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We are doing it—I can send you copies of our agreements—as the licences come up for renewal. We told the industries that the wood must be utilized. If they say that it is not economic—if it is not economic to one firm, it will be economic to the others. We are doing this and we will be doing more of this. Now, some of you—I forget whether it is the hon. member for Thunder Bay, or who—mentioned the lack of growth in Ontario.

We too, are very concerned about the lack of new mills in the province of Ontario, and there are many reasons for this. I think that it was mentioned that mills are going up in British Columbia and other parts of the province. I would like to mention first that in Ontario we have, and have had for a number of years, been very fortunate in having some of the larger and very enterprising and confident pulp and paper companies. One of the reasons why we met them is to find out what could be done to stimulate the addition of existing industries. As you gentlemen may know, there are many problems facing the pulp and paper industry. One is over-production in Canada at the moment and the other is that markets are down. However, all indications are that by the years 1970 to 1972 there will be an increase which will get larger.

In British Columbia, they are building for various reasons, including volume. In British Columbia the average volume per acre is somewhere above 50 cords or cubits per acre.

In Ontario the average is about 10 or 15. Also, Ontario has about the highest unit cost per cubic foot in Canada. British Columbia is also closer to the markets. The Japanese interests are building three mills, and they have the 12-month shipping season. However, we are doing all we can to find ways and means to stimulate the industries, and I am very optimistic that we can be helpful. Mr. Morrison—mentioned in my remarks as the former chief of the timber branch—is in Europe. The purpose of his being there is to try to find out how much capital investment is available for forest industries in Ontario and also to study markets.

We need more markets and we are expanding our sales force in conjunction with the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall). With reference to Nipigon, to Norply, we working on the problem of timber supply with the three parties concerned and as late as today the department was carrying on discussions about this matter. The hon. member for Thunder Bay knows that our department had met several times during the past months with various parties and we are doing all we can to try to make it possible for an interested party to establish themselves in Nipigon.

With reference to that matter raised about timber for the Indian group at Lake Nipigon area, our department is not aware of an application for timber from this group. If the hon. member could supply me with the details, I will be pleased to look into it. With reference to the Indian population, this is an area in the forest operation where they are most skilful. Last year, for instance, we hired about 1,300 Indians for tree planting. In certain parts of the province we are doing all we can to assist them with reference to employment in the timber industry. If the hon. member will give me the details I will be pleased to look into it.

There were some questions about cohoe, a new species of fish for Ontario. What we are doing in Ontario, as was mentioned by my remarks, is introduce cohoe here. I believe that this is the fifth year, and I believe that the results have been most successful. Cohoe have been brought in from British Columbia and introduced into Georgian Bay and other parts of Lake Huron. Splake has been introduced into Lake Huron to compensate for the loss of the lake trout. We are getting very good results with both splake and cohoe. We are working very closely with Michigan and other states, and as a matter of fact, our people are currently meeting in the Westbury hotel. They have met for the last two days with the Great Lakes fishery commission.

We are looking very closely at the introduction of cohoe in Lake Michigan, but this is a very costly programme. I believe that the state of Michigan is spending in the millions of dollars in building a hatchery. Their cost for the cohoe project is as much as the total budget for fisheries stocking in Ontario. This is about all I have at the moment and I am sure that I have missed some of the comments that the members brought to my attention, but I will be pleased to try to answer them.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the remarks made by my

young colleague from Rainy River and was certainly impressed with the breadth and scope with which this young man approached the very interesting subject. This department is one that gives a great measure of enthusiasm to a member, especially one who represents a northern Ontario riding, because this department deals with the optimium utilization of one of our most important natural resources.

I have always had a private belief—and very genuinely held by evidence brought by the senses over the years—that one of the chief impediments to the proper development of the natural resources of the province has been the fact that the natural resources are controlled in their direction from Toronto. There had been too many people occupying the upper floors of high buildings in the commercial core of Toronto who, when they look out of their windows, can see only the occupants of other high buildings. They lose a sense of the broad expanse of this province, its people, resources, and potential. The annual report of this department, of course, demonstrates the validity of the criticism that to some measure obtains with The Department of Lands and Forests.

One observes with a great deal of gloom that of the complement of the department, something in excess of 25 per cent of the staff is in Toronto out of 2,270 of the employees that are called regular. I do not know what the word regular means—it might mean that they are regular fellows—but I think that it is meant to give the connotation that they are regularly employed by the department. Out of 2,270 of them, 581 are situated at head office, and that depresses me greatly.

I firmly believe that the Minister is burdened by too many desk generals at headquarters. They have forgotten the lore of the field, the smell of the pine. Only by memory can they conjure up visions of the rushing rivers and streams, and all the other pastoral pursuits given by the wilderness that exists over four-fifths of the land area of this province, over which this department has jurisdiction, which comprises quite a remarkable percentage of the wealth of Ontario. In all perhaps it is *apropos* to cite the following —and I do not do it in any spirit of derision at all. If you walk out of the Royal York hotel at 9 a.m. and see union station spewing forth hundreds of persons, an equal number coming out of the subway, you do not have to be impolite, cynical or derisive to harbour a secret thought when you look at them going to their desk jobs, the filing cabinets and the computers. Reflect for just a moment that somebody else in the province is doing the work, the real work in the production of its natural wealth.

Of all the departments of government—of all of them that ought to be decentralized—this is the prime example. This department deals principally with northern Ontario, north and west of the French, and that is where the timber resources are.

There was a time in the life of this province when the Booths, O'Briens and McLellans down in the Ottawa valley looked over the vast stretches of the white pine and said: it will never be cut down. Then before they knew it, they woke up one morning and it was cut down.

You have to get a regional forester now to take you out and show you a white pine, south of the district of Parry Sound. But the timber is in the north—which leads me to interject that the other thing that bothers me about this department, in addition to its centralization in Toronto head office—is that this department is too engaged in the tourist business. This department pokes its nose, to put it bluntly, far too much into tourism. There is too much flash in this department concentrated on making the tourist comfortable. We have a Department of Tourism and Information and this department—I say most frankly—has no business whatsoever being in that branch of enterprise. But it just seems—in its publications, in the verbal emissions that you see from this department—that there is such a tremendous preoccupation with the natural wonderland of Ontario and its savable characteristic to those who visit it from abroad.

I would like to see this department—maybe I am a minority of one in the life of this province, if I am then I will plant my feet firmly in the rug and stick with that position —engrossed to the exclusion of all else in the optimum use of our timber resources. Preoccupied in that alone—and indeed, I hastily add—that which goes hand in hand with it, the conservation measures that are necessary to perpetuate our forest resources.

The Minister might, just as a lark, send a questionnaire around to those 2,270 and ask them how many of them read the book, *The Coming Age of Wood*, written in the early 1950's. It would be curious to see the response, to have revealed the multiple uses to which the forest resources can be put. In almost everything we use or touch nowadays, there is wood some place in the process. It is true that other provinces have

outstripped us in the attraction of industry to use our forest resources.

British Columbia is far ahead of us and the Minister says—I can summarize what he said in one word—it is rainfall. It is rainfall, that is what he said in the lengthy answer he gave my friend from Rainy River. The winds that beat up against the coast range dump more rain and therefore the trees grow faster and thicker in British Columbia.

Well, at one time, of course, when they were cutting down the white pine in Ontario, Ontario led the way in the utilization of forest resources. That has slipped now. Well, how does the rainfall in British Columbia explain Domtar's choice of le comté Abitibi dans la belle provence comme une préférence pour Blind River? How does it explain that? Yet they had the chance of getting Domtar and I was told that KVP did not mind if another company opened up the street, so to speak, from them. In the final stages, of course, that industry was lost to the province of Quebec. That has nothing to do with the rainfall in British Columbia and, certainly, the markets for forest resources are handier to this central province than they are to the province beyond the mountains. So there is a good deal unexplained. I go back to the earlier proposition that I made, that I want very shortly, to see this department engaged in almost total emersion—a good Baptist phrase—in the utilization of our forest resources and a putting aside of all this distracting preoccupation that is involved in promotion of the tourist industry.

These are the greatest entertainers in the world. These are the greatest hosts. They outstrip the Minister of Tourism and Information and give him his $75,000 as a head-start to his private fund. These guys are professionals in entertaining. Come from any part of the world you want and they will show you nature's wonderland of Ontario.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Why the city of Montreal—

Mr. Sopha: Pardon?

Mr. White: The city of Montreal spent more than the whole province of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: Well, fine. They are in another world. We cannot compete with them.

Mr. White: Go on, do not think that—

Mr. Sopha: For further proof, of course, I summon another piece of evidence to show the attraction of America to this Minister. My friend from Rainy River was quite right when he spoke in the nationalistic spirit that he did. It showed his identification with Canada at the age of 25, and it is a matter of great enthusiasm to me. He is right when he complains about the patronizing of our American friends by this department. Did you notice the answer that the Minister gave to my question about the sale of our sovereign rights—our land? Fifteen per cent of the sales of the sovereign rights to the freehold that we have go to America.

Mr. White: Oh, you would cram the province of Ontario into a tiny mould and lock the lid.

Mr. Sopha: Fifteen per cent. What right does any American, that we have always welcomed here—despite that yammering—there is not a Canadian alive worth his salt that has not demonstrated the utmost of courtesy and good hospitality to his American cousin when he comes to visit. They get along immensely. But what right do they have when they come here to purchase from the Minister of Lands and Forests part of the freehold of this country and for the Minister conversely to alienate part of the freehold to non-residents in the way he does? But it would be—

An hon. member: From the deep south!

Mr. Sopha: Where was he born? He has always sounded like a Yankee to me. Judging by his intellectual contributions he would come from south of the Mason-Dixon line.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): He is a carpet-bagger!

Mr. White: I am from Kansas City, Missouri, on the north side of the Mason-Dixon line. I am a Canadian by choice, unlike my friend opposite.

Mr. Sopha: Well—

Mr. MacDonald: Listening to you, we are all from Missouri.

Mr. Sopha: —in saying that, I happen to know throughout the middle ranges of the administration of this department, you have people who are convinced of the validity of the replacement of the grant of freehold of summer resort locations by a lease—a 25-year lease perhaps. Long enough time for a man to enjoy during his natural life. But, why does not that permeate through the higher echelons of this department to the desk of the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We are considering it.

Mr. Sopha: I am glad to hear that, that is very encouraging. Now at this stage support to the proposition that I make that the business of this department is the cultivation of our forest resources. I think it a total indictment that out of a budget of $48 million that the Minister informs us that the total amount for research in silviculture in 1966-1967 was $614,000. If there is, as the Minister says, a momentary depression in the forest industries; one gets the impression from the financial pages that some of those companies are not too well managed. When you see the decline of their share value, the decline of their equity, the decline of their sale and reduction of their profits, one gets the impression that they are not too well managed. Apparently there is a depression in the industry, but surely, in the long term, this is but a momentary recession.

In that regard, whenever you pick up any document written by someone who has some special knowledge in this field, concerning the future of this industry, then you are struck by the optimistic outlook regarding the demands upon our forest resources.

And one that I ran across by chance is that compendium published last year under the editorship of Careless and Brown, called "The Canadians," 1867-1967. In the article written by Roderick Haig Brown, entitled "The Land's Wealth," he points out that in the next 20 years the demands upon our forests are going to be double. How do we meet that day? How do we prepare ourselves for that day? By spending $600,000 in a year on research.

The Minister says the member from Sudbury knows that it takes 60 to 80 years for a black spruce to come to maturity. Well he credits the member for Sudbury with a good deal of knowledge, which I duly appreciate.

Mr. Nixon: That is mostly around Kapuskasing.

Mr. Sopha: Yes that would be around Kapuskasing where—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member for Sudbury travels a lot.

Mr. Sopha: It is so unrealistic to suggest that we in Ontario might be in some way equating the affluence of people in the Scandinavian countries where the utilization of their forest resources is treated in much the same way as farming. They actively engage in farming of the forests, and to have been there and seen their forests, the well-ordered way in which they are laid out, and then to experience Canada, to have lived in Canada, is to realize that one of the greatest inhibitions against our development is the sense we have of the wide expanse of land and the multiplicity and the occurrence of resources in gross.

We have been victimized by the size of our resources. We have not speculated. We have not directed our efforts to the intensification of production. We reap production of those resources. We just assume that we have a lot of them, and with a reasonable amount of effort and attention that they will always be there.

Last year I asked what was being done in the realm of research in the fast-growing species. I have not looked at the answer, but I remember that it was enough to discourage one from listening. The Minister was sitting down there at that time, more toward the centre. If as he says—to go back to his argument—the land does not produce enough in a given area to make it attractive to the location of a mill, then the answer that would occur to a layman would be that the increase of production on a given amount of land would provide the raw material.

Now the area of plywood immediately comes to mind. My leader and I have knowledge of a venture in Nipigon that failed. An inquiry elicited the information that it failed because of the shortage of raw material—the handiness of raw material. Well I say to the Minister that—

Mr. MacDonald: How about incompetent management?

Mr. Sopha: I do not know, and I hesitate to condemn a person.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, that was a rather important factor.

Mr. Sopha: I would hesitate to condemn, but I will not go into it. I could appreciate the motivation you would have for saying that. But I will not go into it.

Mr. MacDonald: I can appreciate your motivation for ignoring it.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I do not know, but I have an idea why you would say that, and the reason would be somewhat sinister.

But the Minister, I would expect, appreciates these companies are not going to haul the raw material over a large extent of territory. They do not appear to use the rivers

to any great extent, for the shipping of the raw material. Coming by road, then becomes a matter of economics, which is very germane to the profit picture.

So, at least one can say to the Minister freely, without being thought to be starry-eyed about it, that this department ought to make the venture into the realm of fast-growing species at a very early date.

Now, it seems to me that the Ontario Paper Company prided itself on Manitoulin Island that they were developing, or they were making research into this very area. I do not know how successful they were, but my memory is pretty good and I recall one of the officials of Ontario Paper telling me that they had a hardwood that would regenerate in something like 14 years to the point where it might be utilized.

Notwithstanding the success they might have had, they vacated Manitoulin Island as being economically impractical. Which, of course, leads to another very sensitive point.

Mr. MacDonald: Is this a second lead-off speech?

Mr. Sopha: This bothers the member, does it not? Every time somebody make a valid point—

Mr. MacDonald: No, it is breaching the rules—

Mr. Sopha: —he barks away. Well, as I said the other night, the dog barks, but the caravan passes by.

Mr. MacDonald: We will see.

Mr. Sopha: This department regards Manitoulin Island, of course, as being totally a recreation paradise. That is the typification, the tourist-orientation of this department. Perhaps sometime later in the estimates—I am not going to go into it—I will demonstrate how the Indians have been put aside by this department, how the farmers have been put aside. This is the garden of Eden to this department. Manitoulin Island must be a tourist paradise to The Department of Lands and Forests. As far as this department is concerned that will be its sole industry. It will not be anything other than a tourist mecca.

I am grateful to have had the opportunity to make those remarks only by way of enlargement for my friend from Rainy River. But to go back to where I began, I would like to hear from the Minister a rationale why 581 of these employees at head office should not be removed into the field. Removing them would mean the removal of the decision-making process close to the site. Perhaps the ideal situation would be that the only necessity for contact with head office would be to get the approval of the Minister himself on important matters of policy.

Everything else relevant to the department's activity could be decided in Kenora and Port Arthur and Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury and Cochrane and Sioux Lookout, and then the other places for the regional installations. But the trouble is that when it comes down to the head office here, the decision is made in an environment—not of trees and lakes and fish and wildlife and the call of loons in the night—but in an environment where the person making the decision, if he looks out the window at all, can see only the Hepburn building or the Whitney building.

He lacks entirely the intellectual environment in which to come to a decision that collates all the relevant factors that are important in respect of decisions affecting our natural resources.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: First may I say that if it were left to the choice of the employees themselves, quite a large number would prefer to be in the field rather than at headquarters here. As a matter of fact, we sometimes have a little difficulty in getting some of our key field personnel to come to Toronto.

Mr. Sopha: Send them out then.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: But I would like to say to the hon. member that we are decentralizing the department more and more. As he may know, we have 21 districts. The district foresters have a lot of authority and they are getting more. One of the recommendations of the forestry study unit under Mr. Brodie, is that the district forester be given more authority.

We have two regional directors in northern Ontario, one for northwestern Ontario, one for northeastern Ontario, and one for southern Ontario. These regional directors have a tremendous amount of authority. But we are doing this more and more, giving more authority to our district officers. We have, in addition, 4,500 seasonal employees in the field, not including, of course, our firefighters.

Now, 80 per cent of the money that we are discussing now, 80 per cent of our expenditures are in the field.

The hon. member for Sudbury made reference to the fact we should be concentrating more on timber, on the forest industries, and not so much on recreation. My answer to

this would be that we believe in the multiple-use concept—using our resources, our water and land resources on a multiple-use basis. This is our objective.

With reference to Domtar, there are some very good reasons why Domtar located in la belle provence instead of the Blind River area. The main reason is the high percentage of black spruce which, of course, is the choicest tree for newsprint. Now, the Blind River area is predominantly a pine and hardwood area and therefore is not as suitable for their purposes as was the Tebion area.

I would like to mention, with reference to Blind River, we have in the province of Ontario five sites for future expansion and Blind River is today receiving considerable attention—

Mr. MacDonald: By the government, or prospective operators?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —receiving considerable attention by the government in making contacts. We have had many discussions within the last year with certain companies and we are still negotiating with these companies. As I said earlier, at the present time there is over-production and there is a depressed market, which is a temporary situation. But the Blind River area is probably one of the most attractive areas in the province due, of course, to the fact that it is on the Great Lakes and accessible to the huge markets of the northern states, Michigan, Ohio, Minnesota, and so forth.

So, Mr. Chairman, with reference to research again, may I remind the hon. member for Sudbury that we will be intensifying our expenditures in research. We are, in Canada, I believe, either the first or second province for the amount of money spent on research. I believe British Columbia and ourselves are about the only provinces who are doing it.

On vote 1101:

Mr. Chairman: Before the member proceeds—he has the floor—but I would just like to point out to the committee that there is a separate vote, vote 1106, for research; 1107 for the timber branch. In addition to that, if the members would look at vote 1110, which is the basic organization and field services, and which covers the major amount of total expenditure on the research part so, on vote 1101: the remarks on any of these other votes could perhaps be left to those specific votes.

Mr. Sopha: I cannot understand. May I take that up with you? I just cannot understand how this department lays out its estimates. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to look at page 84.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: Under the five items beginning with fish and wildlife down to timber, you will see millions of dollars totalling $37,302,000. Then if you go back and start at vote 1102 right through to vote 1107, you notice relatively minor amounts are picked up.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, the member is quite correct and the Chairman thought there was going to be some difficulty in dealing with these votes, so—

Mr. Sopha: Well, take 1103, for example, over on page 84 in vote 1110—they have $10,570,000. Why should they pick out a mere $290,000 and put it there? I would think that the provincial auditor would prohibit them from doing that.

In the allocation we voted the money, and they separated it into two separate votes. One may go to write a cheque the provincial auditor has to approve. Then they have got two votes in which to attribute that cheque.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury is quite right and I do not know what we can do other than to include vote 1110 with these other—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: May I say a word, Mr. Chairman? Votes 1111 and 1110, as it says, are for basic organization and field services.

The other votes, like vote 1102, fish and wildlife branch, 1103, forest protection branch —these are the administrative offices. But for instance, with reference to research, this is a special vote. The same as parks is under vote 1105, research is vote 1106. That is the research branch. Maybe I am to blame and I should have reminded the chair that really the remarks of the hon member for Sudbury should have come under research, as a special vote.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I did not want to interrupt the member—

Mr. Sopha: Yes, but from the broad spectrum of the activities of this department—surely the broad aims of this department should be under this vote.

In that regard I have just one further comment to make. I want to read to the House this one paragraph from this book. This article written by Roderick Haig Brown —a very excellent volume entitled: "The

Canadians 1867 and 1967," under the editorship of Professor Careless and R. Raith Brown, outstanding Canadian scholars, to contribute to this survey of our history of the last 100 years. I do not know this Roderick Haig Brown. One recognizes the names of a good many of the others; for example, there is a fellow in here by the name of Laurier LaPierre, and also John Saywell, but it does not tell much about who Roderick Haig Brown is, except he comes from Campbell River, B.C., and he has written on natural resources. With that background I would like to read this paragraph from his article, entitled "The Land's Wealth."

> If the Canadian forest industry is to hold its high place in the Canadian economy and its relative position in world markets, it is believed that the yield of Canadian forests must be doubled within the next quarter century. Any such achievement seems highly unlikely without basic forest research on a scale not yet attempted anywhere in the country.
>
> There is at present, for instance, little real knowledge of forest ecology, or forest soils, and little work has been or is being done. There is no outstanding school of forestry in any Canadian university. Though schools of forestry in the universities of New Brunswick, Laval, Toronto and British Columbia do some research, the total research investment being shown at the resources of tomorrow conference was $130,000 annually, a truly pathetic figure for an industry employing 300,000 persons with an annual payroll of $1.2 billion.
>
> At the same conference it was pointed out that the federal government of the United States employs nearly 1,000 professional research workers for 783 million acres of forest, the United Kingdom 141 workers for four million acres, and Canada, 323 for over one billion acres.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

May the Chairman suggest: On vote 1101, from item 4 to item 12, there are certain specific items which have no relation to the remaining votes. Perhaps we could deal with vote 1101 and then take from 1102 on to 1110 specifically. Could we deal with 1101 now and then if there is anything in that particular vote, let us get rid of it now?

Mr. MacDonald: Fine. In other words, you are going to lump them all in one.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, if there is anything that has been missed the Chairman will not restrict the debate.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Mr. Chairman, on the main office, the one point I wanted to raise has to do with policy and I think it would most appropriately be raised here. During the past year, as the Minister knows, there has been a study completed on that rather controversial question of shoreline, and the alienation of Lake Erie beaches from the public domain into private hands. This study was done by Professor John N. Jackson of the department of geography at Brock University. Queries were put to the Minister shortly after the study became public and he indicated that the government was examining it and making up its mind.

In view of the fact that the Minister has said nothing on it in his introductory remarks, I assume that they have not made up their minds, but in the hope that they have made up their minds, I would like to ask him what conclusions they have reached. When he replies, just in case he has not come to a conclusion yet, I would like to advance one general proposition. Without going into the many aspects of this study which covers: "recreational development on the Lake Erie shore," I would like to focus attention for the moment on the specific problem of title to lots, and whether or not the beach is in private hands or whether it is public domain; in other words, whether the shoreline is up beyond the high water or whether it is down at the water's edge, so that the beach can be public domain.

I would remind the Minister that the argument that has been advanced by the government is that it cannot really move in and reclaim for the Crown, beach which has now been claimed as private property, because this would involve expropriation and great costs. But this argument really does not stand up in light of experience. I acknowledge that the titles vary almost as often as there are titles, and how one can bring order out of the infinite chaos of titles, going back to the early part of the 19th century is admittedly a difficult problem.

But the important thing is this: This government, back in the early 1940s, saw fit, as I understand because of the needs of the war, to pass an Act which in effect altered the law so that the beaches became public property. The borderline between private and public property was up the bank at the high-water

mark—the very high-water mark. For ten years that was the case, by a statute, by an Act of Parliament. The government's Act, in effect, superseded all of the titles and said, "This is public domain."

Now after 10 years, for reasons I am not completely aware of, the government changed its mind and reverted to the position that had been the case in the early 1940s. In other words, they returned all of this public beach to private holders. If you happened to own property bordering on it, you could claim the beach, even if it was a considerable width right down to the water's edge.

The government's argument in the last year or so has been that to take this away from them would, in effect, be taking private property away without compensation. Let us look at the reverse of the argument for a moment. Back in 1941 when the government, in effect, deprived private holders of all the beach, they took it away without any compensation. Indeed, what happened was that in many instances people bought property during that decade—roughly the early 1940s to the early 1950s—and the value of the property was considerably appreciated by returning to them the beach when you changed the law in 1951. So this kind of intervention by the Crown on behalf of the public domain is not an unheard-of thing; this has been done. Indeed, this Conservative government, since its election in 1943, did it, admittedly in a way that might cause less public outcry. They handed public property back to private owners.

Now that does not cause an outcry, but for those of us whose responsibility it is to speak on behalf of the public interests, and the public treasury, I think that perhaps the outcry should be coming from us. However, I have made the point that I wanted to draw specifically to the Minister's attention, in case the government is still arguing that it cannot intervene this way because it would be an unwarranted encroachment on private rights. I would solicit from the Minister some comment as to what the present state of thinking is of the government on the recommendations of Professor Jackson or any variation thereof.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to make some comments at this time. Really, though, this should come under vote 1105, the parks branch. However, I would say that it is a very complex matter. Since 1962 we have acquired 45 miles of waterfront property along the Great Lakes and we have at the present time another 37 miles under consideration.

Mr. MacDonald: Some of it on Lake Erie?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: In Welland county?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right.

Also, with reference to the study to which the hon. leader of the NDP is referring, this departmental study of between 1,400 and 1,500 township plots in some 76 townships fronting the Great Lakes has been completed. A legal opinion is presently being prepared by our department on the extent of beachland in these townships which may be in public ownership. The wording used in the grants from the Crown for these lots varies in terminology—and may I say that some of these grants are quite old; some are over 100 years old and they vary considerably.

Approximately 40 per cent of the lots were granted by reference to the lot and concession only. About 25 per cent were granted on the basis of description of the land, including the lot and concession number, but in addition they described the exterior boundary of the lot as along such line as the water's edge, the lake, the shore, the bank, or the high-water mark in the front. The remaining 35 per cent of the lots were described by various combinations of the above.

At this time it appears that the policy which may be followed is one of acquiring privately owned land where it is in the public interest to do so. May I say, Mr. Chairman, as was mentioned in my remarks—now this is generally speaking of course—we have acquired during the past year, 42 per cent more than the previous year, and we are doing more of this. We need to acquire more. We are purchasing as much beachland as we possibly can. Of course, the cost is very high.

Also during the past year, due to an amendment in the regulations of The Municipal Parks Act, we have made it possible now for municipalities to obtain grants under The Municipal Parks Assistance Act for beachland areas without the obligation of having camping sites. This is for those areas along the Great Lakes. Up until now—this was only introduced late last fall—we have not had many applications, but this, Mr. Chairman, is a very complex problem and it is quite true what the hon. member says, that in 1940 the government of the day amended the Act whereby it declared that all the beaches were public, and this brought about some varied—

Mr. Sargent: In what area?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well this was general throughout the province.

Mr. Sargent: All of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, to my knowledge. And this brought about some very complicated legal problems and the government felt that it was very confiscatory in nature—

Mr. Sargent: It is a good word.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —and therefore, in 1951 I believe, they amended the Act to revert to its original intent.

Mr. Sargent: What year was the amendment?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In 1951—but I think the member will agree that it is a complex matter. People who have title to their lands and who have had this in the family for over one hundred years, and who claim they have ownership of the beaches—to have it taken away would cost the government millions of dollars. What we are doing is acquiring land in those areas where we feel the need is for public use—and we are making substantial grounds.

Mr. MacDonald: I wonder if the Minister would permit me to intervene here. There are two aspects: First, I am sorry if this had better come under parks but I was deliberately putting aside the parks aspect of it. I recognize that this is involved; I know, for example, that Welland county has been seeking a provincial park in the controversial area for quite some time. This would be not just the beach, but it would take considerable land back from the beach into the hinterland. What I am interested in at the moment—and this is policy and I did not think it related to parks—is clarifying the ownership of the beaches as such. I am intrigued by the Minister saying that the government found, in 1951, that something that they had done in 1940 was confiscatory.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It was a different government I believe.

Mr. Nixon: It took you a long time to react.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, this is rather strange. Let us forget for the moment who did it in 1940. Admittedly it was the Hepburn government, but the interesting thing is, if you look at the Act, you will discover that there was no explanation given when the bill was introduced in the House in 1951 by this government—no explanation at all. Go back and look at it in the records. I have had occasion to look at it. It was introduced and nobody know exactly what the significance of the bill was.

As a matter of fact, I have a healthy suspicion, Mr. Chairman, that a few people who had the ear of the government and influence with the government, made representations to have this change made and nobody knew it was being made.

An hon. member: They would not do that.

Mr. MacDonald: Not only would they do it—they did it. So that which was a confiscatory act back in 1940, presumably, if the Minister's argument is to be accepted, was redressed in 1951. Well, it is a rather strange way of solving a problem, because in some instances the property had changed hands, so you hand back to new people, a property that they got at less value, because the beach had been taken away. Suddenly you give them a gift of a whole beach. From that point on, they can claim that it is their own private property.

This government confiscated it—let me assert my own view Mr. Chairman—when the government "confiscated" the beach property in 1940 they were acting in the public interest, because beach property should not, in this fashion, be alienated from the public to the extent that thousands just simply cannot get to the beach at all. This is the source of the controversy, of course.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Would you advocate it without compensation?

Mr. MacDonald: Well you did it without compensation. The government did it without compensation in 1940. They just said that this beach property is public property. The person who happens to buy a cottage lot, on the bank could, in effect, claim that stretch—30 or 40 yards, in some instances—of a beach as private property, because he got an adjoining cottage lot. This is giving away a portion of the public domain.

My main point, Mr. Chairman—and I repeat it, and then let the matter rest—is that governments have intervened one way and the other. I suggest that the government can intervene again, as was done back in 1940, and reclaim the beach for the Crown, or at least make some arrangements, so that the people, who happen to have the cottage in the neighbouring area, are not going to exclude all the great mass of the Canadian

public, and any visitors who may come from this country, from enjoying their heritage of the shoreline of Lake Erie or elsewhere.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): You did say that you were acquiring land in Welland county. Do you want to tell us about it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I am sure there will be many comments and questions on the park vote and I was wondering if—

Mr. Bukator: On this parks vote, I did not want to miss the opportunity of putting you on the spot, because I think I am. I know of no land that you are acquiring.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In the Welland area?

Mr. Bukator: In Welland county.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am sure you must have heard of Effingham park.

Mr. Bukator: Effingham park is in the hinterland.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: You are referring to beachland?

Mr. Bukator: You were talking about "on Lake Erie," that was the question you were answering—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have several areas that we are considering in the hands of The Department of Public Works—as you may know, that is the department which purchases the land—and we have some areas under very active consideration.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps we could deal with this particular aspect raised first by the member for York South. I am sure that the members will not repeat themselves when we come to the parks branch. Now if there is anything further on the point raised by the member for York South, perhaps we should pursue it now.

Mr. Bukator: I know of land along Lake Erie, that I have spoken about in the House on many occasions, where you could have acquired land. I mentioned lands within the last month, that immediately, or close to, the parks commission land, which were acquired originally back in 1885 or 1886. Some were expropriated, many of them, to build that lovely park system that is there now and I can see no reason why this government cannot continue to use that process. Especially when there is 3,300 feet of lakeshore property just above Fort Erie which could be acquired right now. It is for sale, it can be bought, and I know that having said that, it is on the record, and your people will take another look.

These lands should be bought up as they are available. I say that you ought not to expropriate these lands from people who have had them for one hundred years with the many descriptions that the hon. Minister has outlined, because I know—this is not a new argument—that there are many areas that could be acquired now. Along a certain road, there is a golf course. I do not know how many acres, but many, many hundreds of feet of lakeshore property can be bought immediately.

They want to sell, your people have looked to see if The Department of Public Works has this and you can rest assured I will question them also. If you people are looking, I do not want to interfere with the sale. Maybe we should not discuss this so much to get it into the papers because people will want more money. You always have the alternative if they do not want to sell it; you can expropriate it if they get unreasonable. Having told us, or having mentioned it to this House—if you have—that this is being looked at, I look with interest to the day that you acquire the lands that are available now.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce on the same point.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, on the same line, I agree that the member for York South and the member for Niagara Falls have knowledge of the need in the Lake Erie area and the southern lakes, but I am opposed to this confiscation policy insofar as the great north is concerned. I would like to ask the Minister the general policy in this area concerning sale of land, lakes, islands, insofar as your acquisition of land is concerned. We have changing patterns in our economy, we have tourism which is a great industry, and a timber industry which seems to have long-life contracts with your department—but the tourist operator has to operate too, and I would like to know the Minister's policy about this: How much land do you own in the north in the lake area and islands; how much of Ontario do you have title to that you can sell? If you can give me that answer I can get to the point I am trying to make.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I had a distraction there and your last sentence—

Mr. Sargent: I would like to know, Mr. Minister—you are in the act—you said you

have acquired 42 per cent more beachland in the past year.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, no, all land. This included beachland, hunting grounds and marsh lands.

Mr. Sargent: Then the general policy is one of acquisition and the general trend insofar as this section of the public is quite good within bounds. Deviating for a moment, the idea of confiscating land without remuneration is completely wrong. I do not think that is the policy now, but as long as people have access to it, it does not matter who owns it. As long as people have free access to it, I would not care who owns it. But I am asking you now—if your policy is to acquire—how many land acres have you now?

Mr. Chairman: With respect to the member—

Mr. Sargent: This is a very important point to us in the north.

Mr. Chairman: I think that the Minister has pointed out that even the original question raised should have been brought up under the parks branch. I would think that the member for Grey-Bruce is straying a little from the original point.

Mr. Sargent: I am not talking about parks, I am talking about the acquisition of lands.

Mr. Chairman: I know, but this is a little different from the point raised by the member for York South, under the parks branch. We were dealing with the specific point raised by the member for York South which does not really come under this vote as pointed out by the Minister. But we will not restrict the debate on the point the member for Grey-Bruce raised. Now the member for Welland South was trying to get the floor before on this same point.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): I would like to ask the Minister what the definition of the high-water mark is?

I know of many cases where the department is making studies. I am thinking in particular of Bertie township where they can buy a plan or a map and they tell you; brown means to the water's edge and red means to the bank, and one means to the low-water mark. Could you give me the definition of the high-water mark?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I wish I could give him that definition, because you may ask as many lawyers and land surveyors as you like and you will get different answers. This is one of the reasons why the definition of high-water mark is so complex. Some claim it is the water's edge, others claim that it is at the regular—I do not know exactly what is meant by the high-water mark.

Mr. Haggerty: There must be some regulations sometime under the Act way back. I have a clipping here about Elco beach. This is a problem that is going to crop up day after day—perhaps in the near future—of trespassing charges and this the NDP member was mentioning here. Mr. Ronald St. Louis, Fort Erie, Ontario, was charged Saturday with trespassing in connection with an incident in Elco beach here on June 7. Now, we talk about riparian rights for certain property owners and yet here is a man who travels the lakeshore just for a walk and he is being charged. Has this man not any title to that beach at all, to walk along the shore? In many cases the solicitors will tell you that the person who own this property had riparian rights. This is fine, you have the Niagara parks system and there are many beautiful homes built along it. Those persons have riparian rights and yet you have a park in front of their property the public have use of it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I have one definition of high-water mark. High-water mark will mean the level at which the water in a navigable body of water has been held for a period sufficient to leave a water mark upon the bank of such a navigable body of water.

I cannot give you an answer as to why this person has been restricted from walking on this shoreline. Unless we have court cases in the last year, where the judge has ruled, has not taken action on it because of the complications—

Mr. MacDonald: That is why you have got to clarify it. It is so complicated that there is an obligation on the Crown to bring order out of this infinite chaos. I think there is some validity in the judge's comment.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I agree with the leader of the NDP, that we should get some clarification. I am hoping that sometime—now that we have completed this study—within the next year that we will have—

Mr. MacDonald: You have got to make certain that the lawyers really do clarify it for us laymen.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, may I ask one more question on this? What right have

certain property owners—if you call them property owners, in certain parks to run strings of barbed wire out 10 to 100 feet out into the water?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We examine each title, and each title varies. It would depend on what their title says. Some titles, I understand, under some of the old English law, indicate ownership up to half way out into a river. Others say up to the water's edge. So it is very difficult to give an answer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Surely in water, according to law, complete access cannot be barred—you cannot bar anyone from it. Shoreline is federal, it is federal property.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The Great Lakes—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I think the Minister has recognized and stated that it is a problem he simply cannot answer in this discussion due to the confusion. Is there anything that can be added to that?

Mr. Bukator: Yes, on the Lake Erie property again, the thing that my hon. friend from Welland South was talking about is this. You have a 66-foot road on the original road down to the property. Now the people who live behind on many properties on many of the subdivisions come down on street ends. This goes on all through Welland county. Every 66-foot street is supposed to be left open to the lake but the people may own the property on either side, up to the low water mark—or to a point so many feet from there. And it happens that the banks have receded and so they actually have the property, they claim, out into the water.

What the people of that area do is come down on the 66-foot street like cattle to water and then they spread out into the water. They have been deprived by the land owners on either side from using that lake because they claim they own out into the lake and the others have no business being there.

Having done that, the Frontiersmen—they wear a uniform similar to the mounted police; not the same colour but they look very much like mounted police; if you see them in the dark you could not tell one from the other—are appointed by private concerns to keep the people from spreading out into the lake after they have come to the water by that 66-foot right-of-way. What my colleague is asking, complete with—

Mr. MacDonald: Complete with dogs.

Mr. Bukator: Yes, complete with dogs, and as a matter of fact the worst kind of dog, if it is trained that way, is the police dog. These men have been known to chase people out of the lake because they have come down the street and they want them to stay within that 66-foot area. They cannot spread out into the lake.

What I say to you is, this is not a new problem that you are wrestling with, because the Minister before you was acquainted with it. I know that you have to clean this situation up.

The people of the province of Ontario have a right to use that lake and if they have to be channelled down a 66-foot street and then spread out into the lake they are at least entitled to that privilege. But there are certain land owners who will not allow it and have this police commission, or at least these Frontiersmen, who keep them from it because they get paid to keep the people from getting out into the water.

This is not right and never was right, and I say to this hon. Minister, as I have said before, that there are many areas that can be purchased. I know some of these areas are rock instead of sand. But the group of people who own the old original Erie Beach Company had enough foresight to take this rock, dig it out and build swimming pools of natural water running through them. Again, Erie Beach can be used that way because the old foundations and the old beaches or swimming pools are still there. They even had a pumping station to filter the water.

I say that the people in your department have not the foresight, have not the imagination, and ought to be convinced by someone. I have tried since 1959 to persuade them to buy that property, because I know it can be made into a nice park. Of the people who go to parks along the beaches, I would say 75 per cent of them do not go in the water anyhow. They use the picnic tables, they go to these lovely grounds and lovely shade trees and they watch their children puddle around in the water. I do not think it is necessary to have sand but I do believe it is necessary to acquire all of the land that you possibly can, along these lakes and open it up to the public.

You do not have to go any further than Florida for the solution. There, despite all of the buildings that you have along the way, the shores and the ocean belong to the people and they use them. I do not know why we cannot continue the same policy that the imaginative people who were originally on the parks commission did with the park systems. They come along the water; they

picnic from Niagara Falls to Niagara-on-the-Lake, from Niagara Falls to Fort Erie; the grass is maintained by the park system; they take their children out; they have their picnic and some of them swim.

I think you are missing the boat if you do not acquire Erie Beach before some private enterprise acquires it. There are a few cottages there now, so for a $200,000 investment you could acquire this property in Bertie township. As a matter of fact I should not be talking for Bertie now, I have Niagara Falls to look after. My friend can look after it, but believe me, this is a sound proposition. For $200,000, immediately you have a $15,000 income from the cottages. So it would pay for itself.

I suggest to this Minister that the parks commission is doing so well, and it is so close to it, between the two of you at least you could purchase that property and let them take it and maintain it. As I said before, this is all along the lake. There are paths throughout the whole system, which is grown over with weeds and I know concrete walks. There are fine big trees that money cannot buy. There are 60-some acres in that area that can be purchased very cheaply, just a stone's throw from Buffalo along the lake.

I know I had many of the Ministers there, before your term in office, who looked at it and did not have the imagination and said this would not suffice, it was not big enough. But I say to you that a little portion of the land of about four acres in the village of Chippawa, that belongs to the Hydro, along this particular system, was made into a swimming area and they even brought the sand in. They park about 200 cars, and many hundreds of people enjoy picnicking and swimming in front of my home on a Sunday and on the weekend, enjoying this beach—that is a man-made beach.

This can be done to Erie Beach. It can be done to that stone beach of the golf course that I speak of, and from time to time, small parcels of land can be purchased along the shoreline of Lake Erie.

Mr. Chairman: May I point out to the member that this is beside the point we were debating? It should be discussed under the parks branch.

Mr. Bukator: We were with Lake Erie and I did not want to miss the continuity.

Mr. Chairman: Well, we were talking about the shoreline; the ownership rights and so on.

Mr. Bukator: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: We just wanted to get that point clear.

Mr. Bukator: Let me finish; just another minute or so.

Mr. Chairman: Oh yes, go ahead.

Mr. Bukator: About half a mile of beach along Lake Erie has been leased by a former Minister of Lands and Forests and has been let out on a licence of occupation to Bertie township who control it. That is a beautiful sand beach there. Your people should get together with that township, and since you have been given that authority, to enforce it, to charge the boats that anchor there and to take that money and develop the beaches for the people—the Canadian people—who ought to be able to use those shores that they cannot use now because the Americans have them pretty well tied up. We who live here cannot use those waters and it is not right.

It being 6:00 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.

No. 126

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 19, 1968

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Brunelle, continued 4729

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to 4757

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 1968

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS
(Continued)

On vote 1101:

Mr. Chairman: The member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I want to take one moment—I have no intention of prolonging this question on the beaches issue; the Minister has a difficult task and everybody will concede that he has—but I would like to make this point.

I think that to delay in coming to some decision on this situation is intolerable, not only for the reasons that the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator) talked about this afternoon, but for others that might be added. The proposition of the citizenry being herded around by police dogs and having to go down to the beach through a 66-foot roadway—and, incidentally, I have seen sections of that roadway where the neighbours on either side, if you can believe it, threw glass into the sand so that children running over the road to go to swim would cut their feet.

This kind of undesirable situation has many ramifications, for example, growing tension between Canadians and Americans. When I visited the area I wondered if I was in Vietnam, because there were signs reading "Yanks Go Home," because of the fact that Canadians were being denied the right to go on the beach. I do not need to labour this point at any great length to impress upon the Minister that this kind of situation has got to be resolved. Everybody is not going to be happy when you have resolved it, but at least you will have eased the tension of the situation.

In short, I urge the Minister to grasp the nettle. Postponement is not going to make it any easier to grasp, and I would hope that before this House meets again, to consider the estimates of this department next year, that we will have a solution. If not, I give the Minister fair warning that we are going to spend a lot of time on it.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word about this, because the hon. member for York South is talking about the need for a solution. I would be most interested some time to sit down with the Minister and the people of his department to find some of the ramifications about the departmental decision that repealed the statute of 1940—the Minister called it "confiscatory," or perhaps his pronunciation was a bit better than mine in that regard. But there must have been certain studies done at the time that the government in 1950 or 1951, decided to repeal that decision, because the decision that now rests with the Minister is surely not to return to the 1940 legislation.

I would assume that this would not be one of the possibilities open to him from the way that he described the government's view ten years later. He has, however, had a fairly detailed study done of the chaos, as it has been described, of the legal ramifications of the lot boundaries, but I do not know what alternatives are open to him.

We know that it is government policy to spend $200 million in the acquisition of public lands, particularly along the beaches. Surely that would be no departure in policy. If he is going to spend the money to acquire beaches, then that is something that we on this side would favour. We feel that we have not gotten along quickly enough on that and we can discuss it under parks.

I do not know what the alternatives are that are available to the Minister. Passing a statute that says, once again, that all of the lot lines run down to the high-water mark, or some distance out into the water, would be one of the things he may consider. But I would like to know what machinery the Minister has in motion to arrive at a conclusion, or whether the decision now rests

with himself advising the Lieutenant-Governor and the rest of the council.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks, we, in my department, under the lands and surveys branch, completed the study of these 1,500 lots and now we are getting—

Mr. Nixon: Fifteen hundred; is that all?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I think it is 1,400. The department study says between 1,400 and 1,500 lots in 76 townships fronting the Great Lakes have been completed and a legal opinion is now being prepared. It was mentioned by, I believe, the hon. member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty) that there are areas, public road allowances, leading to these beaches which apparently are being declared private by the adjoining owners. In my very humble opinion these are public property under the jurisdiction of the township. Maybe we should give leadership in the department to make sure that the township does not declare these public areas.

This summer—in the month of August, I guess—I, along with, I hope, my colleague in the parks integration board, the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) and the others—we will go to these areas. Some of my colleagues were there last summer looking at these areas. Unfortunately I was unable to be there at that time and I believe, I am very optimistic, that we can work out some solution. As the hon. leader of the NDP has remarked, we cannot satisfy everyone, but I think our main duty is in the public interest to try and find some satisfactory solution and I am very optimistic.

I heard the warning of the hon. member that before the next session we will have, using his terms, "come to grips" with this problem and I am optimistic that we can find some equitable solution.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise another subject; there may be others who who would like to continue with this one.

Mr. Chairman: On this particular point, before we proceed to vote 1101 generally.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to put the Minister on a spot on this. I had a chat with him for about 20 minutes before 8 o'clock and would like to know what action the Minister is going to take in removing the fences that project out into the lake?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, Mr. Chairman, the way I look at it is each individual lot is a case of its own. Our own people have looked at it in the surveys branch and now in the legal department, and each case will be dealt with individually. We can rest assured that we will try and find a satisfactory solution. I think at this time that you will appreciate that it is very difficult to say just what is the answer.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): With all respect to the Minister who is trying to do a very wonderful job in this department, this does not go. He does not know the answers. We have multi-million dollar assets tied up here and he is asking $40 million for the development of this department and there are certain things we must define.

Mr. Chairman: I must point out to the member again that we are dealing with a specific topic and we are not dealing with the acquisition of lands. We are dealing with the matter of the high-water mark and the beaches and public ownership. It has been pointed out continually that this is something which requires urgent attention and the Minister has indicated he is awaiting a legal opinion on it. He has indicated that he has been awaiting the report and in order to clean up this point I would say to the member that it comes under the parks branch.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to see in this vote where you have money set aside for land acquisition. What vote do you have that in?

Mr. Chairman: It is not in this general vote. It has to do with the provincial parks.

Mr. Sargent: There is nothing in parks about land acquisition at all.

Mr. Chairman: This is where it is, vote 1110; vote 1114 is the capital, of course; votes 1110, 1105 and 1114.

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry. Then the last thing, the policy on land acquisition, the policy of sale of all these properties, will come under this group?

Mr. Chairman: That is right.

Mr. Sargent: Vote 1114?

Mr. Chairman: There will be no restriction on debate on that but this is not the proper place. We want to clean this point up first. The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: One more point.

Mr. Chairman: Right; vote 1101.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, this is another matter of policy that concerns me from time to time. I have delegations from my own Indian reserve in the constituency of Brant and elsewhere who bring to my attention the difficulties they have in abiding by the regulations imposed by the Minister and the government concerning hunting and fishing, in light of their treaties of old.

There have been a number of cases before the courts. I believe my colleague from Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) has been active in these over the years. But the Minister is surely aware that his regulations appear to infringe on the rights given to the Indians in Ontario by their treaty, the treaty negotiations sometimes having been handed down for more than a century. This is a continuing problem and there have been cases in Ontario where the stand and the policy that has been taken by the department has been reversed by judicial decision. There is, of course, the complicating involvement of the federal jurisdiction as well, which has the responsibility for seeing that the Indians' rights under the old treaties are lived up to.

There has been, then, some continuing difficulty. The phrase that is frequently used by my Indian constituents and others is that they have hunting and fishing rights as long as the grass grows and the wind blows, and they feel that the infringement of these rights by provincial regulation and provincial law is really a matter of some seriousness. It is not that so many of them in southern Ontario are dependent on these sources for their livelihood, but it is true, I believe, in some areas of northern Ontario, and even in the southern reservations they are convinced that their rights under the federal laws are being infringed on.

I would like the Minister to comment on provincial policy in this regard, and if he believes that it is our responsibility to live up to these treaties, or whether the Indians should be treated as citizens in the ordinary sense under provincial regulation.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition's remarks I would say that we do honour the provisions of the treaty. Of course, that comes under the federal department.

I am advised, as far as the Six Nations are concerned, at Brant, that there is no treaty with these Indians. There is quite a problem involved with the boundaries of these waters, and I have had correspondence with the hon. Mr. Laing, not in the last few weeks, but up until a month ago. This involved my colleague the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), and again, it is a very complex matter as to the boundaries of the waters—and this refers mainly to northern Ontario.

I am very optimistic that we can come to a satisfactory arrangement and, like yourself and most of the members here, I am very concerned about the rights of the Indians. In my own riding I have more than 5,000 Indians, and we should do everything we possibly can to guarantee their rights.

Mr. Nixon: In the boundary problem that the Minister brings up, you feel that they can be given their treaty rights as long as they stay on their reservation boundaries. I had understood that their rights to hunt and fish were without regard to these boundaries and included the lands that had been normally used by the Indians, before the coming of the white man, for their hunting grounds.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am advised that not all the treaty rights refer to the reserves. This is what I am advised.

Can I ask this of the hon. leader of the Opposition: Have you any other instances that you are aware where the rights of the Indians are being jeopardized?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the ones that come to my attention are usually based on cases that go to the court. The Minister has said that the Six Nations Indians are treaty Indians in the ordinary sense, but he is aware of the fact that the lands that they occupy have been contracting over the years. So there is a legal problem here, if the boundaries were associated with the original agreement.

I do not know whether it is a treaty or not. I understood that it was, that it was signed by Governor Haldimand and that it set aside areas for their use, but these lands have been sold off. Whether they thought they were selling off the hunting and fishing rights as well—probably it never even occurred to them during the time of the sales, in the early 1800s.

The most recent case involving my own area was more than a year ago. Two Indians were caught by the conservation officer, or found by the conservation officer, fishing off the reserve and out of season and were charged with an offence under these regulations. Their defence was that they had the right to do this, as Indians, whether they were on the reserve or off. They were off

the reserve probably 10 or 15 miles at the place where they had habitually done some fishing.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In that particular instance, was the case not dealt with favourably?

Mr. Nixon: Yes, it was, but it was not the kind of a case that can be used. It was dismissed, I understand, under some special circumstances—not because the magistrate decided that the Indians were right and that their treaty of 1791 permitted them to undertake the fishing and the hunting. It was dismissed on some other basis, so it was not the kind of case that could be used as a bench mark as far as their rights are concerned.

I suppose that it would take a lot of discussion with the federal authority, and yet as I understand it, it is the provincial regulations that are imposed in contravention of what the Indians believe are their treaty rights, not the federal.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the leader of the Opposition raised this with a view to clarifying policy. As I understand what the Minister has said, it is provincial government policy that these rights of Indians shall be respected. But then he qualified it by saying that in some instances they do not have treaties, so you get into the question as to whether or not they are covered by a treaty or what area the treaty covers.

I have been most interested in listening to and reading the discussion, of comparable kinds of cases that have been taken to court in New Brunswick and British Columbia in recent months. The unfortunate thing in these cases is that the judge in each instance has expressed great sympathy for the Indians —indeed, he has gone pretty far, and in pretty strong language, in saying that the Indians have had their rights stolen away—but he still ended up with a decision depriving them of their rights under the law as it stood. It was a legal, technical decision that he made, and his words almost suggested that his decision was in violation of the spirit of justice, so to speak.

If that is the case, I would like to suggest to the Minister that if government policy definitely is that Indian rights shall be maintained—presumably anywhere and everywhere, "while the grass grows and the waters flow", and all the rest of the poetry to describe it—then perhaps the only way it can be done is by some amendment which clearly indicates that Indians are exempt from the imposition of the provincial regulations. Quite frankly, I would think this kind of action, if this is government policy, can be taken without any reference to the federal government at all. If you are talking about provincial regulations with regard to fishing rights, the province surely would have the right to say clearly in its regulations that they simply do not apply to Indians. And that would be the only way we could escape all the arguments in the courts with their legal technicalities.

Mr. Chairman: On the same point, the member for Grey-Bruce?

Mr. Sargent: Does he want an answer for that?

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the Minister might reply to both members at the same time.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I have two Indian reserves in my riding in Grey-Bruce, the Chippewa and Cape Croker, and I take it this $40,000 we are voting here is to the Receiver-General—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: What item is that?

Mr. Sargent: Item 7, annuities and bonuses to Indians, $40,000; vote 1101, item 7.

Mr. Chairman: Well, you can speak about that particular item but this is a different item than that which we are discussing.

Mr. Sargent: Well, who is running this show? What vote are you calling here, vote 1101 or what?

Mr. Chairman: We are calling vote 1101. I would say to the member that under vote 1101, discussion has taken place regarding treaty rights to Indians insofar as hunting and fishing is concerned. It is not mentioned specifically in vote 1101 but that is the appropriate vote. We will deal with this point and then the Minister can reply and then anything further under vote 1101 may be discussed. Perhaps the Minister would like to reply before we move on to another topic.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: With reference to item 7, Mr. Chairman, the vote for $40,000. This refers to the Indians under treaty 9 and this is the area lying north of the Albany River. Last year, when this point was brought up, I said that I would look into it. I am informed that there are 14 treaties across Canada providing for annuities which bring $4, $5 and $6 per person, and that it is not the policy of the federal government to renegotiate these specific rates. While it is realized that the payments are minimal, they do serve a very useful purpose. At the time of the year

when the Indian people gather together and the federal representatives and the provincial representatives meet, this is the time when they get together. They exchange mutual ideas and Indians make both representatives aware of their problems.

The policy is to leave it to the treaty provisions—and this comes under the federal government, as they are—to deal with the needs and the problems of the Indian people through a specific programme such as development, education and welfare. May I mention that, in the province of Ontario last year, we spent $200,000 for resources management programmes. This comes under my good friend the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) and, of course, our department which administers the natural resources, is very closely involved. I would like to take a second to mention to you briefly, just what we are doing.

It may be of interest to the hon. members, Mr. Chairman, to know that in Canada the federal budget for this year in 1967-1968 is $137 million. On a per capital basis, this represents per capita federal expenditures for Indians living on reserves—including health—of $950. While this figure of $4 and $5 and $6 sounds very minimal, you must remember that they are spending on a per capita basis, $950. In Ontario we have approximately 50,000 Indians, and out of that number, about half are treaty Indians and half are non-treaty Indians. So this question of defining an Indian is a very complex and quite a legal matter.

With reference to Indians, Mr. Chairman, last year we had 30 projects in our department and these were in forestry, fisheries, fur, wildlife, parks and tourist development. For instance, in tree planting last year we employed 1,407 Indians. Goose hunting camps were another project. The hon. member for Sudbury and those members familiar with the north country know there is a tremendous geese hunting potential in the James Bay area. Indians are the only ones we allow to operate geese camps north of the Albany River, and they have camps at Port Severn, Winisk, Ottawapiskat, Kapuskow, Albany and Sutton River and this is working out exceedingly well. What we are doing this year is trying to help them more by catering also to the fishermen. At Sutton Lake and other areas, after the establishing, we are having some of our own personnel to assist and guide the Indians and after a few years from now they will be on their own.

For instance, with regard to Indian firefighters, do you know that last year we hired 1,300 firefighters? My good friend from Kenora (Mr. Bernier)—he is not here at the moment, but I know he is very interested—would like to know that more than $1 million was given to the Indians for the harvesting of wild rice.

In my own area, we are bringing trappers from the James Bay area, and the Chapleau, Gogama, White River and Sault Ste. Marie districts. Approximately 50 families participated last year in this exercise. As you know, the average gross income of a trapper throughout Ontario is about $500—gross income. This is what happened to these trappers. The average income of these Indians was at least $3,000, though, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to mention that as far as the Indians are concerned, we in The Department of Lands and Forests are doing a lot and as the years go ahead we will be doing a lot more.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1101. The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I just want to suggest to the Minister that this is the second problem that has faced him in these estimates which is a very difficult one— the problem as far as the treaties are concerned and the problem as far as the access to the beaches is concerned. We have in the province, as the Minister knows, a law reform commission of repute. Up until now they have concerned themselves with some of the more esoteric corners of the law, but it would seem to me that the Minister might ask his Cabinet colleagues to agree that this is the sort of thing that might be referred to the commissioners for their careful scrutiny and their recommendations.

Both of these matters, I feel, would very properly go before them and the Minister might consider it. The matter of Indian rights has been hanging on for some time. There are four or five cases each year, and the courts do not seem to have the ability to make decisions which can be binding precedents. There seems to be some difficulty in this regard and it seems to be within the Minister's power in the government to pass statutes which would clarify this, if only they could make up their own minds to see that justice was done.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I will take this up with my colleagues and especially the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart).

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Chairman, in reading over the remarks of the Minister of Lands and Forests, at page 9 of the remarks he says that by January of 1969 all of southern Ontario will be eligible under the Act for assistance, and by 1970 designated management areas in northern Ontario will also be eligible and included in the programme. That is sometime in 1970, we hope. On page 22 he says:

> My department has nearly completed a study of a co-ordinated ten-year resources management plan for road construction and maintenance planned for northern Ontario.

On page 25 he says:

> To ensure that our parks programme will meet the needs of the people of Ontario we are presently collecting information that will enable us to prepare a master plan for outdoor recreation.

I spent considerable time in my opening remarks with regard to the proper use of land. This department has demonstrated to some extent, by the recreation and land use committees that he has set up in the various district forest regions throughout the province, that it has spent considerable time and money in gathering data about the flora and fauna and the characteristics of the lakes, the water in them, the lake bottoms, and the ecology of the area. I was just wondering what kind of overall plan the Minister has for proper land use in the province of Ontario? It would seem to be the only department in the government that is at all concerned about the proper use of land. I venture that The Department of Municipal Affairs, to some extent, is responsible for land insofar as it relates to that land around the municipalities, for the proper assemblage of land and the proper servicing of land.

I spoke about the relationship to The Department of Trade and Development, in regard to the proper location of heavy industry and complexes. I spoke about the pollution aspects and the changing environment with regard to pollution and about the acquisition of land for parks and beaches and swimming areas, wildlife reserves. There does not seem to be any department of government that is concerning itself at all about the proper use of land. Even the Minister of Agriculture and Food, in his estimates, made a passing remark about the proper use of our arable land in southern Ontario, but he said that our ability to grow things on much smaller areas is better than it once was and he did not seem to be too concerned about it.

But when one hears such eminent people as Dr. Norman Pearson, and those qualified in the field, who are vitally interested and disturbed about the proper use of land. Having regard for the climatic conditions that this land happens to be in, and the kind of land that it is, and the use to which it could best be put, I think that it is incumbent upon this Minister and the department to prevail upon his colleagues and particularly the Premier (Mr. Robarts) to make absolutely certain that the best use of the land that we have within our borders is put to the best use for which it is suited.

I was wondering, in view of the brief references that the Minister did make to the proper use of land in his opening speech, if he would elaborate and say if he has an overall plan for the best use of the available land, having regard for those things that it is best suited for in the province.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would commend the member for Thunder Bay because in my opinion, as well of that in the department, we agree that land planning for optimum use is of prime importance. Now, in my own department we have done considerable work and each district is carrying out a land use planning study. You may have heard, for instance, in the district of Cochrane, of the Hoffmeyer report, which was completed three or four years ago, by The Department of Agriculture and Food, in conjunction with The Department of Lands and Forests. This is being done in every district now. It is a major undertaking and we are working closely with the federal government through the Canada land inventory programme where we are making an analysis, and maps are being prepared of the inventory of all the resources.

A considerable amount of work is being done, and I would like to give the assurance that we have come a long way in a relatively short period of time, in making land plans on a very sound ecological basis. I mentioned that each district is carrying out this plan. However, we are making substantial progress, and in certain areas we are getting federal assistance under the Canada land inventory. We are working closely with other departments such as Highways, Mines, Tourism and Information and the Ontario water resources commission, because all the other departments are closely involved, and I think that this is an area which is a most

important area, because it has tremendous impact on all the province.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1101? The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has made an extremely important statement. Quite frankly, I had not been aware that this long-neglected problem of land use had fallen mainly as the responsibility of The Department of Lands and Forests. I am not complaining because somebody, I think, has had to come to grips with the problem and it has been neglected for far too long already. But what I was a little curious about, as the Minister outlines what he was doing, was the extent to which there is a meaningful co-ordination of the efforts of The Department of Lands and Forests, with all the other departments that one normally thinks about as being involved in some decisions with respects to land—departments such as Agriculture.

Is this a new interdepartmental committee, which is going to work closely with the Cabinet to get the necessary co-ordination?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Prime Minister, about two or so years ago, made his design for development. The main body and the other bodies work under this main body.

Mr. MacDonald: The design for development, as I understood it was for the economic development for the province, and to try to get a more equitable distribution of economic development. Now, I would agree that that would involve land use. Is the Minister in effect saying, that one of the government moves within the framework of the design for development is an assessment of land use for the whole province and that aspect of it is being tackled by The Department of Lands and Forests? This is what you are, in fact, saying. I missed the significance of this important task being tackled in your department. Maybe I have been asleep.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, my friend the Minister of Agriculture and Food is responsible for ARDA. ARDA is the one under this Canada land inventory. The Canada land inventory is the main body carrying out this land inventory assessment and capability of all the land resources in the province, both land and water.

Our own Department of Lands and Forests in each district—as you know we have 21 districts and cover the entire province—is carrying out this work in conjunction with the ARDA programme and we are under ARDA. I believe Mr. Fred Ward, who used to be with Lands and Forests, is now working under the ARDA programme of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food. There is a tremendous amount of work that has been done so far and I think that some time, maybe, we should make the House aware of just what has been done.

Mr. MacDonald: I certainly would appreciate that being done because we all agree that it is an extremely important question. But I must confess that the Minister has begun to arouse my fears again. If the ARDA aspect is being carried on in The Department of Agriculture and Food, it seems to me, if I understand correctly what you are saying, that this is an extremely important aspect of it, and yet you are out doing another aspect of the problem. There appears to be too many cooks, and the broth may get spoiled in the process.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, in our department naturally we do the forest aspect, but for the overall agricultural picture, may I ask my colleague, the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food, if he would comment on the ARDA feature?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Chairman, briefly, the Canada land inventory is the responsibility of federal ARDA. It is paid for by the federal government through ARDA. The administration falls within the administration of the various provincial ARDA administrations. The Canada land inventory that applies to the vast areas of this province that are not directly related to agriculture falls within the jurisdiction of The Department of Lands and Forests. The department is a member of the ARDA directorate of the province of Ontario. This is the way it is being done. The Canada land inventory will be completed within the next year or two, if I am not mistaken. I believe the target is within the next 18 months. Parts of it already are completed. But this is the way it is being carried out.

It is a federal responsibility. I should not say it is entirely a federal responsibility—the provinces are all co-ordinating, they are doing the job but federal ARDA is paying for it—and the way it is administered within the provinces is as I have described.

Mr. MacDonald: But that portion of the problem that falls to The Department of Lands and Forests will be an assessment of non-agricultural land, am I right?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The recreation, the forests—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I would not say that entirely, sir, because there are areas where we have a blending of non-agricultural land, as well as agricultural land. Up to the north and east, and north central Ontario, you have extensive operations of The Department of Lands and Forests—and rightly so—but interspersed within that area are sizeable pockets of good agricultural land.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Minister that this is completely inadequate, because you have the federal ARDA programme responsible for a land inventory. They are paying the shot for the inventory and the survey that has been taken in all provinces in Canada.

What I suggested earlier was somebody under some committee set up under the aegis of The Department of Lands and Forests, because obviously they are the only department in this government that seems to be doing anything in a planning way with regard to proper land use in the province. So I would suggest to the Minister that an interdepartmental committee be set up—Department of Lands and Forests, Department of Agriculture and Food, Trade and Development, Tourism and Information—any department of this government that is in any way concerned about, or responsible for the proper use of land.

It should be a co-ordinated effort, so that while The Department of Lands and Forests is acquiring land on a beach someplace, The Department of Trade and Development is not subsidizing an industry that is going to make that beach completely useless for recreation use. I do not see how this government can attack the problem of proper land use in a piecemeal way. I think that one hand has to know what the other hand is doing.

It seems to me that the only way that you are going to be able to do this is by an interdepartmental committee whose responsibility it is to make a complete inventory—assess what particular land is best suited for what purpose and have an overall plan based on decisions made by this committee. I think that is the only reasonable way that you are going to make the best use of the land available.

We have all kinds of land in northern Ontario—certainly it is not suited to agriculture, but it is suited to recreation; it is suited to the forest industry. At the same time, down in southern Ontario, we have about a 50-mile-wide stretch running from, say, Windsor over to Cornwall, that is the only arable land that we have in the province of Ontario. It has been eroded because of pipelines, because of transmission lines, because of highways, because of urban sprawl.

It is not going to be too long, if this keeps up, before you have no arable land at all in the province of Ontario. You are going to be importing all of your fresh produce from outside our borders. Unless you make a decision now that you are going to set aside for agriculture the kind of land that is best suited to that use, and the kind of land that is best suited to recreation, separated from industry, so that one does not conflict with the other, unless you come up with a plan for proper land use along those lines—I think that you are just going at it in a piecemeal basis—you are not going to achieve anything. It is going to be complete chaos.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Briefly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, to the hon. member's concern there is some misunderstanding. In this plan that the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food said is just about completed there has been very close co-ordination. We have received federal assistance through ARDA and this plan takes in the Georgian Bay and north Georgian Bay recreational area. That report has been completed—the study has been completed and the report will be available some time this fall.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, no.

Mr. Sargent: You have not paid your bills.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle. There has been very close co-ordination and I, Mr. Chairman, sometime in the future, would like to get the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food to inform the House of the progress, because this is just about completed. There has been some of the closest co-ordination between all departments and the work is just about completed.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1101, the member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the Minister on his presentation thus far and his replies to our opening remarks. It is something like sparring with one of these punching bags, Mr. Chairman. We make a statement and you agree and the bag keeps coming back

to us. We can't get at you, you are just like a sponge.

I say, "You are not doing enough in research." You say, "Yes, we are. Isn't that too bad?" I say, "You are not doing enough in the timber inspection." You say, "Yes, we are," and the discussion really gets nowhere.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): A very agreeable fellow.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I would like to talk and rebut some of those arguments you made about the fishing licences, but perhaps we could wait until the next vote.

I would like to ask about item 4 under this vote: public information and education. Does this cover the weekly news bulletin that the department—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: All publications.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That is included in that.

The grant to the Ontario forestry association of $12,500, does that include any research or is that strictly for administrative—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, this grant under item 10, Mr. Chairman, is an annual grant. The Ontario forestry association is a very dedicated group and—

Mr. T. P. Reid: What do they do?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is a very good question. This is what they do.

Their purpose is the promotion of the sound land use and full development of the Ontario forest resources. Here are some of their programmes.

For instance, forest fire prevention. They have lecture tours, promotion of the Smokey Bear programmes. I am sure you are all familiar with the Smokey Bear programmes.

They have slides, films—an excellent film—the Premier was shown last February at the annual meeting. This is, I believe, a 14.5 minute film in colour showing the junior ranger programme—a junior ranger is from the ages of 12 to 15, I believe.

They also promote good outdoor manners. Many of you are familiar with "Litter Picking Pete" to encourage the cleanliness of our parks and outdoor recreation areas.

The resource rangers, as I have just mentioned, is for boys between the ages of 10 and 16 years of age. This programme now boasts 15 clubs cross the province. The Ontario forestry association sponsored the tree farms movement, aimed at encouraging woodlot management.

Conservation schools: They encourage these programmes within the school classes and these are held throughout Ontario. Schools at Dryden, Marathon and Espanola have been aided by the association.

Last year the president was Mr. Mackey, former chief of the forest protection branch. They are a very very dedicated group. Most of their funds come from the association and from industry, and I believe our grant of $10,000—is it $10,000 or $12,000?—represents only maybe 14 per cent of their budget.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I do not disagree with this, and I think this is very worthwhile.

Would this not be more properly the job of The Department of Lands and Forests, rather than the—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Look at the tremendous work that they are doing, and our contribution is $10,000. It is a voluntary group, and I think—

Mr. T. P. Reid: The department carries out related—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1101.

Mr. T. P. Reid: One other thing. I would like to ask the Minister if he would like to discuss the provincial land tax under this vote, or under some other vote.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Under this vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I just have a few remarks that I would like to make in regard to this.

I would like to suggest to the Minister that he give very serious consideration to removing the provincial land tax on community arenas, community centres, and sporting facilities that communities in unorganized districts maintain. I realize the tax is not overly much in relation to ordinary land tax, or real estate tax; still, for some of these communities in unorganized territories, the charges can be burdensome.

I would also suggest that this tax be removed or at least lowered in the case of the provincial land tax in unorganized areas in regard to farming lands, especially those farm lands in depressed areas.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the provincial land tax I can appreciate the hon. member's comments be-

cause my own area is largely under the provincial land tax. May I say that this tax has been constant for the last 15 years, and there has been no increase; it is 1.5 per cent of the assessment, and it is presently under review. With reference to The Community Centres Act, it is a very good recommendation, and we hope that next year that this will apply.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Are you going to bring in legislation—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would say we will bring in legislation to bring this about.

Also, I would like to mention that, as you know, in the unorganized areas at the present time they have a provincial tax bill, a local roads board bill, a school bill, and The Department of Municipal Affairs have district assessors, and it is just a matter of time until they have district assessments. In this future age, also, we hope that there will be only one tax bill. So there is quite a lot of work put in on this.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1101, the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I know this will grab the Prime Minister, but if I were in the hotel business in Toronto, I would be up in arms about the fact that all through these estimates we see, "Westbury hotel, X thousands of dollars". What kind of a deal have they got with the government that they get all the business? I mean, are there not other hotels that we can do business with? I see an item here—$9,000 in this one section. There will probably be a lot more as we go on, but do you not have any sense of spreading the business around, or what goes on?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I can see the hon. member's point. Let me give you an example of what happened this evening. The Great Lakes fisheries commission are holding their annual meeting at the present time at the Westbury hotel. I left here at 6 o'clock. I walked over there. I was there at ten to six. I met with these people—

An hon. member: How did you do that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, I walked. It was good exercise. The Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) recommends walking. The food was excellent, the service was good and I walked back, and I was here at 7.30. It is a matter of convenience.

There are other hotels that we are locating. Some we located only in the past year. We have held some of our functions there, and we—

Mr. Sargent: But they are taxpayers too. You have got a 65 cent cab ride—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is a good suggestion and we will certainly take it into consideration.

Mr. Sargent: I do not think you will. I just think it is a real big family compact. You have an item of $150,000 for data processing services. This is part of the overall deal in the government. How long is the term of the lease with the data processing or the computer?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: How long is the lease? We are working, as you know, in the computer age. Everything is being automated and it is a more efficient—

Mr. Sargent: I did not know that—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Data processing comes under the Treasurer's departemnt. We are paying our share of the work that comes under Lands and Forests, and this amount of money represents our share under the Provincial Treasurer's department.

Mr. Sargent: That is the portion of the cost of the computerizing.

All through your vote, you have possibly $65,000 to $75,000 or maybe $100,000 worth of charges to Office Overload and other outside employment services. Do you not have the continuity, or is this all seasonal?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would like to say that I guess we are making less and less use of Office Overload. This year for the first time I believe we are using the civil service department, and this will be a tremendous saving. This comes under the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1101, the member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid: On the item about the advisory committee to the Minister, probably in incidental expenses No. 9, who are they, what do they do and was it they who recommended a fishing licence?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, Mr. Chairman, I would say that they are a very able group. They are composed of industry and labour. For instance, I will name you the members: Mr. T. Boyles, executive vice-president of the Bank of Canada, and he represents, of course, the banking industry; labour is repre-

sented by Mr. Andy Cooper, and I believe he was the president of the international union of carpenters and joiners; Mr. Gordon Godwin represents the pulp and paper industry, and he is the executive vice-president of Ontario Paper Company; Mr. Gavin Henderson, executive director, national and provincial parks association; Mr. Wes McNut, president, William Niel and Sons Limited, representing the sawmill industry; Mr. Ted Perry, president of the Ontario mining association, and of course The Department of Mines is closely involved and closely allied to our department with reference to land matters; then the chairman is Dean Sisam, dean of the faculty of forestry at the University of Toronto; Dr. Don Longmore from Sudbury, the new president of the Ontario federation of anglers and hunters. These are the members of the advisory committee. We meet periodically. I would say that lately it seems that we meet on an average of at least once a month.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Are they paid a salary?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, they are paid no salary. They are paid $25 a day for expenses, and they make substantial contributions to the department.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1101, the member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): This afternoon, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks that were made by the hon. member for Sudbury, in which he suggested that Lands and Forests be confined to timber rights and matters of that nature in northern Ontario. I have reason to disagree with him very much.

Mr. Sargent: He is not here to defend himself.

Mr. Whitney: Well, it does not matter, he will defend himself tomorrow or the next day. But I would simply say this, that when I was newly elected as a member in 1951, I had people from my riding who criticized the government for the fact that they could not get their gasoline tax rebates paid back quickly. This is apart from the subject, but on one occasion I went in to the office that looked after that particular feature and I discovered that they were doing the best job they could and that the department could not fire and rehire people to do the job only at the time when the rush was on.

This same situation is absolutely apparent here, in that the staff of The Department of Lands and Forests has to be almost, we would say, ambidextrous. It has to be able to take care of a great many things and if it was confined, as the member for Sudbury suggested, to the timber matters alone, or this alone, or that alone, well, I do not think that would be the proper practice or anything of the kind. I want to say without equivocation of any kind that to my mind the various fields in which The Department of Lands and Forests is active, the parks, conservation, commercial fishermen, forestry, timber business—

Mr. Nixon: Wolves.

Mr. Whitney: Not wolves. They are on your side of the House. But nevertheless we did trap one the other day and we named him "Monsieur Trudeau." That was just a local matter. We did not try to explain it or anything like that. But that was the name he had and I am telling you he stood that high. But he was a dead duck when it ended.

I just want to take issue with the remarks that were made by the member for Sudbury this afternoon, who suggested that this great department should only confine itself to northern Ontario. My point is simply that this dedicated staff of this great department is able to do so many things, in helping our junior forest rangers, in looking after conservation measures, parks, commercial fishermen, tourist operators, all those things; the officials in this department are among the most dedicated officials there are, and you can find them in any section of the province doing various work at different times. We need to utilize the talents, the education and the ability of these people to the utmost. As far as saying that they should serve northern Ontario alone, I say that is a fallacy. They should serve all of Ontario and I think we all should appreciate the great services they do.

Vote 1101 agreed to.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, on 1101—

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1101 was carried.

Mr. Stokes: You were not even looking up. I was standing here when you had your head down.

An hon. member: He was on his feet.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I certainly did not see the member on his feet.

Mr. Stokes: You were not looking, I was standing up.

Mr. Chairman: If the member was on his feet, all right. On vote 1101:

Mr. Stokes: I want some advice as to whether or not the restricted areas, the closed areas with regard to this survey that we spoke of earlier, come under this vote or under another vote?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the member is probably referring to recreational zoning committees? No, this would come under the lands branch, vote 1104.

Mr. Stokes: I just want to ask one short question with regard to the item for public information and education. I was wondering if the letterheads—they are very beautiful, they are by far the most attractive of any department of government—are much more expensive than the plain, ordinary letterhead? Would there be any prices on them? It is four or five colours and I was just wondering what the additional cost would be?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that the original cover plate cost $100. This is the initial cost and the additional cost is just the same as ordinary paper.

Vote 1101 agreed to.

On vote 1102:

Mr. Chairman: I must point out that vote 1102, fish and wildlife branch, also has $6 million in vote 1110. The member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The Minister will probably not be surprised to hear my next few remarks concerning the resident fishing licence that he has proposed. I do not propose to repeat all of the remarks that I made earlier this afternoon, but I would like to reply to a few of the remarks that the Minister made in rebuttal to the remarks that I made.

I think, first of all, that the Minister did not prove this afternoon that he had any real valid reason for imposing a resident fishing licence on the people of Ontario. He suggested that if we were to raise the fishing licence of the non-resident in this province that we would perhaps drive some of the tourist trade away. I reiterate that the province of Quebec has a non-resident fishing licence of $15.50 and British Columbia has one of $10. Surely these are two of the provinces of Canada that enjoy a large tourist trade also. I do not think the Minister would suggest that they do less than Ontario because they have a slightly higher fishing licence.

Again, I do not accept the theory that the Minister once more espoused, that the users of the resources should have to pay for them entirely. Again, I refer the Minister to the remarks made by Mr. Hadder in his speech on wildlife budgeting. The Minister this afternoon did not reply or did not mention the fact that he was going to give any particular consideration to the senior citizens of this province. I hope that at the end of my remarks he will rise and state that he is going to give the old age pensioners of this province a break and that they will not be required to pay for a resident fishing licence.

I would like to say a few words at this time—and I am sure the hon. member opposite who just spoke recently might be very interested in this particular subject—on item 9 on payments of wolf bounty. We have been going over this, year after year, year in, year out; the arguments have been made on both sides, but I think it is worthwhile at this time to repeat some of the comments made by the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar) in his critique of this department last year. He said that where the wolf is a menace he should be eradicated, or certainly driven into those parts of the province where he will not be a menace to sheep farmers or to wildlife.

The theory that we should completely destroy the wolf, I think, is an abominable thought and horrible to behold. We have already lost a great deal of our natural wildlife in this country. We have already eradicated the plains wolf and I think it would be a great injustice to the people who will follow us to do away completely with the wolves. So I would suggest to the Minister that his department adopt a policy of eradicating the wolves where they present a menace to livestock or a great menace to the wildlife, mainly deer, but that in other cases the wolves be allowed to go their way as other wildlife is.

I would like to bring to the Minister's attention a practice where we allow the American resident to come into Ontario and purchase a $5.25 wolf licence. We allow him to get into an aircraft, or in some cases a converted snowmobile, from what I can gather, and allow him to hunt wolves in this province for the princely sum of $5.25. Then we turn around and pay him a $25 wolf bounty. I believe again that my hon. friend from Algoma-Manitoulin mentioned in years gone by that this wolf bounty should be

restricted to those trappers and Indians who make their living trapping or who make their living off the land, and that all others be excluded from collecting this wolf bounty. I would say at this point, especially Americans. If they want to come up here and hunt wolves as a sport, perhaps they should be allowed to, but I do not think that they should benefit at the expense of the Ontario taxpayer.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the angling licence, I think it has been made very clear to us that we have this choice: If there is no angling licence, then we cannot spend the money. The reason why we are spending $9.3 million this year was because we informed the Treasury that we hopefully could introduce an angling licence. So therefore, if we do not introduce an angling licence I would say that we certainly do the things that we should be doing.

Mr. T. P. Reid: So is the Treasury board.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The Treasury board, in their wisdom and the government in their wisdom. Alberta has a $3 angling licence. Maybe you did not know that. British Columbia, by January 1 next year, will have an angling licence of $3.25. The province of Quebec is in the process of raising its angling licence; it is not doing it now, but it will before the end of the year. So therefore, by January, British Columbia will have the highest angling licence in the country and there are others following suit.

I met with the representative of Minnesota about three weeks ago and he said, "You are going through the same process that we went through several years ago. There was a tremendous uproar when we introduced an angling licence and they resent it." So do I. I do not like taxation and no one likes taxation, but I think you have to admit that if you want to spend the money that should be spent, you have got to raise the money and I do not think it is fair that the money should come from the public. Therefore, we have to find the money through other sources—either raise the sales tax or raise the highways-gasoline tax. We have got to find the money some place.

Mr. Sargent: Hit the big boys instead of the little fellow.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Hit the big boys.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That will come under timber. So therefore, that is our position, and you know in my riding—

Mr. Sargent: Pretty good one.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In my riding I received one letter against an angling lience, and I am surprised to see that the Opposition in certain areas, and I have a suspicion—

Mr. Sargent: You are prejudiced, that is why.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I have a suspicion that this was raised. There have been ads in the paper saying, "Write to your member," or "Write to the Minister." I have a suspicion that it only takes one or two persons to really create quite a controversy. At the moment most people accept this, if they can see that the money will be spent for the purposes that we say. We will spend this money; we are doing it now. We are going to increase our hatcheries. We are going to increase our surveys. We need to do this, and I am sure you will agree that ten years from now, if we did not do these things, you would criticize us for not having done the things that we should be doing now.

With reference to the wolf policy, you know what our wolf policy is. I think we agree on this. Our policy is this: Where the wolves do not create any harm, we leave them alone; in those areas where they are causing destruction to domestic animals and other animals, we remove them. We have these predator control officers, and if in your area you have problems, if some of your farmers have problems, please ask them to get in touch with the district office and I can promise you that they will do everything they can to trap and remove those wolves.

Mr. Sopha: Is there somebody against wolves over here?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Could I?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, go ahead.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I am certainly glad to see that we finally got a rise out of the Minister on something here. I hate to drag out this discussion but I cannot agree with you, sir. I really cannot. I feel very strongly, especially coming from the northern part of the province. You can stand there and say the money we raise is going to be used for our programmes this year, but I repeat that there is nothing this government has said time and again that changes the fact that this

money goes into a consolidated revenue fund. Certainly you are going to get a grant this year, or you have got a budget this year for the programmes that you want, but next year you are going to have to go before Treasury board again. Apparently they are not very interested in The Department of Lands and Forests or you would not have such a small budget.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Our budget this year is close to $60 million, and you call this a small budget?

Mr. T. P. Reid: In comparison to the revenues that this department raises and the money that should be being spent on the timber branch and in research, yes, I say it is a small amount, a very small amount.

The Minister said we have to do this, this and this or in ten years or 20 years we will be criticizing him for the work that was not done. But the Minister said this afternoon that his department was not doing enough in regards to research and in regards to regeneration and silviculture.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We should be doing more.

Mr. T. P. Reid: So, in other words, you should have more money—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Exactly.

Mr. T. P. Reid: You are arguing both sides of the fence. You say you are spending all this money and then you are saying, "Well, we are not doing enough because we have not got enough money." You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Whitney: Which department would you take it from?

Mr. T. P. Reid: I repeat to the Minister, the Minister tried to suggest that this was sort of an Opposition ploy that some of us had received two or three letters and we were blowing this thing up. I say to the Minister, he is wrong, very wrong. When I go up to my constituency, what people are complaining about is the fishing licence, and I must admit, in a large number of cases, it is not $3 that they are worried about. It is the principle of the thing. It is the very last thing we have in this province that is not taxed—except the fresh air, what is left of it, and I am sure the government will get around to that.

This is our heritage, especially for us people in the north who are brought up on the lakes and in the woods. Now when I go out fishing I have to have a little piece of paper in my pocket from the Minister of Lands and Forests saying that after you have paid your $3, now you have the privilege of fishing—what I have been doing for 25 years and my father and his father before him and so on. That is the thing that gets us, Mr. Chairman.

I say to the Minister the paltry sum of $3 that you are raising per person does not come to any more than a total at the utmost of $5 million added revenue; and that is high, I would suggest not more than $3.5 million. Try raising the non-resident fishing licence. These are the people who are, in the large case, getting the benefit from any of these things. Certainly where I come from, we have, if not the greatest fishing in the world, it is adequate at the moment, so if we use the Minister's philosophy that the users of the resource should pay for it, surely those guests and tourists into our province are the ones who should be paying the majority of the cost.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Prince Edward.

Mr. Whitney: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sopha: You are not serious.

Mr. Whitney: No. Mr. Chairman, I only wish to speak about wolves and coyotes because I had a few remarks earlier and it is only in that regard I wish to speak. However, I do want to congratulate the hon. member for Rainy River on his remarks this afternoon and this evening. I think that he is doing a very capable job, and I do not want to argue with him too much. However, I do want to say in regard to wolf protection that there is a great deal of misunderstanding among a great many people as to which are wolves and which are coyotes. I imagine that over there you have your share as elsewhere. But I was going to say that 12 or 15 years ago the coyote was not known down in the area in which I live.

Mr. Sopha: It is a Tory province.

Mr. Whitney: No, you drove them. Otherwise how can we have an election? Well, you are fortunate that you have your sulphur dioxide; maybe you should have carbon dioxide also.

However, I do want to say that these animals that originated on the prairies have spread all around the states and into Ontario and they are a definite menace to livestock. I have had sheep killed and lambs killed.

My lamb count is down this year. I am not trying to eliminate them myself, but when people get up and defend the wolves, sometimes people assume that they are talking about coyotes which are entirely different from timber wolves. I know nothing about the latter. I speak to the hon. member for Sudbury on this—you talk about helpless animals being tracked down. You could put all your helicopters, all your hunters, and every means at your disposal at the present time, and I would say that you could not eliminate the coyotes in Prince Edward country, which is a habitat in which they are not natural. You could not do it.

There are gangs of them around. Lands and Forests deserves credit for what it has tried to do. They have taken their recordings —the howler, they call it—and they have had replies to the records of their howls time after time. They help trap and they have done a great many things. Just as a result of their trapping we managed to trap and shoot a coyote on my farm about two weeks ago. But that is just one. There are many more, and when you people talk about defending the coyote or the wolf you are barking up the wrong tree because there is nothing that you can do to eliminate them.

We are not out to eliminate any species, but we know what we are suffering from. We know that bounties are being paid by our municipalities and we can find efforts being made. I am telling you this much. I do not want to be associated with it as a matter of personal profit, because I was concerned whenever in my township I have had a loss. It has been very generous in regard to dogs, because the coyote is part dog, and these coyotes are inbreeding with dogs, especially the German shepherd.

Nevertheless, the point that I have to make is that you should give Lands and Forests a little bit of credit for the job that they are doing for a change and not find fault with what they are doing. They appreciate this problem. They are not out to eliminate the timber wolf from around Sudbury. I am telling you that it will never be eliminated while Elmer Sopha is here, we know that. I would say give these people help to eradicate this animal, this crossbred, that has come to an environment that is not his natural habitat. He spread from the prairies to the southern states, and into Canada and here attacks the one product of livestock in which we are not in competition with anybody.

Ontario lamb is a premium product which one can hardly obtain, but these coyotes are one of the animals that is making it this way, because people will not produce Ontario lamb. It is one of the choicest products that there is. I am not advertising it to you because I can sell it without praising it to you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me this opportunity to talk about the wolves, or the coyotes, that we have had.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my voice for the people of my part of Ontario against the fishing licences. You know that in this vote we are spending $1 million under the fish and wildlife branch and under lands and surveys we are spending $1.6 million. This pretty well is the yardstick of the department's approach to fish and wildlife.

For instance, the Minister says that he never had much correspondence from his people on the licence fee. I have a bunch of cartoons that I received in the mail. All our people in conservation and game and fishing clubs are up in arms about it. Some of these are very interesting and I will send them over to the Minister afterwards. Here is one of a cartoon of a provincial park. It is $10 to enter, $2.50 per night, no electricity, fishing licences sold here, and it says, "Well, I can understand why taxes keep going up, to pay for the government departments. Robarts cannot even make a profit on free land. He charged campers $5 to see it, and $1.50 to sleep on it, and now it is $10 to see and $2.50 to sleep on. What an economist! And now a fishing licence too."

Another big cartoon of a provincial park; $10 to get in, $2.50 a night if you stay, no electricity, use flashlights. The caption says, "Sure the land belongs to the people of Ontario, but Robarts wants to stop inflation. People should be soaked if they will not stay at home." The other man says, "Ontario is a place to stand all right. A family cannot afford $27.50 to lie down in the bush for a week! A fishing licence also!"

Here is a cartoon of an outhouse, and it says in the park, "Ontario provincial parks for your convenience." And the man says, "I gues that Robarts forgot that provincial parks have not got flush toilets, washrooms, showers, laundry rooms, or even cookhouses, yet he does not have to raise the rate for the great service that he gives to campers. I would like to see John pay $27.50 for washing and shaving in cold water. The garbage is collected once a day, and I wonder what the charge will be if the government had to buy the land? And now the fishing licence too?"

Mr. Chairman, I would like to pinpoint the scandalous charge of $3 for the right to fish in our streams. It is the last thing in our lives that we thought that we would be charged for. I think that it is very chicken of the government to soak the little guy for that last thing that was left to him.

In the multi-millions of our resources, in the timber rights in the province, there have been a lot of inside deals. Millions are going down the drain that should be going to the taxpayer. Millions are going to the inside guys who do business with the government on the timber rights.

Here again we hit the little guy. It is not the big guy that you go after, it is the little fellow all the time. You hit us every way you can. The guy who likes a cigarette, who drinks beer, the hospital insurance, the gasoline tax. Everything hits the little guy.

You have now come to the last thing left—a licence to fish. To drop a line and a fish-worm in the water, you want to charge $3. Now, that could be the straw that broke the camel's back—to break the great Tory machine. It is the little things that will knock you fellows out of the ball park, and this is going to happen sometime along the line

You would not do this in an election year, because you are too conscious of the need to play on the public. You have not got the guts to hit the big guy, you attack the little guy all the time.

An hon. member: Order!

Mr. Sargent: Who said that?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): This is not very parliamentary; Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: Neither are you, to look at you.

I would like to pinpoint, Mr. Chairman, the plight of the commercial fisherman in Georgian Bay — and all the Great Lakes, I guess. You know, in Ontario we used to have in the Great Lakes, sir, the greatest commercial fishing. It was a great industry. Many, many millions of dollars were invested and are still invested in commercial fishing. Tourist fishing was a great industry.

You recall, going back over the years, up in Meaford they used to have the fishing derby every year. They would come from all over the United States to go in this fishing derby and they would go out and get their bag of so many trout in an afternoon's fishing. It was the greatest thing. We had, maybe, 100 or so guides who had their own year-round business and they could make a living by guiding on Georgian Bay in the summer months.

We have this great commercial and tourist fishing industry—and we bring in 70 or so scientists into this department—they say there are about 70 of them there. Now we have the 70 scientists, we have no fish. We have the people who say we fish. We have not got the fish—so we have got the scientists. That is costing us a potful of dough.

Possibly the answer, in all truth, is in pollution. Perhaps this is the end-cause of all this. But this department here, The Department of Lands and Forests, is in the park business, sport fishing, forests, reforestation and by the very absence of the word "fish" in the department's title, I believe that the Minister's personnel, Mr. Chairman, feel the same way about commercial fishing too.

They fish in international waters and I believe that the jurisdiction over fisheries falls within the control of the federal government. If your department wants all of Georgian Bay as a fish sanctuary, why not be gentlemen and purchase the commercial interests? Do not try to starve them off the lake and put them out of business just by legislation.

The fishermen in Georgian Bay, I am talking about my people, are open to you to talk to them, to the department, for the purchase of their outfits. If the department does not want them fishing on Georgian Bay—if the Department of Lands and Forests is interested in removing commercial fishermen—which it is trying to do—from Georgian Bay, let the department purchase the commercial fishermen's outfits instead of trying to legislate them out of business through moving their lines farther and farther out in the lake and refusing to renew their licences.

I have scores of people writing me about the cancellation of their licences. Some of them are justified by your policy that anyone who does not renew within two years is dead.

First of all, I would like to say that the province of Ontario licences truckers through the PCV licences, which are not necessarily active but are renewed and held for the day they might possibly need them.

The Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) knows that I know of the hanky-panky going on in his department in PCV licences. But here is an example in the forest industry. People who are in the logging and lumber business hold large tracts, of course, through

paying a yearly licence fee or tax. They do not necessarily take that resource in order to stay in business. They have the option of retaining their right over the years, and this is all we ask in the commercial fishing industry.

So I would like to ask the Minister, first of all, how many commercial fishing licences were cancelled and not renewed so far this year in the Parry Sound district? What is the value of the equipment represented by such licences, because The Department of Lands and Forests has this information from the submission of annual returns of every licence holder? These returns ask for the value of land, buildings, nets, gear, boats and equipment.

Further, I would like to ask him, how does The Department of Lands and Forest justify the cancelling of these licences when it is impossible to sell a commercial fishing outfit when you have no licence for the operation of this outfit? I would like to hear those points.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I can certainly appreciate the concern of the hon. member for Grey-Bruce for fishermen—especially older people—who have been in this business for years. At the same time, I think you will appreciate that the problems of the commercial fisherman are similar to many of the problems of the farmers on marginal farms and sub-marginal farms.

The problem, of course—in the Great Lakes and certainly in the area of Georgian Bay that he is concerned with, and Lake Huron —and I know the hon. member realizes this, is that the fishing, due to the lamprey problem, has decreased substantially during the past years. Therefore there are limitations to the number of economic—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I asked specific points to answer. I want the answers.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: With reference to your specific question as to the number of licences that have been cancelled, we are getting this information. We will have this in a few minutes, but I would like to tell the member—this has a bearing—again, if I may preface my remarks, by saying that there is only a limited number of economic licences that can made it worthwhile.

Now two years ago, my predecessor, the hon. Kelso Roberts, sent a letter and our own people went to Killarney, and to various areas of Georgian Bay. They met with the commercial fishermen and this policy that we introduced was agreed upon by the commercial fishermen of that area. The problem was explained that there was only so much fish available and, therefore, this policy was introduced. Those commercial fishermen who did not utilize their licences for two consecutive years would not have their licences renewed, and this was agreed upon.

I realize this concern again for people who have been in this industry for years. However, due to advanced methods of catching fish, it is a serious problem for some of these older people who have old equipment trying to eke out a living.

I am told that there were 13 licences that have not been renewed so far. As to the value of their gear, this requires, of course, more study. I will have this information available tonight, if I can. If not, I will have this information available tomorrow.

But again, may I remind the hon. member that each fisherman was advised by letter dated July 8, 1966, and addressed to all commercial fishermen on Lake Huron, Georgian Bay and the North Channel, in reference to commercial fishing in Lake Huron. It is a three-page letter. I will send it to the hon. member and as I said, this was agreed upon by the commercial fishermen of those areas.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, over my four or five years in the House here, I have had a lot to do with the commercial fishermen in the Parry Sound and Georgian Bay area insofar as their problems with the department are concerned.

I think that the policy you have adopted is dictatorial and you have no regard for the human element any more. I have quoted in *Hansard*, over the years, the decisions made by the Minister and his department heads which has cost our people of Ontario many, many thousands of dollars unnecessarily when you could have used the human touch to help people to keep in business until they could have disposed of their operation.

But a case in point as I go along. The Department of Lands and Forests did experimental trawling in Lake Huron and Georgian Bay in 1967 with a boat contracted from the Homestead Fisheries on Lake Erie. This boat was brand new and had not been equipped for trawling of chub in Lake Huron and Georgian Bay. It was manned by an inexperienced crew and did very little actual fishing over a period of several months. The results were very poor and inconclusive with regard to fish in these areas. There were boats up in Lake Huron and Georgian Bay that were equipped for trawling and yet The Department of Lands and Forests contracted

with the largest fishery on Lake Erie for their boat. I would like to know the amount of money spent for trawling to pay for Homestead's boat. Do you have any information on that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No.

Mr. Sargent: There is a large fishery called Gothiea Fisheries of Windsor, which has found nets at the mouth of the French River and the Bad River, in the Parry Sound district, to take many thousands of yellow pickerels each year. Now these fish are game fish, and commercial fish, but I believe they would only be classed as game fish as their value is greater to the province than the tourist's creel. The Department of Lands and Forests allows these fishermen to operate at full capacity, while denying another fisherman the privilege of renewing his licence because he has held his licence for the tuna white fish which have not been available for several years. And these gill net fishermen considered that the yellow pickerel is of no more value to the province of Ontario than the tourist's angle or the creel.

As the white fish had been virtually nonexistent in the Parry Sound district, many fishermen in this area do not fish to comply with the rule that two years of no fishing and your licence is cancelled. It was the fishermen's understanding at a meeting in Parry Sound three or four years ago when the "two years no fishing your licence is cancelled" rule was discussed at a meeting, The Department of Lands and Forests representative stated that the two-year rule would not apply in the Parry Sound district because of the absence of fish to make it economically feasible for any fishermen to operate. Is this contrary to your statement that the people said that they would go along with the two-year rule, but there was a special ruling made for Parry Sound? This one large fisherman here has been paying $120 a year licence fee and still cannot fish. This has been going on for the last six years—sending you $120 and he cannot use his licence.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: How old would this gentleman be, this fisherman?

Mr. Sargent: This was Mr. Warren Lahee of Owen Sound—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, may I first reply to the first question? As I said, the number of licences cancelled was 13, and the value represented in gear is about $65,000.

With reference to the boat on Lake Huron, this boat on Lake Huron was selected by the best technical people available from the federal government, and the contract was for $41,000.

Mr. Sargent: Did the federal government retain this?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, we did, we retained it, but—

Mr. Sargent: Why did you not use the equipment in the boats that are equipped to do this job?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: Why did you not use the boats that are equipped to do this job?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is why we are working closely with the federal Department of Fisheries, and it was through their advice and guidance that this boat was selected, and it was the best boat available for that particular job.

With reference to the fisherman in the Parry Sound district, I am not aware, Mr. Chairman, of the different policy, but I would like to say this to the hon. member: I am very concerned also about some of these older fishermen, and I have had representations by other members of the Legislature on behalf of older fishermen. I promised that as soon as an opportunity arose, we would look into this, and I personally would go to certain of these areas to see if anything can be done to help those elderly fishermen who are, say, 70 years of age and over, and who have no other means of earning a livelihood.

Mr. Sargent: I apreciate that. I think there is a great area for the humane element in these things. What I am concerned about in this whole business—my leader will not mind me saying this—but getting to the point, Mr. Chairman, we here, the elected representatives, are just a joke in this government, because the department heads — the people who run the departments from the Deputy Minister down—make all the decisions and we are just pawns, and it has got to the time—

Mr. Sopha: Rubber stamps.

Mr. Sargent: Rubber stamps. It has got to the time when somebody has to put these guys in their place. I am getting sick and tired of phoning up departments in this government, and they are out to lunch, you cannot get hold of them, and it is getting to be a ridiculous situation. They are never on

the job, you cannot get a hold of them. Who in the hell is running the show? I do not know, but if they were in private business, they would be fired in no time. When I am here, I expect to get action when I am here.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I resent very much the remarks of the hon. member because—and I say this very sincerely—I have heard nothing but complimentary remarks about our staff. They are dedicated; they work on weekends; and I have heard this from not only our own people in Ontario, but from others in other provinces. Tonight again I heard this from our good friends south of us. They get the closest co-operation and they say we are very fortunate to have heading our resources such knowledgeable and such dedicated people.

Mr. Sargent: You notice that it is the government people who are clapping their desks.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): We like the truth.

Mr. Sargent: And there are few of the—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Have you received any unfair treatment?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I am getting fed up to the teeth with civil servants, because they are non-performers. It is a pension for life, and it is time somebody put them in their place and said that people are important, and we want some action.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They always say nice things about you, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: I did not say anything about you, Darcy.

I appreciate your offer to give this a bit of personal attention, but a case in point is a man at Bing Inlet in Ontario, a Mr. George Simpson, who has a $20,000 boat and another $20,000 in nets and allied equipment. He has not fished in the last 12 years, but he has kept his licence in good standing over that period of time by paying his yearly renewal, because he has faith in The Department of Lands and Forests, and also that the white fish would return one day. Yet the department has the audacity not to renew his licence this year. He has $40,000 sitting there because he cannot fish; there is no fish to fish.

This particular example is similar to a number of cases in the Parry Sound district, and these are but a few of the greater ambiguities—that is a good word—that The Department of Lands and Forests has perpetrated over the years. But I am very sincere about the fact that this industry has had a pushing around, and they should get special attention. You do it for everybody else, every other area of the economy – agriculture gets subsidies, industry gets subsidies. This area needs some help, and if I have been rough on the Minister, I have a great regard for him personally, but I think it is time we called our shots as we see them.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1102, the member for Humber.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Chairman, while we are on the topic of boats, I appreciate what my friend has just finished saying about the unfortunate fishermen who have got licences and all of a sudden they are cancelled. That man had a licence for 12 years and did not use it.

I would like to read a letter that was written to Prime Minister Pearson on a very famous case that our Minister has dealt with, and perhaps after I do read this, the member who just sat down will have a little more sympathy for some other unfortunate citizens who try to deal with the hon. Minister's department. This is addressed to the Prime Minister:

> I, Walter Zilow of Toronto, a New Canadian and a Citizen of Canada, take the liberty to submit this plea to You during our great centennial year. In this year of our nation, we all suppose to be rejoycing the freedom, the equality in sharing in our true democratic laws and citizens rights and the pride of belonging to our community in this great Province and Federation. As for me, I feel humiliated and frustrated by the outcome of my long struggle and perseverance in my endeavour to become a commercial fisherman in Ontario, and this is the matter in which, as a last resort, I took this opportunity to tell you about.
>
> Commercial fishing has been my profession in the old country, in Poland, and ever since I came to Canada in the year 1951, I dreamt of building my own boat and help to harvest the waters of Great Lakes. Through hard work and much savings I acquired my own land and a place to work on the shores of Lake Ontario, and with my own hands built a boat with steel hull, 40 feet long and equipped for trawling. This method of fishing is most popular in Europe and also in use on Great Lakes both in Canadian and United States waters. There are no

trawlers operating in Lake Ontario on Canadian waters. I submitted in 1963 my proper application to the "Department of Lands and Forests" in Brighton, Ontario, to the attention of inspector, Hamel. After a while I was informed that the inspector is in favour of my application but that he has to refer it to inspector, Cristy in Picton, Ontario. After a few months I was informed that Mr. Cristy can not decide himself on my application, that this should be referred to inspector, Oryzawa in Lindsay, Ontario.

At that moment I was frightened, as my boat was ready and I invested a lot of money in diesel motor, winches and nets, and was anxious to start fishing and earn necessary funds to keep up with my obligations. I made the trip to Lindsay, and Mr. Oryzawa told me in personal interview he can not decide, and that I should submit my application to inspector, Warner in "Wildlife Dept." in Maple, Ont. Immediately I went to Maple and submitted my request for permit to Mr. Warner who is the chief inspector. He informed me after a lengthy interview that generally he is agreeing in granting me the permit, but that he has to seek advice from the Deputy Minister, Mr. Bayly, Province of Ontario. Finally, I received a letter informing me that the special commission will examine my boat and so in March of 64, inspector, Cristy and inspector Oryzawa from Lindsay arrived and examined my boat. They both liked my boat very much and tried to discourage me from fishing by asking me to sell my boat.

At this moment I felt that they do not approve of my application and so I renewed my efforts to secure the permit. The government in my opinion had nothing to lose, as I built the boat from my own resources and I was ready as a fisherman to work. I would not resign my position and finally the permit was granted. But, the conditions of the permit were such that all my work and struggle from the beginning to the end proved itself worthless. The permit reads: between merydians 77° 37′ on the east and 78° 15′ to the West and beginning in waters no less than 15 fathoms deep. In addition, to add insult to injury—only two kinds of fish were permitted—alewives and smelt ONLY. The first, Alewives is the specie not suitable for human consumption, second its seasonal. Both species most in warm weather live in shallow waters so it is impossible to trawl for them.

The waters assigned to me by the permit consist of deep, rocky bottom and uneven formation, so that every lowering of the trawl, which cost hundreds of dollars, must produce a risk of heavy damage or loss of trawl. Mr. Cristy, who for years did experimental trawling in this waters knows very well about this condition. He knows also that the Government spends thousands of dollars cleaning up dead alewives (millions of fish), which die in great masses in summer, polluting the shores and beaches and sending decaying smell all over. Nothing said that the real commercial fish like Perch, Pike, Ciscoes, Herring could be caught, not even mentioned. By this time I was desperate, and I knew that I have to try to make a living and live up to the conditions of the permit. For three months I tried at great expense (constant damage to nets and high operating costs and long cruises) to fish in this water with no results. I could hardly catch fish for my own consumption.

After that I asked Mr. Cristy to change my permit to include the waters east, towards Prince Edward County, where the bottom is even and clear of rocks. And here I met the CLEAR REFUSAL, for the reason that these waters are licenced to some fishermen using gillnets and that this area is reserved to sport fishing. I could not understand this reservation for the following reasons:

I. The fishermen using gillnets and small boats are limited to waters close to the shores and one trawler on all of Lake Ontario can not and will not ruin their business, as my boat operates or would operate on deeper waters.

II. Sport fishermen are using mostly quiet bays along the shore lines to which my boat would not even venture for a risk of running aground.

I renewed my quest again and went to The Dept. of Fisheries in Toronto and presented my case to the Deputy Minister, Mr. Bayly. He told me word for word the same reasons as Mr. Cristy and refused the permit in Prince Edward Bay. So I asked him where in Ontario I could trawl? Lake Erie—No, too many fishermen, Lake Huron—No, same reason, Lake Superior—No, no more licences to be issued. So I came to the end of my line, but I can not comprehend, that in this vast Province and waters there is no room for one fisherman

with a small boat, when at the same time in Europe, hundreds of fishermen are making good living for centuries in much smaller water beds.

I could not understand this and blamed on my poor knowledge of English language, how it could be that in this country so vast and underprizing a man, who for his own money built his workshop, and could not operate it to his advantage. I went to the lawyer, Mr. Best in Toronto, spent more money in presenting my case in proper English but the answer still was "No". Through my M.P. Dr. Stanley Hajdasz, for whom as always I and my family cast our votes, as all of us feel so close with Canadian Liberal Party, I renewed my efforts, however, the enclosed correspondence is the result of my long trying and "No" remains the answer.

Therefore, I am submitting this plea to you, Your Excellency, to find the place in Great Lakes suitable for trawling with my boat, which is not a ship of such size that could affect the wellbeing of other fishermen and my countrymen, and the fun of my fellowmen, sport-fishermen, and to be able to fish for species which are marketable, i.e. for human consumption, so when I lift a trawl I do not need to cast back in the water all the pike, herring, perch, eel, ciscoes and white fish, but keep only the alewives and smelts. Knowing you from many television speeches and appearances, for some reason you made me feel close enough to you as my leader, to ask you for your guidance and help, in which I think is a bureaucratic dilemma, which some place got stuck in a knot, and it is beyond my power, even that I am a fisherman, to untangle this one out myself.

Yours respectfully,
Walter Zilow,
11 Munro Park Avenue,
Toronto 13, Ontario.

If there was ever a condemnation of this department and this government, this is it. Not only did you restrict this man to fishing in a place where there are no fish, but you restricted him to smelts and alewives. Then you restricted him to the quantity of alewives that he could take, while other jurisdictions, and your own jurisdictions, are spending millions and millions of dollars, or should be spending them, to clean up these alewives that are polluting the shores.

I say on that ground alone—and I have never sincerely asked that a Minister resign—but with all due respect to you, for this one case alone you ought to hide your face in shame.

Go to the most remote area in this province and hibernate there. This is an utter disgrace, that you cannot allow one trawler on all of Lake Ontario and when you do allow him, all he does is catch coarse fish, alewives, and you restrict him to tonnage, when they die in millions on the beaches of this province. And this is what you call administering a department.

Get up and explain that if you will.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member for Humber. Ashamed as I am, I will try and explain the situation, as I understand it.

First, may I say that I read this for the first time in the Toronto *Daily Star*—I believe it was about a week ago. The matter was raised in the House by the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) and I told the hon. member for High Park that I would be pleased to meet this gentleman. This is what I am advised by my people. I am advised that this Mr. Walter Zilow was the man who insisted on fishing in the east end of Lake Ontario, one of the most crowded areas in the province. This is the area where we have commercial fishermen. Their fathers were commercial fishermen, their grandfathers were commercial fishermen, and there are commercial fishermen who have been in the family, so naturally they would resent an outsider coming in and establishing himself in an area that has very limited commercial fishing possibilities. Also I am advised that he originally asked for and was given most of the lake, but not the eastern gill net area. He would not fish under these conditions.

You may know that trawling in shallow waters interferes with anglers and I do not need to remind you that there is tremendous controversy between the angling sportsmen and the commercial fishermen. The sportsmen—the anglers—would like us to do away with the commercial fishermen. Of course, our policy is the belief there is room for both. Trawling in shallow waters interferes with anglers and also with gill nets. And, with the restricted fishing, we simply could not put a new fishery into a crowded area.

I am told—and I read as much as I can—I am told that, sure, alewives and smelts have no value as far as eating is concerned, but there is today the pet food industry. As you know, people love pets, and there is a tremendous demand for certain species of fish

for pet food. Also the Ontario trade and development council have many inquiries for certain species of coarse fish. I am sure, if you want to bring this gentleman in, or the member for High Park wishes to, I would be pleased to sit with him, along with my people, and see if we cannot work out some satisfactory solution.

Mr. Ben: Why did you restrict him to four tons a day of these alewives when they are so numerous and there is such a demand for them? And I have the permit in my hand which restricts him to that.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We would be very glad to increase this.

Mr. Ben: But you refused to increase it. You have refused to increase it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I have not. This is the first time—

Mr. Ben: When I say "you," I mean the department. But you are responsible for that department. Not the fellows sitting in front of you. Not the fellows sitting off to the side. But you—you are the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Is this not a fair answer? Ask the gentleman to come and see me and we will—

Mr. Ben: And furthermore, Mr. Chairman, he asked to fish in the rest of the lake and you forbade him, although his would be the only boat on that whole stretch of water.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We forbade him to fish, as I mentioned earlier, in the eastern end of Lake Ontario, where we had a sufficient number of existing commercial fishermen.

Mr. Ben: I have the permit in my hand, Mr. Chairman. The Minister restricted him to the portion pointing north of Lake Ontario to the international boundary, between 77 degrees and 37 minutes on the east and 78 degrees and 15 minutes on the west. That is approximately between Port Hope and Prince Edward.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that we did not restrict him to four tons. We did not restrict him to four tons.

Mr. Ben: Well, I wish to differ with the hon. Minister. Here are the conditions of the permit: Exhibit number one: Condition, "This permit void for taking of any specie of fish not described above." Two: "Operative of this experimental gear," and so on. Then we get up to number 10:

> The permitee shall not take any more than four tons of fish in one day, a 24-hour period beginning at 12:01 a.m. local time and shall not take in the aggregate more than 20 tons of fish in any one-week period as described in condition number five.

How dare you get up and say the permit did not say that. He is restricted to 20 tons a week, which is not even four tons a day.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that the permit—a Lake Erie form—and the quantity was never discussed. So apparently your facts and my facts are not the same. Once again, I say to the hon. member, if he is really sincere in helping this person, ask this person to come and see me and I will meet with him along with my fish and wildlife people and we will do our best to see if we cannot help in this situation.

Mr. Ben: Well, that is fine but you are still wrong because I have the permit in my hand.

An hon. member: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Ben: Get up to his defence because you are a good defender.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has no further comments?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: I want to say a person is a product of experience. Everyone is affected by his own experiences and having listened to my friend from Grey-Bruce, it shows you how different one's experiences can be, because one of the fewer delights, in nine years in the public life of Ontario, that I have experienced, is the unfailing attitude of courtesy and co-operation of the civil service at all levels. One further concludes that the government of Ontario would run pretty well if it was left to the civil service. The weak link is usually the political head. Especially when one surveys that 22 or 23 over there, after a few years, you realize how weak it is, and can hardly wait for the day until the leader of the Opposition chooses his. I think he is going to have only 16 or 17.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, well mind your P's and Q's, will you.

Mr. Sopha: I wanted to ask the Minister whether this fishing licence was enacted by regulation under section 83 of The Game and Fish Act, 1961-1962?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: May I ask the hon. member for Humber to send over that licence, please?

Mr. Sopha: Well, paragraph 1 says—is the Minister finished with that other matter and is he now zeroing in on this one? Apparently not.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Go ahead, then.

Mr. Sopha: All right, thank you. Paragraph 1 says:

> The Lieutenant-Governor in council may make regulations, establishing classes for licences referred to in this Act or the regulations or the Ontario fisheries regulations, governing the issue, form, renewal, transfer, and cancellation of licences or any class of them prescribing their duration, territorial limitations, terms and conditions and the fees payable therefore, and limiting the number of licences of any class that may be issued.

Now is that the power to make regulations under which this licence fee of $3 was imposed? Maybe the thing is illegal.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It is certainly unethical and immoral.

Mr. Sopha: It might be illegal.

Mr. T. P. Reid: And immoral.

Mr. Sopha: Maybe they have not got the power. We can find an angler to put it to the courts.

Mr. Ben: This government is coming to the end of its line, too.

An hon. member: I am afraid so.

Mr. Sopha: Here is the news from Ghent to Aix. See what Garcia has to say.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that it will be composed under the Ontario fisheries regulations.

Mr. Sopha: That is even worse because that is federal legislation. Now we have a backdoor method of using a federal Act to impose taxation upon the people of Ontario.

May I ask this further question before I get the full plight? Was the fishing licence approved by the Treasury board of this province? Did it go to Treasury board?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am advised it would go to Treasury board. All expenditures are supposed to go to the Treasury board.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask you a final question in order that I have all my facts? Is this hon. Minister on the Treasury board?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I have not been on—

Mr. Sopha: He signifies that he is not. Well, of course, part of the obscurantism of government is that we in the Opposition are never advised of who is on the Treasury board. But I know a number of people who are on it, and I must say that our Treasury board, for the time being, is a very weak body, very weak indeed. Most of them, you would not hire them to run a candy store on an obscure corner in Sarsfield, Duntroon or Chesterville. Most of them are thoroughly without business experience and I wish to say this – having knowledge of the facts, I want to say this about them and I wish the Premier was here—

An hon. member: He is listening.

Mr. Sopha: I wish that man, who is so much in a hurry to get out of here, and always egging us on to get the business done, would come here once in a while—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Do not be so cheap.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I believe in free speech and this is the free speech in which I am going to engage myself. I wish he would come and take some of the responsibility for the government over which he presides—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Why do you not go back to court?

Mr. Sopha: —some of the responsibility for the measures that his government enacts.

Here we had a classic case of the imposition of taxation upon people of Ontario, without the Legislature having an opportunity to say aye or nay, and every member here has got letters and has anglers devoted to the art of fishing and in love with the out-of-doors of this country. So every member over there has got an equal number of similar people in his constituency whom he represents and he knows very well that when this government made a decision in policy to allow Sunday racing, then the dogs barked. You heard them bark then. And the bill has not come for second reading, has it?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Probably will not, either.

Mr. Sopha: Probably will not. Now, had they done the proper democratic thing here, and imposed that $3 fishing licence in this House by an amendment to the statute, then perhaps the howls of the coyotes would have

been heard. Perhaps we would have had a little exercise in democracy. We would have had a little exercise in democracy around here about it, but no, within the confines of the Cabinet chamber, or within the inner sanctum of The Department of Lands and Forests, the light came on.

They said, "Here is a way of chiselling $3 million out of the people of Ontario" and they went to the Treasury board with it. The Treasury board was foolish enough—I would really like to go to one of those meetings, I wish the provincial auditor would tell us something about that outfit and the way it functions—to rubber stamp it. And it ended up—the only thing that needs to be added to what my friend, the member for Rainy River, and the others have said about it—taking away the last recreation that you had for free. Yes.

Now the man goes fishing of a Sunday afternoon and he has the Minister of Lands and Forests on his right side and he has the treasurer on his left, both with their hands in his pocket. They both accompany him for the measly $3 million.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): How can a man fish in that position?

Mr. Sopha: And for a crummy $3 million that they might hope to raise, and yet in a mood of expansionism in the shelter grant, the other fellow down the row there that we hear by way of interjection only from time to time, is giving away $150 million under another statue. You see, the only justification that he can possibly call, in defence of this nuisance levy, is that he hopes to spend it in the propagation of fish species in our lakes. Well, the answer to that is plain. I have been to Barney's Ball Lake camp, a guest of this department, and have seen the accommodations laid out there, and have looked at the roster to see the quality of the guest that arrives, and the prices they pay old Barney for the use of his Ball Lake camp.

Mr. Nixon: Good old Barney.

Mr. Sopha: Good old Barney. Where even the blueberries are stylized and sophisticated. I say, and apparently we say on behalf of most of the people who think about it in this province, that you ought to raise some money for the propagation of your fish. Fine! Put the hook on the Americans for about $25 per before they drop a line in the lakes. And when they come—you know, I am not anti-American in the slightest degree, I am pro-Canadian—but when they come to see the country they own, why not charge them a fee? Why not charge them a fee when they come to see their equities and want a little recreation with it?

With all my angling friends to a man, that I have met, and from what I read in the paper of the monster meeting at Copper Cliff, that was exactly the consensus that they came to about it. You want to raise a little more revenue, I say rhetorically, then raise the levy on our American visitors; put it up to $15 or $20. But in the great drive by the Treasurer of this province and his pals on the Treasury board to raise a little additional revenue and the obsession, of course, they had to do it in the form of regressive taxes. They had to stoop to this level—that is the proper word—they had to stoop to this level in order to be completely consistent; gasoline tax, hospital services premiums, OMSIP premiums, cigarette tax, parks, and to be consistent they had to grind the noses of the ordinary folk of this country into the ground a little bit more.

This department had to impose that $3. That levy just about equals some of the worst of the Elizabethan statutes, or the Tudors, who were the masters in this type of thing. in the days before Parliament had developed to the stage where we responsibly could stand up here and complain on behalf of the people who feel with deep and bitter resentment. The Minister knows he has lost a lot of friends in northern Ontario, as a result of this measure.

Finally, to round the thing out—and one must take note of the observations of Mr. McRuer—this levy, of course, was imposed before Mr. McRuer wrote and delivered his report. In the dark and secret confines of the operation of the government, I am trying to place it as being sinister, but what happened is the Parliament never had an opportunity to pass on this thing. McRuer said about this type of taxation these words, "The general rule is that the Legislature is presumed not to confer power to impose taxes or other levies or charges on a subordinate legislator," and that is you. Not you, Mr. Chairman, but that is the Minister of Lands and Forests. "Even by general language, by the bill of rights of 1689, it is provided that no money may be levied to the use of the Crown without the consent of Parliament."

Now, that is the violation of the fundamental rights of the people of this province. During the days that The Game and Fish Act was discussed in the committee, I was there in 1961 and 1962, and a day was spent

in discussion of those sections. Never once did a suggestion come from anyone in The Department of Lands and Forests that the historic attitude involved in the free use of our lakes and rivers by the people of this province was going to change in any way. When the committee gave its consent and later this Legislature ratified that bill, there was not a scintilla of a suggestion from anyone that that policy was going to change.

But suddenly out of the blue in the most arbitrary fashion he who advises or submits to—"no subject could be truly loyal to the chief magistrate who advises or submits to the exercise of arbitrary powers," published every day in the *Globe and Mail*—the arbitrary decision is made elsewhere, ratified by that Treasury board of very mediocre ability when it comes to laying down a cohesive and sensible rational policy of taxation, and published in an obscure publication, the *Ontario Gazette*, and that is it. So the Minister does not have to feel that the Opposition in any way overdoes it over here in respect of that, because the Opposition carries out its responsibility in voicing the resentment of the people of the province about this drastic change in policy, this sweeping aside of the historic practice, violation of what Mr. McRuer says will be the fundamental liberties of the people of this province.

Therefore, with the greatest sense of responsibility I move, seconded by Mr. T. P. Reid, that because of the imposition of this $3 fishing licence, that vote 1102 be reduced to the sum of $1.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury moves that vote 1102 be reduced to the sum of $1. Shall the motion carry?

Mr. Whitney: Mr. Chairman, I think I requested the opportunity to say a few words. I am not replying directly to the hon. member for Sudbury but I do believe that the previous speaker, the hon. member for Humber, made a statement about a commercial fisherman applying for a licence, coming in from no part of Canada and I feel that that was the question.

I would appeal the hon. member for Sudbury—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Point of order.

Mr. Chairman: State the point of order.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Is the hon. member speaking to the motion?

Mr. Whitney: The hon. member for Humber was referring to a different subject altogether and I think that we, on this side of the House, must have the opportunity to reply to what the hon. member for Humber—

Mr. Chairman: The member is out of order. We have a motion before us.

The House divided on the motion by Mr. Sopha, which was negated by a vote of 34 to 22.

Votes 1102 and 1103 carried.

On vote 1104:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the lands and surveys branch in 1104 has some responsibility for the surveys of the Crown lands that are available to the citizens of the province. I wonder if the Minister can give us a report on the availability of the Crown lands to people who are not Canadian citizens or residents of Canada. From time to time we see advertisements about cheap lands available in Ontario from Crown land sources. Could the Minister give us an idea of the number of non-resident purchases of Crown land in the past year?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: At the present time we have 3,000 cottage lots available in the province. So as far as non-residents are concerned, there is no restrictive policy. Our sales are encouraged as much as possible. We mentioned earlier considering the suggestion of the hon. member for Sudbury of leasing land as is done in British Columbia, and there is certainly a lot of merit in the policy. This is under consideration.

Mr. Nixon: Are these lands advertised out of Canada in any way? Are they advertised for sale in other jurisdictions?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Our summer cottage lots are not advertised out of the province. To my knowledge no Crown land is advertised out of the province.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1104. The member for Grey-Bruce. I would like to point out that there is an appropriation in vote 1110 for this particular branch.

Mr. Sargent: On the same item, how and who is to know what lots are available for sale?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, each district has the information on what lots are available. One could write the head office of the department, or the district forester, whatever is more convenient, and we would be pleased to submit the information.

Mr. Sargent: So there is no organized plan for the marketing of the 3,000 summer lots? Why do you have these 3,000 lots?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am not sure just what the intent of the question is. Last year, for instance, we sold close to 890 summer cottage lots. There is a tremendous demand and the 3,000 lots are available for sale.

Mr. Sargent: I am sorry. I do not want to be stupid in this thing. Suppose, as a citizen, I wanted to acquire a lot, how would I go about it?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In my riding of Cochrane North, for instance, we would be very pleased to sell you a summer cottage lot.

Mr. Sargent: Who would be pleased?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The department would be.

Mr. Sargent: How is Joe Citizen to know that you have lots for sale?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: All he has to do is to visit the local office.

Mr. Sargent: Why do you not advertise and tell the public that you have them for sale? Here we have an asset of 3,000 summer lots, and no one—well, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I am an average citizen, stupid or intelligent. I do not know what you would call me, but I do not know the fact that there are 3,000 lots available in Ontario from your department. Now why do I not know that? Am I stupid? I got the answer—that was a leading question. Why does not the public know what you have available?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I would say that the large percentage of the public is aware that we have summer cottage lots available. We also advertise in newspapers in certain areas when we have these summer cottage lots available. We also have booklets informing the public of our Crown land sales for summer cottage purposes.

Mr. Sargent: What distribution do you have on the booklets? I guess I have proved my own point that, assuming I am an average citizen, I do not know anything about this at all.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Attend the CNE and all these fairs where you see The Department of Lands and Forest. For instance, the sportsmen's show, which lasts for two weeks, and where thousands of people—

Mr. Sargent: All I am asking you is give the public the courtesy of telling them you have these assets available and give them a chance to buy them. You have to have an inside with somebody in your department to buy a lot.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They are buying them.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): No, that is not right.

Mr. Sargent: All right, Bill, just a moment.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Do you think there is hanky-panky there?

Mr. Sargent: All right, we are getting to the point now.

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): All the lots are going to the great divine?

Mr. Sargent: And you have got lots of them, too.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Nixon: You can go back down to the hotel.

Mr. Sargent: We have the fact that you have this amount of assets available as far as land is concerned. Now, on your policy insofar as the acquiring of lakes or beach property, or land in resort areas, how much of that do you have available—the acreage?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: What we do, Mr. Chairman, is to reserve at least 25 per cent of the best shoreline for public purposes and in new areas we have cottage subdivision plans. There again, we choose the most suitable sites for cottage purposes, and the beach lands are reserved, of course, for public use—under this 25 per cent minimum for public use.

Mr. Sargent: 25 per cent of what?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Of the total area.

Mr. Sargent: How much do you own?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We own 90 per cent of the land in the province; 90 per cent of the land in Ontario is Crown land.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, I did not know that—90 per cent of the land in the province of Ontario. Everything in the north country from the north shore—you own 90 per cent of it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Ninety per cent of the 412,000 square miles of Ontario is owned by the Crown.

Mr. Sargent: This is a wonderful multi-million-dollar asset of the people of Ontario that you have control of. They are getting sharp over there. Now we are getting to the point I want to find out.

You have all this land. You have these lakes, beach properties available—how does a citizen go about buying them?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I am advised we receive in the department thousands and thousands and thousands of enquiries a year from people who ask us for information. We submit this information. We ask them which area they are interested in, and we have no problem in disposing of summer cottage lots. No problem whatsoever.

Mr. Sopha: Most of those letters are addressed from Ohio.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, I know, and that is the point. Why should it take me six months to find out and I do not even get a reply to my letter?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Oh?

Mr. Sargent: Do not give me any of that pained look on your face. What is the charge? How do you charge? How do you sell a lake or an island? How do you base your charge on that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It varies, Mr. Chairman. On the average it is about $2.50 for frontage, and the average lot, I would say, would be somewhere between $500 and $700. There again, in these new subdivision plans, where we construct a road to them, we apportion the cost of the road per lot, so this is added on to the price of the cottage lot, in order to provide a road.

Mr. Sargent: I think you are going by the book there. Supposing I want to buy a lake or an island—what do I do? I am talking about resort operations which want to open up. The tourist industry is a big industry. Supposing they want to buy a lake or an island; what do they do?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: To my knowledge you cannot buy a lake. You can buy land on an island up to a maximum of 15 acres.

Mr. Sargent: All right, now we are getting down to the point. You cannot buy a lake, but you can buy part of an island.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I would like to qualify my answer. For commercial summer resort purposes you can buy an island —15 acres on the mainland, or on an island.

Mr. Sargent: But you cannot buy a lake?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Not in Ontario.

Mr. Sargent: You cannot, but this tourism industry is a big industry. To develop the north it would be a great thing if you could buy a lake, but you will sell great tracts of timber. You will sell great tracts of timber to timber interests, but you will not sell anything to the resort industries.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct the hon. member. We do not sell tracts of timber. As a matter of fact, we are in the process of acquiring private land.

Mr. Sargent: You have long-term leases, same as ownership.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: With the pulp and paper companies we have long-term leases where they have the timber rights, but the ownership of the land is retained by the Crown.

Mr. Sopha: What kind of a province is this, you cannot buy a lake or a distillery?

Mr. Sargent: But you cannot buy a complete island itself?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, you can buy a complete island.

Mr. Sargent: You said you could not.

An hon. member: No, he did not.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am advised that you can buy an island for two purposes: either for private or commercial reasons. If it is private, the maximum size is three acres, and if it is for commercial purposes, the maximum size is 15 acres.

Mr. Sargent: I appreciate that you are new in the department, and you do not know the answers, and I am being very patient with you. We have, up our way, great tracts of land owned by General Motors. They have Griffiths Island; they have Hay Island, and all these islands are privately owned, and they have hundreds of acres of land on them. Now how do they acquire these lands? The big corporations can buy them, but I cannot buy them, or Joe Doaks cannot buy them. Do you have policies for these people?

Mr. G. Demers (Nickel Belt): In the Hepburn days, you know.

Mr. Sargent: It was not during the Hepburn days.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am told that these lands—ownership had been acquired.

Mr. Sargent: You are told this. What do you know about it?

Mr. Chairman: Order! The Minister—

Mr. Sargent: I am trying to find out, if these hecklers will keep quiet for a second. Coyotes, that is the word.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The ownership of these lands has been held for many years, and they had been acquired from others. As far as The Department of Lands and Forests is concerned, our policy has been, for several years, that we do not dispose of land in areas larger than as I mentioned a while ago—a maximum of three acres for summer cottage purposes, and a maximum of 15 acres for commercial.

Mr. Sargent: So this is your policy now. Is there wisdom in the policy? There is no rhyme or reason why it is good because it was good maybe 10 or 15 years ago.

There are changing conditions in Ontario and there is need for development in these places. These great tracts would go undeveloped, but if you should change your policy we could develop that country up there. So I think that your policy is completely wrong and not geared to the times.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, can I ask the Minister—and perhaps his officials can tell him, because I do not think that he has this information at hand—how many acres are there in that Cloche Island in the district of Manitoulin that is under private ownership? The island that the Dodge estate—the Dodge motor car people owned.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: About 20,000 acres.

Mr. Sopha: 20,000 acres. I have been bothered about that for many years. I asked my friend from Huron-Bruce tonight, a very sensible young farmer with a very good head on his shoulders. I was just testing him, and I said, "How many acres do you think a person should own for recreational purposes?" He said, "500." I said, "Would you believe that there is a man, one man, exercises suzerainty, like a medieval sovereign, in the County Palatine, in the province?" And I guessed that he had about 25,000 acres.

I am prepared to say that that is too much land for recreational purposes for one sovereign to own, and that is the brother of the Tory candidate who is running federally in Nickel Belt. I do not want to make politics out of this. That is his brother. He has made a potful of dough in his lifetime.

No one envies him his money, but really there has to be a limit to this, and that man owns that whole island, which formerly belonged to the Dodge estate a long time ago —Dodge motor cars—and it has passed through a couple of hands and now it has come into his.

It is situated very ideally on the road to Manitoulin Island, and the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) carries this across his County Palatine with a road that was laid out by agreement—I think that the Minister of Highways could tell us.

They did not have to expropriate; by agreement they took the right of way across that land. The Minister then built him a fine looking fence—and there is nothing wrong with that, it is a splendid looking fence that the public built and that is fair. Having taken the land they took up this fence on either side of the right of way and it has the advantage to Fielding that it keeps the public out of his preserve. There he sits on 20,000 acres. My complaint is that it is too much land for one man to own no matter how much cash he has.

Secondly, what the department ought to do in respect of that, is to take it over for a public park. Now, a few years ago Fielding thought, as my friend from Nickel Belt will tell you—and he is not as close to the Fieldings as he would like to convey to us—

Mr. Demers: That is what you think.

Mr. Sopha: It is not exactly a Damon and Pythias act between them. A number of years ago, this Fielding, a very shrewd man, tried to con the department—

Mr. J. Jesssiman (Fort William): Is that not too strong a word, I wonder? He tried to "con" the department!

Mr. Sopha: He approached them and said to them, "Look, would you be interested in a public park?" The department of course is always interested in a public park, and this is really an ideal location for those thousands of people who go to Manitoulin Island every year. They turned around to Fielding and said, "How many years?" Hhe said "Five." Well, of course, The Department of Lands and Forests isn't going to be interested in a mere five years. If he had said 99 years, he might have been holding out something attractive to the department, but really I

think that the Minister has to consider whether, in 1968, the enlightened age, the public of the province can tolerate one individual sitting on 20,000 acres of land.

Mr. Sargent: He does not make any decisions over there.

Mr. Sopha: This Minister does not get pushed around at all. He has got an independent point of view, and I am suggesting —and I have no vindictiveness whatsoever toward Fielding; I only met him once in my life; I have no personal feeling for or against him at all—to the Minister that perhaps the time has come to say, when we are looking for parkland, that Killarney Park has not been successful, let us face it. Only 17,000 used it last year, as against 136,000 for Grundy, and 100,000 or so for Windy Lake.

This is in such a good location that I dare say that thousands of people would make use of it and perhaps a deal could be made with Fielding in this way. You could say, "Look, we will give you a reasonable amount of land for your enjoyment and the rest will come into the public domain for the establishment of public parkland." Now it is up to the Minister, as to what is reasonable compensation for Fielding for everything that he has done on that land. He did not pay a great deal for it. My memory tells me —and they will be quick to correct me in Sudbury—that the 20,000 acres was bought for something like—

Mr. Demers: Half a million.

Mr. Sopha: No, not that much, about $275,000, I think, cash on the barrelhead. That was what he paid for it. But even if it were a half a million, that is a pretty cheap sum for 20,000 acres. But my point is, that first the public need is for parklands for public recreation in the city of Sudbury. To be consistent, I have said to the council, that every time a piece of land is up for grabs on Ramsay Lake, you should buy it for public use.

That is the philosophy that I pursue, and that is the reason that I raised that here, but ancillary to it, and inseparably connected with it, is the fact that I do not think that it is in the best interest of our body politic, that one individual should sit on 20,000 acres of land for recreational purposes. He is not farming it, or harvesting it, he is, we are told, importing a species of fowl from Scandinavia to try them out, which is all to the good, but it looks like a purely recreational pursuit, and I say to my friend from Nickel Belt, after the 25th, he can put his brother on it as game warden, because he will not be occupied elsewhere.

Mr. Winkler: With the federal government in power, it will be public land anyway.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and begs leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:25 o'clock, p.m.

No. 127

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, June 20, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 20, 1968

Air Pollution Control Act, 1967, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 4761

Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading 4761

Trading stamps, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. MacDonald 4761

University Avenue subway, question to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Sargent 4761

Takeover of municipal police forces by the Ontario Provincial Police, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Sargent 4762

Subdivision of land in Nassagaweya township, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Shulman 4764

Windstorm damage relief for Bruce and Grey county farmers, statement by Mr. Stewart 4764

Highway 3 in the town of Essex, questions to Mr. Gomme, Mr. Ruston 4765

Wrong man sentenced to four years, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Sargent 4766

Compensation for wrongly sentenced citizen who spends time in prison, question to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Sargent 4766

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Brunelle, continued 4767

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Stewart, agreed to 4797

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 1968

The House met at 2:00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our visitors today include: In the east gallery students from Blyth public school, Walton, St. Peter's school in Wanapitae; and in the west gallery students from Goderich public school, Goderich. Later this afternoon we will be joined by pupils from St. Kevin's separate school, Welland; Orono public school, Orono; Harper Condie public school, Smiths Falls; and Loring public school, Loring.

We are very glad to see these young people here.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Air Pollution Control Act, 1967.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the amendment extends the scope of servient recommendations that they may be made by provincial officers.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the Act respecting the appointment of an acting medical officer of health are amended; and the amendment also provides authority to make regulations respecting health units, enlarging their authority to appoint associate medical officers of health.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Attorney General. The *Globe and Mail* of June 18 reports that still another major chain store has indicated its intention to cease using trading stamps. Will the Attorney General therefore give consideration to proceeding with his law of last year to outlaw such gimmickry?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Whatever happened to that bill? That was one good bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It was a good bill; wait until the hon. member hears my answer.

Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to the hon. member for raising this matter. It is not my present intention to proceed with any legislation with respect to trading stamps at this time. The constructive discussions and publicity attendant upon the earlier bill which I had contemplated, have perhaps accomplished a very useful purpose in bringing to the attention of many merchandising concerns some of the difficulties attached to what my hon. friend is pleased to call "gimmickry."

In the circumstances, I think that the educational programme will achieve our ultimate objective in a most reasonable and effective manner.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Prime Minister. How does the Premier justify capital grants of $20 million from the provincial Treasury on a $45 million mistake, the University Avenue subway, when Mayor Dennison says that he was once the only rider on a five-car train?

A $45 million mistake. I would just like to underline that.

Will the Premier advise why he will not honour his statement to provide similar grants to other transportation systems in Ontario?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have one of my usual answers to the hon. member. The government of Ontario made no grants to the University Avenue subway; and secondly, I made no statement that similar grants would be given to other transportation systems.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Prime Minister is misleading the House. Every time he gets cornered, he starts to squirm.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: It is a very painful subject, that he can juggle the provincial funds belonging to all the people of Ontario—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The member will have to back up his statement that the Prime Minister is misleading the House if he alleges that he is so doing. And he does that not by making blanket statements but by producing evidence of statements that have been made by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I can qualify the fact that he gave $10 million in an outright grant and a $20 million loan to subways in Ontario, which is part of the picture here. And $45 million has been wasted on University Avenue. It is our money, not his to juggle around like that.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would proceed with his next question.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would have to speak to the point of order, if it is one. I simply repeat what I said. That is that the province of Ontario made no grant that was used in the construction of the University Avenue subway. Now that is a fact; I want to make it very clear that that is a fact.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, at this point I cannot produce the facts, but I will bring them in shortly. He is dodging the whole issue.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member will now proced to his next question.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General.

Will the Minister give us a firm assurance of a definite policy in the matter of the takeover of municipal police forces by the Ontario Provincial Police, as a result of the press report of June 12 in the Toronto *Daily Star* that 50 small-town policemen have lost their jobs and another 250 stand to lose their jobs under the OPP takeover scheme, in spite of the Attorney General's assurance that there would be very little problem involved?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is a rather strangely worded question, to ask the Minister to give his firm assurance about these jobs.

Mr. Sargent: It is no laughing matter; this is serious.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No. I will do my best, Mr. Speaker, to answer it and advise the House that the Ontario police commission have reviewed the policing of all one-man police forces.

At this time some 27 municipalities which previously operated a one-man force have asked that these duties be performed by the Ontario Provincial Police. In addition, 19 municipalities with larger forces—that is, with two to five men—have obtained the services of the Ontario Provincial Police to perform police duties and this is on the request of the municipalities themselves.

At the present time, a study of police forces is under way to determine the adequacy of police protection to the citizens of Ontario. That is a complete survey of the province. When this review is completed, then recommendations will be made by the police commission as to what steps should be taken to provide police protection to the citizens of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I answered a question very similar to this a few days ago. I thought I made it clear at that time that we offered the services of the Ontario Provincial Police to those municipalities with very small forces, starting with the one-man force, purely on a basis that they were agreeable and that they requested that service.

We encouraged them in the correspondence, stating our willingness to take over some of this responsibility but they would be responsible for the enforcement of their own bylaws and would therefore need, at least a bylaw enforcement officer.

Also, we said that we could not undertake, and never did give assurance that we could absorb, into the Ontario Provincial Police force, the members of local forces. We urged the municipalities to assist them to find employment in every possible way, and to give as much notice as possible. In every case, they were advised to have the members of the local forces make application to the Ontario Provincial Police and the assurance which was given, was that these applications would be considered and interviews granted to the members of those forces.

I am sure the hon. member will realize that, by reason of age, by reason of background, or lack of training, by reason of

educational disqualifications, and so on, it was certainly not possible to accept more than a proportion of those persons. But everything that we could do to assist was done. I think I mentioned in my answer a few days ago that the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police actually took a very lenient attitude in considering the matter of qualifications.

We have gone just as far as we can go—and we will continue that policy—to take as many of those policemen as possible. But I must point out now that to take in the members of all those forces—and this is particularly true of the small forces—you would dilute the quality; you would create problems of seniority; and you would destroy your general qualifications for recruitments to the Ontario Provincial Police force. These have to be adhered to with some reasonable consideration and we have gone just as far as we can go and I assure the hon. member we are sympathetic with the problem. We have used every effort to make sure that these men are employed. Some of them—a great many of them—have obtained employment, quite a number have been taken into the Ontario Provincial Police force; some, I regret to say, by reason of age, some perhaps because they were not particularly anxious to obtain immediate employment, are still unemployed, but I assure the hon. member it is a matter which gives us as much concern as it does him and we are doing everything possible to meet that problem.

Mr. Sargent: Would the Minister accept a supplementary?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister agree that the last time he made the statement he said the same things he said today and he assured me that there would be very little problem. Since he made that statement, there are 50 who have lost their jobs; and it says here another 250 stand to lose their jobs and they want the Minister's assurance, or some guarantee, that they will be protected. That is what I am asking. I do not want the same double talk again.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say that the statements the hon. member just made are not correct. I do not say that he is deliberately misstating something, but he has got his facts wrong.

Since I made the statement, which was about two weeks ago, the Ontario Provincial Police have not moved into that many municipalities. I think two, and the total number of men—

Mr. Sargent: My information is wrong?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The total number of men who would be affected would not, I am sure, be more than 10, because I think one was a five-man force and one was a three-man force. So there could not be 50 policemen put out of work in that time. This is wrong, and where he got the idea that 250 are to be put out of work, I have no idea.

Mr. Sargent: The association said that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, they are saying things that should be investigated.

Mr. Sargent: They are wrong and the Minister is right?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They are wrong. They are definitely wrong.

Mr. Sargent: It is always—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They are just speculating. They are speculating purely and simply. This is not a fact at all.

Mr. Sargent: How can one win?

A question of the Minister of Trade and Development. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister made a great speech in Owen Sound at the opening of the Pittsburgh plant. I do compliment him very much. He did a great job there.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Did he say they cannot be independent? Did he say that?

Mr. Sargent: Has the Minister considered a programme to serve the urgent needs for housing in Ontario, similar to the Detroit-Michigan programme where the united auto workers have joined forces with Consolidated Edison, using private capital, to set up a multi-million dollar programme to aid low income housing?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, I just noticed this on my desk when I came in. I was in my office and called the housing corporation and asked them to get the details of this alliance. As soon as I get it I will be glad to give the House the information.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

On what date did the matter of changing the rules regarding subdivision of land first come before the Cabinet?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I will simply say to the House, and to the member, that the deliberations of the Lieutenant-Governor in council are privileged information and are not for public information.

Mr. Shulman: I have a question for the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister investigate reports in the June 17 and 18, 1968, Oakville *Daily Journal-Record* that the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) subdivided several pieces of land in Nassagaweya township shortly before provincial legislation prevented such action?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Minister about these reports in the paper. I believe the hon. member has another question to ask him. He will speak for himself when he answers those questions.

Mr. Shulman: Very well.

I have an eight-part question for the Minister of Social and Family Services, Mr. Speaker.

1. Did the Minister divide up land owned by himself in Nassagaweya shortly before new legislation was introduced by the government prohibiting such action?

2. Did the registration occur on May 6, three days after the new legislation came into effect?

3. Did the Minister at a hearing in Nassagaweya township maintain that rural Nassagaweya should remain rural and that land should not be divided?

4. Did the Minister have knowledge of the impending legislation at the time he took his personal action?

5. Did the Minister notify the township council that he was dividing his land or did he go directly to the Ontario municipal board?

6. Did the Minister subsequently put the subdivided land in other people's names?

7. Did the Minister take these actions in five or six different places in the four corners of the township?

8. If the subdivision of the land was registered on May 6, three days after the new law took effect, was a special exception made in the Minister's case to allow such registration?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker the answers are as follows:

1. No.

2. No.

3. My opinions are set out in a letter to the chairman of the planning board dated November 22, 1966, and related in the main to the maintenance of the township as "rural," in the sense of living in the country, that is non-urban.

4. See No. 1. There was no "impending" legislation. Legislation had been introduced and was a matter of public record.

5. No and no. There was no requirement to go to either the township council or the board.

6. The use of the words "subdivide" and "subsequently" are erroneous. Pursuant to a partition understanding between my wife and myself a parcel of land owned by us jointly in the township was in part conveyed to two separate persons in trust.

7. The parcels referred to in No. 6 were the only ones so conveyed in Nassagaweya township, to my recollection. Other parcels were conveyed in part of my wife, pursuant to a trust agreement and other understanding.

8. See No. 2. No.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Minister give us the date when these actions took place?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would like to put his questions in writing I will answer him.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Agriculture and Food has a statement.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Before the orders of the day, I would like to refer to a matter that is of some few days' standing. On the night of June 11 there was quite a severe windstorm that rushed through the province of Ontario and had disastrous effects in parts of Bruce and Grey counties. The hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) last night brought the matter to my attention, reminding me that there were a few barns that had been damaged and some destroyed in the part of that area that he represents in this Legislature. We have taken a good look at the situation and as of today at this hour we have indication of at least 18 barns or farm buildings damaged throughout parts of Bruce and Grey counties.

In past instances where there has been severe wind damage, this government has provided a matching dollar-for-dollar grant with any money that might be raised locally to help alleviate the damage, and we are prepared to do this again, in this particular instance. This offer is contingent, however, as in the former instances, upon the establishment of a local county committee to head up the collection of the funds and to assess the damages and to assume all responsibility for the administration and allocation of the funds so collected. I would hope that the local people would also make the same matching request from the government of Canada as has been requested from us. This has been the case in the past, where there have been instances where the government of Canada has matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis any money that has been collected locally, and which has been matched by the province of Ontario. I would hope that they would so request this from the federal government. This offer stands conditional upon the administrative requirements being met, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, may I just make a comment in this regard. The Minister has indicated that I have talked to him about this. I am very happy the Minister has given an undertaking to help those, including some in my area, who have been adversely affected because of the severe windstorm on June 11. I am wondering first of all what the procedure is for the local people to request assistance from the federal government? May I have clarification on that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the procedure in former instances where such damage has occurred, has been that a local committee is formed, usually of the local municipal council. Since this embraces more than one municipality, I would think, just as a suggestion, that it might be the county agricultural committee, who could head up the committee to collect the funds and assess and distribute the funds. They might then make formal representation to the government of Canada to match this on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

There is the Canadian disaster relief fund, which is administered on behalf of the government of Canada by a group of businessmen who have control over that fund. I could provide the hon. member with the name of the Ontario representative. I do not think that I have it on my desk at the moment, but I could give him that name and I would suggest that the local people make that representation.

I would like to make it explicit, Mr. Speaker, that there be a local committee established and that there be a public subscription taken up. We would match that dollar for dollar.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, this is very good news. We are happy about it and we appreciate it very much.

Mr. Sargent: On the same subject, do I understand that the money you are offering is conditional upon federal assistance?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, not necessarily. We would like it that way, but I tried to do this last time—in the Perth-Huron storm of last year. We made an announcement that our grant was conditional upon the participation of the federal government. The federal government never did put a dollar up, and has not to this day. Quite frankly, we wonder why it has not. Ontario put up $32,000 towards the Perth-Huron tornado disaster fund last summer.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Highways.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to two questions asked me by the hon. member for Essex-Kent (Mr. Ruston) yesterday.

Question No. 708: Highway No. 3 through the town of Essex is under the jurisdiction of the municipality as a highway connecting link. Under terms of the connecting link agreement, the town may initiate reconstruction or resurfacing and, up until this year, has not seen fit to do so. Recently the town informed the department that it was considering an expensive drainage programme, suggesting a combined storm and sanitary sewer system. The department and the Ontario water resources commission do not favour combined sewer systems, but the department is willing to share in the cost of a separate storm sewer system. The department will co-operate with the municipality and maintain the surface of Highway 3 through the town in as good a condition as is possible.

In answer to question No. 709: The first part is no; and the second part is yes.

Mr. Speaker: When this House adjourns this afternoon at 6:00 o'clock we will be losing a good many of the page boys who have served us so well for the last nine weeks, and I am sure that the members would like

to join with me in expressing our appreciation for their good services.

As I did before, I would like to read their names so that they be recorded in *Hansard* and at some later date perhaps some of these young men may be back here in the seats which we occupy and may turn up that page of *Hansard* and be able to refer to the fact that he began his public service as a legislative page in the Ontario House.

You will note, because I shall give you their home addresses, that this time we have page boys from many parts of Ontario. This is good and I would like this practice to continue.

The boys who have been with us for the past nine weeks are as follows:

Frederick D. Cass, Belleville; Daniel Chikane, Round Lake; George H. Free, Kincardine; Larry Gideon, Scarborough; Russell Green, Downsview; Paul Hammond, Oakville; Cameron Hubbs, Toronto; Peter Jong, Toronto; William Locheed, Forest; Simon MacDowell, Willowdale; Gerald Papiernik, Toronto; Edward Peters, Pikangikum; Edward Robinson, Windsor; Jeffrey Seidman, Downsview; Evan Tarleton, Toronto; David Winch, Toronto, and James Sinclair, Etobicoke.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the member for Grey-Bruce asked a question yesterday, I believe it was, question No. 707. I left it to the end of the proceedings before the orders of the day, but he has now left the House. However, I should like to put the answer on record.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He is never here.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The question was: "Will the Attorney General explain how legal aid is working when the wrong man can be sentenced to four years in jail, as reported in the *Globe and Mail* this morning?"

Second: "How does the wrongly sentenced citizen who serves time in prison get compensation from the courts? Is there a financial repayment available?"

My answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the incident raised in this question occurred due to the fact that an accused person, named Joseph Beles, stood up in the prisoner's dock when the name of another accused was called.

Duty counsel was aware that the person whose name was called wished to plead guilty to the offence. However, he did not know the two accused personally and was not aware of the mistake until later. The accused in this case, when shown the record of the other person, with the other person's name, agreed it was his record, and the court proceeded to impose sentence. This accused again rose in answer to his name being called and it then became obvious that an error had been made and steps were taken immediately to rectify the error.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the two accused before this court were both charged with the offence of theft—one with the theft of a radio, one with the theft of copper. Their records were exactly the same in that they each had three previous convictions. This accused and the other accused were seen by the legal aid duty officer. He did not know them personally and this man simply answered to somebody else's name, stood up—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): It was his fault, not the court's?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think it is fair to say that if you stand up to someone else's name and accept the designation of another name, you can hardly say the court was altogether to blame.

Mr. Sopha: Did they not have a presentence report?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This I do not know at the moment.

Mr. Sopha: Well, they should have!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The officers who made the arrest, the investigating officers, were not present because both these accused had indicated they were going to plead guilty. So the investigating officer in the offence was not there.

It is simply a case of a man standing up to another person's name. I can tell the House that the man speaks English well, but does not read it and may not understand it. The mistake was rectified immediately when he stood up again as his name was called.

The second part of the question, Mr. Speaker, does not relate to this matter—as to how a person sentenced receives compensation if he serves time. That was not the case here, of course.

My answer would be that there is no provision for compensation for persons who are in custody unlawfully, other than civil suits framed in the style of a malicious prosecution suit or an illegal arrest.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 18th order; House in committee of supply, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS
(Continued)

On vote 1104:

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, last night at the close, I had drawn to the attention of the Minister of the ownership of some 20,000 acres of land known as Flash Island in the district of Manitoulin. I had suggested to the Minister that land might be acquired for the use of the public generally, perhaps leaving a moderate amount for the use of the individual who purchased that land a few years ago.

I am sure a great many people in that area, as well as the interest of the wider public, might be to some extent satisfied to hear some comment from the Minister as to whether the department might consider the acquisition of those 20,000 acres, for the purpose of the establishment of a public recreational area.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, our parks people have looked at this area I understand and it did not meet our requirements.

The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar) has been in the office quite recently—I believe last week. He has suggested to us that there are some excellent beaches on the south shore of Manitoulin Island and this summer we will be carrying on further studies as to which ones of those areas would be suitable for provincial park purposes. We are very interested in that area.

As the hon. member for Sudbury mentioned, it has a tremendous tourist potential and we certainly will do all we can to try and find suitable areas.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I am delighted to hear that. It is somewhat encouraging and it is indicative that my friend from Algoma-Manitoulin must be responding to some inquiries being directed to him from his own constituents about accessibility or access to this land.

Now, of course, there is a much wider interest than only the constituents of my hon. colleague. I wish to ask the Minister whether it is not a fact that prior to the acquisition of these 20,000 acres by this single individual, that the previous owners—I believe they were absentee—they permitted hunting over these lands without hindrance. They permitted hunting off the land, by people in the area but since this owner has acquired these lands, this owner does not permit the public to hunt over the lands?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This information is being acquired. I would just like to mention with reference to his remarks last night that we are looking into this whole question of land, provincial land tax and so forth and I do not need to mention today, that there are many land owners who are holding land in speculation and we are trying to find means to get back to the Crown land that we need for recreational purposes.

Mr. Sopha: Well, the Minister's answer would seem to indicate that, and I am prepared to leave it at this point. It would seem to indicate that there is a feeling in the Minister than 20,000 acres is just too much land to be vested in a single individual and perhaps the Minister is conscious of the broad public interest involved here, that a large holding, such as this, for the enjoyment of a single person and those whom he permits to enjoy it, is not consonant with the broad public purposes in the utilization of our lands.

I hope that is the Minister's feeling in the matter.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, these 20,000 acres of land that this man owns—I do not suppose it is your department—maybe someone in your department could tell me. How do they pay taxes on a package of land that size? On a per-acre basis, and if they do, how much per acre?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well if it is in unorganized territory they pay provincial land tax and provincial land tax is assessed at 1.5 per cent. As I mentioned yesterday this provincial land tax is presently under review. It has been constant for the last 15 years.

Of course, if it is in an organized area, for instance, in an organized township, they would be paying their taxes to the township. We are in the process, throughout the whole province under my colleague, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), to have uniform assessment.

Mr. Bukator: Two or three years ago, if I recall, the former Minister of Lands and Forests spoke of the railroads that have many hundreds of thousands of acres tied up.

There was some talk about it in this House. I could be wrong, but I believe they were

discussing then that these railroad companies ought to pay taxes and if they do not, then they ought to turn the land back to the province where it rightfully belongs.

Is there anything more being done on that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They are, Mr. Chairman. They are paying taxes. I believe about two-thirds of our private lands in northern Ontario are railway lands and they are being assessed provincial land tax of 1.5 per cent.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1104? The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister, if he will, to explain to me how you judge what land is to be taxed and what land is not to be taxed?

I took this up with the Minister quite some time ago. To explain the background to this, it has to do with a land reserve that was granted, by this department, to Anaconda Iron of Canada. I understand it is a reserve, some two miles wide and about 140 miles long, stretching from Melchett Lake north of Nakina in northern Ontario to the shores of Lake Superior at Camma Bay.

In a previous communication I had with the Minister, he said that there was no charge for this, it was a land reserve. There happens to be a roadway built by public funds running from Nakina some 40 to 50 miles north of there to Terrier Lake, from which point it is a private road. I would just like to read into the record a letter I got from one of my constituents, it says:

Dear Sir:

> I have been wanting to write you this letter to let you know the problem I have regarding these lakes, Melchett and Kapikatangwa. It took me almost three years to get the commercial fishing licence on them. I fished only one month early last fall in 1967 and had to pull out on account of the early heavy snowfall in that area. Everything went fine while Mr. Porter was in charge of the mine road.

Now this is all on public land.

> He let me use the mine road because I was using it for commercial fishing only. Mr. Porter mentioned to me at the time that there was a possibility of a change over to Mr. Wieben, which Mr. Wieben is using this mine road commercially up to Melchett Lake.
>
> I want to use the mine road only about one month and a half early in the spring and late in fall, if the weather permits. Mr. Porter thought I should not have any problem to continue on using the mine road as Mr. Wieben was supposed to be a friend of mine and I trusted him on that. While I was commercial fishing with my gang in the inland lakes, Mr. Wieben asked me to complete a shack for him at Melchett Lake landing and I did that too. When I was in Mr. Wieben's office at the Lakehead he promised me if I played ball with him, he would do the same for me.
>
> After I learned Mr. Wieben was in charge of the mine road I went to see him to get his permission to use the mine road again and he turned me down. He has full control of the road now.
>
> Is there anything you can do to help out?

Now, according to Bill 115 that received third reading in this House—it has not received Royal assent—I have some assurance from the Minister that he will take over all private forest roads, and I assume that he is going to make them open to the general public.

Now in this particular instance where the mining company has done considerable development work there, they have not chosen to develop their known deposits at this time, and are sitting on this huge reserve at no cost to them, with certain assurances that other people are excluded under certain conditions. At the bottom end of the reserve, is the most choice piece of parkland, or land that could be developed for a provincial park on the north shore of Lake Superior, at Camma Bay.

Now we do not want to be in a position where we are going to discourage industry from settling in the north, but there is a company here who got this huge land reserve, at no cost to them, where they have been given the privilege of building roads which they turn over to private individuals, who are using it for commercial enterprise, to the exclusion of everyone else.

I think that the Minister should take another look at the policy and proceed with implementing the provision of Bill 115 forthwith to give everybody equal opportunity and access to the north, not only for the tourist business, but for prospectors who would like to go in and assess the mining potential in the areas, possibly for foreign timber operators, or anybody else. I do not think that we can have one law for a small group, and another law for the general public, and I would just like the Minister to clarify that for me.

What does he intend to do with regard to implementation of Bill 115, not only for the land reserves but roads that have been built on these land reserves; and I would like his assurance that he would make these roads available for the use of the public.

Another one that I would like to draw his attention to is at Killala Lake, which is just west of Marathon. Killala Lake is about 20 miles west of Marathon on Highway 17, and it is about 27 miles long. Your department has an outpost camp at the north end of it. I think it is closed at the present time, but the district forester is well aware of the potential in that area.

There is a road that was used by the Ontario Paper Company and a predecessor company, I think it was Johnson or some such name as that, but anyway there is a road in there. It is inaccessible at the present time, because it has been allowed to run down because of a condition of a bridge or something. But it would open up a whole new area for hunting and fishing, and I am sure that he would make a good many friends along the north shore of Lake Superior if he would open that road.

There are many roads in the north that could be opened for the use of the tourist industry and for the sportsmen in the area, and I would like the Minister to explain what his department's policy is in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member for Thunder Bay, I agree with his comments that we should make available more of our roads for public access. With specific reference to the Anaconda company, they hold a licence of occupation of 1,000 acres, and as I told the hon. member when he was in my office, we are negotiating with the company as well as with The Department of Mines.

About two weeks ago or so, I received a phone call that their representative, who was negotiating with our department and The Department of Mines, was in the hospital, and under those circumstances we would wait until he came out. They thought he would be out within a short period, and to me it was agreeable.

So this matter is under very active review, and I am very optimistic that we will come to, I hope, a satisfactory arrangement to allow the public to use that road. I am advised that the previous owners did allow public hunting, but at the present time the present owners do not.

With reference to the other road, the Killala Lake Road, our district officer has looked into this and we would be pleased to look further into it. I am advised that at the present time we feel that this road has not a very high priority, but we certainly will be prepared to give it a further look.

Coming to Bill 115, which received the approval of the hon. members of this House, I feel very optimistic that it will help considerably in making arrangements on certain roads, with pulp and paper companies mainly, as well as other companies, whereby we will share the cost of construction as well as maintainance. I feel that this will allow hunters and fishermen and other users of the outdoors access to remote regions.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with the answer on the exemption of land in the province. I understand that the railroad owns 940,000 acres of land. That is a staggering figure, and you say that they pay 1.5 per cent. Maybe it would be simpler for one to get the answer this way: If they own 940,000 acres of land, how many dollars do they pay the province yearly for the use that land? I know you cannot answer that now, but I would like—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They also pay fire protection tax, which is approximately 4 cents per acre.

Mr. Bukator: Previous to two or three years ago when Kelso Roberts, the former Minister of Lands and Forests, brought in that bill, they were immune from fire tax or any other type of tax. Now that they are paying something I would like your department to put down on paper for me how many dollars they are paying to the province for that land.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I could have that information sent over to you probably this afternoon.

Mr. Bukator: Fine, no particular hurry, as long as I have it for my files.

If there is nothing more to be said on that I would like to go on to another subject.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Could I ask the Minister in that same connection: What is the status of the reversion to the Crown of land owned by the Algoma Central Railway about which we had considerable debate over a two- or three-year period? As I recall the position a year or so ago, it was that, in selling the land they had retained the

mineral rights, but they had not for a period of some years been paying the mineral tax. Some millions of dollars were due to the Crown, but the ACR had argued that they should be given time to review whether or not they would retain this. This was granted by the former Premier of the province, back in 1952 or 1953 and on about the mid-sixties they began to return this to the Crown.

My question is: How much have they returned? How much do they retain? And did they pay anything on that accumulated tax bill that they really should have been paying down through the years?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give specific answers, but I will say that as far as our department is concerned, with reference to the mineral rights, this comes under my colleague the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. A. F. Lawrence). As far as our department is concerned, we are still negotiating the laws of the fish and wildlife rights. We have had very active negotiations and we are meeting, I believe, sometime within the next few weeks on this matter. We have had several meetings and I can send over to the hon. member for York South as much information as we have available.

Mr. MacDonald: I would appreciate getting the information. But if I just may make a comment, how long does this government negotiate with a corporation before they get a solution? I mean: Who is boss in the province—the Algoma Central Railway or the government? It became very obvious for a two- or three-year period that the ACR was the boss and they were quite defiant. I will give full marks to the former Minister of Lands and Forests because while he took a long time, he also took a rather firm stand and at least moved in the direction of resolving the issue. But it becomes a bit ludicrous when a company that has been getting away with non-payment of taxes and the operation of what was virtually a private feudal domain, should in effect force the government to continue negotiating for what is now at least three years, if not four.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I will admit that it does take time, but I would say a fair amount of progress has been accomplished. Right now the company is paying provincial land tax and forest fire protection tax; also the public now has access to their lands for public fishing and hunting. As to this question of compensation for certain species of wood, this is a very complex matter. We have our own people, and we also hire an independent consultant. But as I said earlier, we are making substantial progress and I hope that within the next few months this matter will be finalized. Personally I think that everyone is anxious to have it finalized.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, on the subject of item 4, land surveys. The Department of Highways and The Department of Energy and Resources Management and your department, again before you took this office, took on a very ambitious programme. I believe Lands and Forests were going to provide a survey or some of the money to pay for an investigation or a plan of the Tobermory, Niagara Falls, Queenston, Bruce trail escarpment drive, I guess you would call it. I am sorry that the Prime Minister is not here because he made the speech that we all agreed with one year ago about this escarpment drive from Hamilton into Niagara Falls and back the other way to Tobermory.

I have a report of the meeting of the conservation authority held to discuss the role of the authority in the development of the Niagara escarpment. They mention here that in 1964—and mark the year—tri-county was established to purchase or develop this escarpment drive which everyone agrees with I am sure. The development planned for the escarpment was consistent with the economic importance of the quarry material present. I realize that there are some quarries along the way. But let me again touch on a subject that I spoke about in this House in 1959.

I have before me a brochure, and it is called "The Niagara Escarpment", and it was then investigated by the three counties—Wentworth, Lincoln and Welland. I was on a committee of county council back in 1956. This particular brochure was presented to some members of government back in 1958. Nothing that I know of has been done to this day. I would like to involve the Minister of Highways (Mr. Gomme) in this, because I am sure that he knows whereof I speak, and I would like his comment to see how we are progressing on it.

We were so enthused at the time about this, that we had quite an elaborate brochure made up, and I would like to put on the record the members of the county of Welland that were on that committee at that time. The reeve of Humberston, Paul Pietz; Melvin Swart, the member for Thoreau township—he is still working on the same project and

maybe between us one day we will get it completed. Francis Goldring, who is now chairman of the contribution committee, was reeve of Pelham, myself as the reeve of Chippawa, and Wilfred Smith, the county engineer.

A lot of work was done on this project, Mr. Chairman, to those who will hear, through you. I feel that we are missing a great opportunity to acquire a lot of this land before it is built on, and which should have been bought long before this.

My question to the Minister is—and I know that the departments work very closely together—just how far have you progressed with the plan? If you want more information in detail, ask the tri-county committee that I sat on with the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell). He was very enthused on this himself for many years, and held that this should be purchased; he even had movies made of the roads to show where the roads are that can be used as part of the escarpment drive with acquisition of lands in between.

My question to you is just how far have you progressed with this? Have you acquired any of the land? Are the plans complete? Have they been frozen to stop construction along the way before they ruin the possibilities of this great addition to this province?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I can well understand the interest of the hon. member for Niagara Falls coming from such a beautiful area, and there again, I would say that there has been substantial progress.

For instance, the Niagara escarpment committee under Professor Gertler. They have now completed their studies and the final report will be available before September 30 of this year. It is the report establishing the priorities for acquisition of land, and easements, and gives very high priority to the lands recommended by the conservation authorities.

The second committee that you referred to, the tri-county study committee, comes under the hon. Minister of Highways. We have met several times, this committee, with Highways, Tourism and Information and, if my memory serves me, there is a meeting next Wednesday, June 26. I may be out a few days with this very important committee. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that we are making substantial progress, and we hope to have something soon.

Mr. Bukator: I am glad that the Minister understands my concern.

The present Minister and the members of that committee, as I recall it, met a year ago, was it not? There were so many meetings. But I think that we did meet, and it was not a political issue, because this is not, any portion of it, in my riding.

When Prime Minister Frost was here, I mentioned this escarpment to him and it is recorded in *Hansard*. When I heard the present Prime Minister make that speech a year ago, I met him in the hall to compliment him on the fact that we are now putting the show on the road.

My question of you was, when and if they are doing some work. Now, they were courteous and sometimes, I hope, between elections, cross party lines and deal with those who are interested and close to the subject. If there is nothing to interefere with your ethics, I would like very much to sit in on one of these tri-county meetings with your people, to assist in any way that I can, because the knowledge that I have with many who have sat on this committee since 1956, the first brochure in 1958, may be of some value to you.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1104, the member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get some information from the Minister with regard to licences for occupancy.

I understand from one of my constituents, who had some correspondence with the district forester for Geraldton that, as as of June 6, there will be no more licences for occupancy granted. This is being done at a time when tourist operators are asking for special concessions on choice sites on remote lakes up north, as witnessed by the minutes of committee meeting held in Port Arthur in 1968.

A resolution was passed that licensed tourist outfitters, on application to the department, and with the approval of the timber licensee, may acquire a land-use permit to erect facilities—subject to the approval of The Department of Lands and Forests and The Department of Tourism and Information—in suitable locations in deferred zones in the Port Arthur district. This motion was carried.

The mover said that many of the tourist outfitter's guests were reluctant to stay in tents, and wanted more substantial lodging. If permanent type buildings could be erected by the outfitters in the deferred zones, it

would improve the services available to tourists. The committee would, in future, appreciate some response from the Minister to give it some indication of the acceptability of their recommendations.

I understand that that recommendation came from that body last year, and there was nothing done on it. I could readily understand why, because at a time when they were denying further licences of occupancy to private individuals and private little hunt clubs to establish outpost camps—hunting and fishing camps on some of these lakes that were in the deferred zone, I could readily understand how reluctant the Minister was to grant a concession such as this.

I would like an assurance from the Minister that licences will not be issued to special groups of outfitters, unless they are made available to the general public. Having regard to your land-use inventory, whether it be a closed, open or deferred zone, I think that if you are going to make them open to anybody you should make them open to everybody.

In that connection, with regard to the new policy, if I am correct in saying that—that no new licences will be issued after June 6—there is one particular case that I would like to call to the attention of the Minister.

It is in a little bay on the north shore of Lake Superior. I cannot name it geographically, other than I happen to know it from my close association with the area. But it is a small bay where there are two land subdivisions; they would not be any more than maybe 200 feet of frontage apiece.

One of them, I understand, is privately owned, on which a land tax is paid. The other one, the chap who was camping on it—in fact he was living on it practically full time under a licence of occupancy—he died this past winter and his estate is being finalized now. When a chap who was interested in purchasing the building that was on the land asked for a licence of occupancy, he was told by the department that departmental policy was now that they were not going to issue any more.

How are you going to be governed in a small area like this, which cannot be developed to any great extent for public use, where half of the frontage—which might be 400 feet at the most—is privately owned and the other half is Crown land, but the buildings on it were owned by this chap who just died?

I was just wondering what the policy was and why this prospective buyer was denied the right to have a licence of occupancy on this particular plot of land. What is the departmental policy with regard to issuance or continued issuance of licences of occupancy?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, as was mentioned by the hon. member, up until June 6 if a person wanted to occupy a site, whether he be a tourist operator or an individual—up to a maximum of three weeks there was no charge—he would go to the district office and obtain a letter of authority. If he wanted to remain longer than three weeks, if he wanted to put a camp there, then he would require the land-use permit. I believe the minimum is $45, plus the minimum provincial land tax of $6.

We have found that these letters of authority were a bit of a nuisance so we have eliminated them. But a person up to three weeks—and we do not discriminate between an individual applicant, a hunter or a fisherman, or a tourist resort operator—does not require a letter of authority; he does require, however, a travel permit. If he wants to establish longer than three weeks and build something, then he needs a land-use permit.

Now, if the hon. member would send me the details of this specific case, the name and the particulars, I would be pleased to look into it and we certainly will do everything we can to help this person.

Mr. Stokes: It is not true then that you are not issuing any more licences of occupancy? You will still continue to licence them under circumstances.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We are not issuing any more letters of authority in northeastern Ontario; we are issuing just our usual land-use permits.

Mr. Stokes: You will still continue to do that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We will continue to issue land-use permits, but no letters of authority in northeastern Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: Will the Minister inform us, Mr. Chairman, whether the boundary dispute with the province of Quebec in the Lake St. Francis area, adjacent to the county of Glengarry, has ever been solved?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am advised that negotiations are still proceeding.

Mr. Sopha: Well, negotiations have been going on since Confederation, and we were told three years ago that this matter was in the process of negotiation. Now, perhaps the time is ripe with the province of Quebec. It wants to settle a lot of things about the future of this country, and it might be prevailed upon to settle the dispute involving the St. Regis band of Indians that occupy those islands in Lake St. Francis.

There was a time, of course, when prohibition was in force in Ontario and it was the desire of the inhabitants to push the boundary as close to the Ontario shore as possible for reasons that do not need to be elaborated. After all, Quebec was wet and it was desirable to enlarge the oasis to include as many islands as possible. But now that the whisky flows as freely on one side as the other, that reason is no longer germane. But surely in regard to the welfare programmes and that type of thing, the inhabitants, the Indians, must be in some doubt in which province they live. There must be a fundamental right in this country that a citizen ought to know which province he lives in.

Some of these islands, I look at the member for Glengarry, are occupied by American tourists, which does not surprise me. It does not matter as far as they are concerned where they live, which povince, but I am thinking of this St. Regis band of Indians. We do not have to be like the programme of Anschluss. We do not have to get into that frame of mind, but perhaps we could be a bit altruistic if we get those islands properly within Ontario. How long do problems have to be outstanding in this country? Why can you not settle that boundary matter with Quebec? Johnson is a very good friend of the Premier (Mr. Robarts).

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention to the hon. member for Sudbury that about three weeks ago I had a meeting with a representative of the Quebec department and we exchanged views on mutual problems; for instance angling licences. We will charge the same fee for a person from Quebec who comes to Ontario and vice versa. He said he would come to Toronto, he has never been here apparently, and visit us. And at that time I can certainly assure the hon. member that this certainly would be one of the matters we will discuss. I was not aware of this problem of the boundary line.

Mr. Sopha: Well I think it involves ten islands.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Ten islands.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Mr. Chairman, the St. Regis Indians are not involved to much with any islands, they live right at the junction where New York state and the province of Quebec starts—along the 45th parallel. It was transferred years ago when they took land from the Indians and gave them that area. Now, the islands involved are opposite Glengarry county and the dispute is this, that Quebec claims five or six islands that Ontario residents have had summer homes on for as long as 60 or 70 years and they have always felt that they were part of the province of Ontario. This dispute to my knowledge has been on now for at least 45 years. I can remember in 1929 coming to Toronto to try to resolve it then. Seemingly the problem was the fishermen fishing in Lake St. Francis. The officials of The Lands and Forests Department, who were looking for people who did not have licence fishing in Quebec waters, caused quite a stir but the last five or six years that has been resolved. They have a mutual understanding with the game wardens of Ontario to agree to let residents on either side fish at leisure in the lake. It is actually the St. Lawrence River, but it is six or seven miles wide there and it is normally called, locally, Lake St. Francis.

Now as far as the ownership of these properties on the islands, the people who live there, who claim they are Ontario residents, feel that they are still living in Ontario and that is what the dispute has been about.

The Charlottenb'rg township, which is part of Glengarry, collects resident taxes from these people and they have never stopped. So this is a problem for which no one seems to have the solution or the answer. Naturally, the province does not want to forsake these islands, which it feels belong to Ontario; and the province of Quebec feels, according to the guideline or the boundary line, that it is entitled to them. That is the problem and, as yet, nobody has found a solution. But nobody is adversely affected since we have come to an understanding the last six or seven years. Residents on the Ontario side who may have gone beyond what they thought the middle of the river certainly resent being picked up and fined by officials from the Lands and Forests or game wardens of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Sopha: Is there any permanent settlement about—

Mr. Villeneuve: Pardon?

Mr. Sopha: Is there any permanent settlement?

Mr. Villeneuve: No, mostly all cottages.

Vote 1104 agreed to.

On vote 1105:

Mr. Sopha: Now, Mr. Chairman, I have said in the past, and in the light of the somewhat critical remarks that I have made of the functions of this department in regard to other matters I would want to take the opportunity to repeat here publicly and within the hearing of this Minister, that as far as I am concerned one of the greatest things that this government has done in 25 years of office in this province is the provision of the many and very beautiful parks that our people, as well as many hundreds of thousands of visitors from abroad, enjoy in the way of recreational pursuits during the all-too-short summer season which is our legacy from the weather in this country.

I, myself, am somewhat intimately concerned with this park matter and I must confess that the chief of the general staff in my house is a senior official of the national campers' and hikers' association. I, myself, have never ever escaped being sequestered into that organization to this point but I have a feeling they look upon me as their unofficial legal counsel. But that group of outdoorsmen and women are very vitally concerned about the affairs of our parks and they keep a very watchful eye indeed on the proceedings in our parks—the care and maintenance, the surveillance exercised by this department, and in fact, everything else connected with them. Sometimes this department makes mistakes; this department sometimes invites into the parks people whom it might better take down to the Royal York hotel or some other place of retreat, and the people it invites into the parks do not always behave themselves in a manner that you would expect to encounter, say at a meeting on a Sunday morning with one of the reformed churches.

However that may be, I do not think that any permanent damage is done in that respect. But one must wonder, in the light of the argument last night, about the procedure of this department in unilaterally and arbitrarily raising the fees for the use of our parks in the way that this Minister did earlier this year, without notice to anyone that it was intended to do so. The public is met with the bland announcement that this season the fees are going to be appreciably higher.

I said "the bland announcement". That was not entirely true because, when this department raised the fees for the use of the parks, there was generated a great deal of confusion among the general public and among those most closely concerned with the fees in the park, as to just what the increase was. Many of us, I know on this side of the House, had to make specific enquiries as to what the increase was and what it pertained to, in order that we in turn could inform individuals and groups at home, what they might expect to pay for the ensuing year in the parks. In that respect it is a curious matter to me that the department did not see fit to publicize, on a very wide scale for the edification of the public in general, the precise nature of the charges that would be encountered for the ensuing year.

But as I apprehended, all the world is divided into two parts so far as park users are concerned. If you are going to stay overnight, then there is no necessity to have or purchase the annual $10 permit for the use of the parks. The group who are fairly sedentary in the parks on an overnight basis can expect to pay $2.50 per night, which is an increase of $1 per night. I am unable to calculate that in percentage terms; it is not quite 100 per cent, I know, but it approaches a 100-per-cent increase.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Up to five days no increase; same as last year.

Mr. Sopha: One dollar and fifty cents?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Last year you had to pay $1 to go in and $1.50 to camp—$2.50. This year there is only one fee—$2.50 up to five days.

Mr. Sopha: Up to five days?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right.

Mr. Sopha: Then the bite of $2.50 a day is applied after five days. That affects most of the people I know. Does the Minister mean five days of any one period? Any one period of five days?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: So if a person is there a week in July he pays $1.50 for the first five days—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: You pay $2.50 per night.

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Last year, as the hon. member mentioned, campers had to pay $1 to go in and $1.50 per night, for a total of $2.50, and they had the choice of buying an

annual $5 permit, which made it considerably cheaper. We feel there are two types of people using our parks—campers and the day users, those who go picnicking. This year, instead of paying $5 for an annual permit they are paying $10 for the annual, 12 months of the year.

You will say, "Well, they do not use the parks in the winter time." Quite true, but we are spending this year about $250,000 for providing trails for those who are using snowmobiles. So for a person who is only utilizing the parks, say, the odd time at $1 per day, it is the same. Say a person goes three days in July and four days in August; last year it had to be $1 each time, this year they are paying the same thing.

Mr. Sopha: Now he pays $10 a year.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: He pays $10 for an annual permit. For those persons who are camping more than five days, it is going to cost them a little more. But the reason why we have increased the park fees is we believe, and I think you will agree with this, that the people who are using the services should make a contribution for these services. We are not charging for the capital costs. We are not charging for the land. We are not charging for the buildings. We are not getting enough money for it, but we are trying to pay for the maintenance costs and the operational costs. During the last three or four years, wages have increased more than 30 per cent and I am sure that the hon. member is agreeable that we should be paying our people a fair wage.

People today want sanitation, especially the ladies. They do not want to go to an outdoor privy, so we are building comfort stations. These are costing thousands of dollars. More than 50 per cent of our parks are utilized by trailers and the projections for the future are increasing substantially. I think you would agree that most people, especially the ladies, like to have their feet on something solid, not on wet ground, especially when it is raining. So therefore people are buying more and more trailers. Last year we had 26 trailer camping stations. This year, out of all our provincial parks, 80 will have trailer camping stations.

Most people who go on holiday—it all depends, of course, but the great majority—by 11 o'clock they prefer to have a peaceful atmosphere. We are spending more money to have more people on duty in the evening to control rowdyism. This costs money. We feel again that the people who are using the parks should pay for these things. You may be interested to know that 21 per cent of the people who are using the parks are in the $4,000 to $6,000 income bracket; 34 per cent are in the income bracket from $6,000 to $8,000; 21 per cent of the balance make over $8,000. In other words, more than 50 per cent of our park users make more than $6,000. Thirty per cent of our camp-site users are American, and I think that the member agrees that they should make their contribution.

So for all these reasons, we feel quite justified. Again using the Smith committee report, we are trying to base our rate on a four- to five-year period. So instead of raising the fee 50 cents this year and having to come back and ask two years from now for 50 more cents, we thought that it would be advisable to set the rate at $2.50 hoping that we can stabilize the rate for several years.

Mr. Sopha: First, in the light of that disposition, I did not understand this proposition of capital costs at all. If as you say, 90 per cent of the land of Ontario is still vested in the Crown, then how can you talk about capital cost of land? What relevance has that got? There is no capital cost at all.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In southern Ontario we are paying thousands upon thousands for land acquisition, but the problem is that where the people are, the land is not vested in the Crown. Ninety per cent of the land in Ontario is Crown land, and probably 85 per cent of that is in northern Ontario. You may be interested in these figures: In northern Ontario there are 17 persons per square mile, compared to southern Ontario which has 124 per square mile. In this great metropolitan horseshoe industrial area the population is 20 times that of northern Ontario, and this is our problem. We are in the process this year of spending $9.3 million for land acquisition and the bulk of it is for park land. I think that many members of this House, especially those from Niagara Falls and Welland, agree that we should be spending substantially more to acquire land for public use in southern Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: Why do you foist the folly of the past, on the present generation? If you allowed this land to go out of the hands of the Crown at sometime in the past, and now you are caught up with the necessity of rebuying it, then I do not see that you should visit that as a cost upon the present users. Do you follow what I am saying to you?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We are not including capital costs. Our costs are strictly for maintenance—wages predominantly—75 per cent of it paid for.

Mr. Sopha: Well all right, you do not. But you try to derive an advantage from that. You say "Look, we don't charge you the capital costs", as if you are making a gift, or bestowing a beneficence. I say, in respect of Grundy Park, which is the one with which I am familiar, you have no capital cost at all! It was Crown land. It was a hardwood forest on Crown land before you decided to create a park.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: But the buildings and the roads—

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes, but they have nothing to do with capital costs of the land. I prefer to look at it from the point of view that the people of this province are entitled to make use of the lands which they own, without unnecessary, artificial hindrances visited upon them by The Department of Lands and Forests. That is my complaint. The people are enjoying what is theirs. I do not want the Minister, in the discharge of his responsibilities in the creation of parks, to embellish himself with any aura of conferring indulgences on the people. He is not giving them a break or doing them a favour. He is doing what he is paid to do. My complaint is that there is a limit on the charges that the Minister can impose upon those users.

In other words, in the enjoyment of our land by our seven million people, is there anything free? Other than sunlight and air? Is there anything free at all left? That people can make use of in uninhibited fashion? Now, why do you come along—for heaven's sakes the Minister of Municipal Affairs gives away $150 million in one fell swoop, he might have reduced the sales tax by a couple of percentage points, instead of the complicated scheme in which he has become involved. I use that as an analogy. There is $150 million going out the door.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Are you against that $150 million for basic shelter?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I think that I am. Not for the very lowest income group, not for them, but for the people making $25,000 a year, I am against it. Yes, I am against it for myself with the pittance that I make. I do not need it. Well, let us leave that aside.

In the light of that kind of thing, can The Department of Lands and Forests not, in the exercise of a little intellectual effort, say "Perhaps we will provide these parks and make them available at a minimum fee," instead of getting itself wrapped up in the business end of it. Does everything have to be a business? Does everything in government have to be approached from a business point of view? That is the way that Senator McCutcheon talks. That is the easy way Robert Winters talks. The government has got to run as a business.

The Department of Lands and Forests, in the recreational side of its activity, is not a business, but it is providing an environment for the optimum use of that great outdoors which the beneficent providence has endowed upon us. That is our heritage in this country, by virtue of having been born here. Now can we not enjoy that? Can people who, as you say, earn $4,000 to $6,000 a year enjoy that at a minimum cost without being saddled with $2.50 every time that they come in the gate? Do they have to fork out that kind of money?

I suspect that what has happened here is that since Wilfrid Spooner occupied this portfolio, and it is well known that he had a very rigid spine in this area, the complaints of the tourist operators were descending upon this department about the cheap camping fees that the department charged. Maybe there has been a little feeling in the resolution of this department. They have succumbed to those blandishments, and in order to attract the benevolent attitude of the tourist operators, they jacked up the fees.

Now I am told, and I do not want to draw any comparisons at all, between the two uses of the campsites. One of the major complaints—and I do not know how valid it is—made by the people who pay $2.50, the overnight people, is that most of the work of The Department of Lands and Forests staff is created by the use of the park by the daily visitor. They are the ones that create the work. That gets us into a dichotomy. That is, the operation of the dialectic, and one group is pitted against the other. I do not think that there is a great deal of merit in that. I think that they should be treated equally, and I have a feeling that people in moderate incomes, where it is in the interest of society that we get them into the out of doors—we would like to see that. That saves us costs later on if we expose them to the swimming, fishing, boating, running around the beach in bare feet, and everything else. We will save money at some later date as a result of that activity, and it seems to me that the sensible thing to do would be to make it as cheap as possible.

Something like a $1.00 a day, $1.50 a day? Well I think $1.50 overnight was felt to be quite reasonable, but along you come without consulting anybody.

You do not consult us, you do not consult your own members. You consult that Treasury board, and overnight I have become even more pessimistic about the total amount of grey matter, there is in that board. You consult them, that is a very weak board. The public of Ontario is very badly served by that board.

None of them would get through first year economics in any of the universities, not one of them. And they are consulted, and they say, "All right, let her go, Reno $2.50, run her through"—and that is it.

There are a lot of people in this province that are resentful of it. So seven days times $2.50 for a week's holiday, is how much? $17.50 off the top. Off the top to The Department of Lands and Forests. The cost of the gasoline getting there. Family of four, let us say, that has got to be $40-$50 in groceries. Well for a family of four, you are approaching, with all the incidentals, $100. One hundred dollars plus, that should cost something in the neighbourhood of $50 for a week of recreational leisure.

The Minister's figures hoist him by his own petard. When he points out that 50 per cent—is that what he said—50 per cent of the users make more than $6,000 a year, small wonder at those prices. The poor cannot afford it. They cannot afford to go in and make use of the camps. Only people with a trailer can go in now. But you cannot take the pup-tent, and put it up in one of the campsites and pay that $17.50. So if that Treasury board ever got around to thinking about the financial affairs of this province, they might, before this season really gets under way, knock that cost back to seven times $1.50. How much is that? That would be $10.50 a week which would seem to me, to just about hit the nail on the head as the amount that it ought to be.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Under this same heading I want to join the member for Sudbury in regards to increased fees to provincial parks. The season fee has advanced double, and the Minister outlined the group of people in the certain groups that makes use of our parks, and I must say he forgot those in the $2,000 and the $4,000 income bracket.

Since the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) brought down his estimates announcing an increase, I have been contacted many times from citizens in my part of the province protesting, and asking me to protest, the increase in fees to enter our provincial parks.

I might say that in my part of the province the park was given to the province of Ontario, and now the fee has reached the sum of $10. People are protesting it in our part of the province. Last weekend I visited the park, and outside the park and along the beaches the people were lined up, and very few entering our Randolph provincial park.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the attendance at the parks in our part of the province is, I would say, going to go down this present year. They are not going to make use of it. They are going to attend the township parks and town parks and I would say this is not a good way to have the people; I think they should be encouraged to use our parks more.

I agree with the hon. member for Sudbury that the fee should be cut down from $17.50 to $10.50 and make it possible for, or to encourage, more people to go in and make use of these parks.

Mr. Chairman, the people in my part of the province over the last few weeks have protested to me seriously. They wanted me to bring this to the attention of the Minister, I know that he has not got all the say about it.

I have the highest respect for you, but I must say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister, I think it is about time that you made a thorough investigation of the cost of operating our parks. I would think that if you did look into some of the costs of operating our parks, it might help to reduce some of these high rates of admission. In our part of the province, I suggest that the Minister have a look at the cost of operation—I think he could find a great saving there.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, something that the hon. member for Kent mentioned a moment ago struck me as being strangely true. He said he realized that the Minister did not have all the say about this. I believe the Minister has shown in his estimates that he has less say than he should have.

This is the second year that he has had this responsibility. He has now come forward with substantial increases in the

revenue-producing policy of The Department of Lands and Forests.

I do not know whether it is his idea, or whose idea it is. Surely this decision relating to the fishing licences has already been discussed here and decided by a vote—unfortunately not in the public interest. But as well as that, the decision to raise park fees is going to become quite significant when we look at the trends in park usage. Numbers of people from our large urban centres are going to be moving into the northern part of the province and, more particularly, into the more inadequate facilities in the southern part of the province.

It seems that if the Minister's policies continue in this way he is going to turn his department into a revenue-producing department of government with a vengeance. Surely the $2.50 fee is much in the same category as a $3 fishing licence? One that he says is designed for the future, rather than present needs? When we see that one of the justifications that the Minister has put before the House for the $3 fishing licence for residents is associated with the fact that he hopes he does not have to change it in the next five years, surely the same argument was used in convincing him that he should go for the $2.50 a day new fee that is not going to be pertaining to our provincial parks.

This is a substantial increase when we see the services that are being offered. It is a substantial increase when we see the predictions associated with the increased desire for the use of the parks. Whether this increased use will come about with increased costs remains to be seen, but there is no doubt that many more people in the population are looking forward to this kind of holiday.

I myself and my family are looking forward to coming up into the Moonbeam region when the House adjourns, so that we can see what the facilities are like and also to have a very pleasant time—the six of us. But I would say, Mr. Chairman, that there has been legitimate complaint from all parts of the province that the fee schedule that is being imposed by the Minister for fishing licences and for parks accommodation is beyond reason. It is taking advantage of what has been one of the best holidays still available to those interested in getting their families into the outdoors, in the economy style.

I feel that we in Ontario are falling behind in the facilities that we offer, but we are moving far ahead of the other provinces in the charges. Surely it is almost reaching the prohibitive level when we see what the Minister has in mind for our provincial parks now?

I would like to say further, that while we approve of the policy that brought about the parks integration board, the Minister well knows that there are five or six agencies of the government—five or six departments, actually, if you include Highways, that have responsibility for parks. There seems to be a great lack of co-operation in the approach into which we see the government funds being channelled.

The conservation authorities are moving towards supplying more and more recreational facilities. The Minister himself has predicted and has reported to this House on expanding financial responsibilities that he is taking on for this particular idea. Yet we feel that the Minister for this department is trying to balance his accounts by raising the rates.

I sometimes wonder if the private enterprise people have not got to him more strongly than they should have, when their complaint that the government is in direct competition to private enterprise in parking and in park facilities has been heard from time to time.

Surely, the government has the overall responsibiltiy to develop our recreational resources and see that they are available to the average citizen and his family so that the advantages that we have in Ontario are available to us all?

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, the large number of people who have written to me in protest against this increase of park entrance and camping rates compels me to say a word.

With one group in particular, there are 155 families, whose names and addresses I have, who have written me on this matter. This one group, particularly, of 25 families with 72 children living in a lower-income housing development. I think they sum it up very nicely when they say:

> Camping in parks throughout Ontario is practically the last pleasure left to an Ontario resident with limited means. For couples with children, travelling is out of the question because of the high cost of motels.
>
> With camping facilities at a nominal cost, families are able to travel throughout this beautiful and wonderful province without going deep into debt. Renting a cottage in the high-price vacation areas is also not

within the reach of the average family. These proposed increases in camping rates, if passed, will place this form of recreation beyond the scope of many families and will certainly curtail the activities of most of us.

These people have, as a community group, built up their camping equipment to the point where this is the vacation they look forward to from year to year. As camping becomes more prevalent now we find that it is being curtailed because of the monetary cost.

I think the government, in its own economic procedure, does not have a good argument for this. The moneys taken in for toll bridges go into the consolidated revenue of the province. Why is it then important that there be a relationship between the amount of money taken in and the amount of money spent? I do not think there is any importance attached to that, not for something of a recreational nature.

The other thing I would like to state is this. In other correspondence from the Kitchener-Waterloo campers' club, which is signed by a great many people, they point out, and I would like the Minister to answer this question, that as far as they can ascertain no public body in North America levies such high charges for use of their parks and public facilities.

I must concur with everything that was said on this matter and feel that some reconsideration should be given so that we can retain these parks for use by people who want a holiday at a nominal cost.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Chairman, I too would like to add my comments to those of my leader and others who have spoken with respect to the licensing situation and the cost of licences for persons who wish to travel in our parks. It is certainly quite apparent to me and to the other members of this House that the development of camping as a family experience is one which is growing rapidly in Ontario, and indeed throughout all of North America. From the Minister's own figures, some 30 per cent of those who attend in the provincial parks of Ontario are American citizens.

But as in other areas, as individual interest in a hobby or any other kind of work develops, so does the organization of like-minded people, who wish to expand upon the facilities available to them and to develop generally the kind of facilities that they would like to see in order to favour their point of view. One such group, to which my friend the hon. member for Waterloo North has referred, is the Kitchener-Waterloo campers' club, and the petition of which he spoke was sent to the hon. Minister. I too was privileged enough to receive a copy of the petition, signed by some 160 persons.

Two matters of opposition were raised, and my friend has referred to one of them—that is, dealing with the charges which are levied for camping by any other of the public bodies in North America, and the various state or provincial government or municipal ones which have facilities available for camping.

Some of the points raised, to which I would refer the Minister, in this petition and the preamble to it, are made concerning the fact as set out by these petitioners that facilities in general in provincial parks have not kept pace in their development with the increase and changes in the fee structure. Similarly, that the income derived from provincial park operations should be more closely reserved for the actual intensive development of parks and other facilities, and that some clear use of this revenue, some form of earmarking of it so that the actual persons who are paying the fees should benefit from it, is a function and responsibility of the government.

This is one of the things that surely the Ontario committee report on the taxation structure has recommended in many areas, that the fees for licensing for the use of various facilities are fees which should be directly related to the benefit received. They should be fees for service. They should not be fees based on regulatory procedures or based on any desire to increase the profit in the consolidated or general revenue funds of the province.

If these fees are being used to actually stimulate the facilities for which the Minister is responsible, then I feel he has the responsibility, in addition, to refer to the members of this House the details of the kind of items which are being provided, the reasons for the increases of costs, and the tie-in that he sees as the reasonable basis on which he is making the changes in the revenue structure that he is now proposing.

In addition to these questions with respect to facilities and with respect to the use of income derived, the petitioners in this situation have referred to the increase in the daily camping fees. The question they pose of the Minister at that point is that in their opinion, the daily camping fee increase is not compatible with the facilities that are presently available. In one brief quotation from the preamble to this petition, I would refer the Minister to this comment and I quote:

> These increases will undoubtedly create a hardship for the many Ontario families who camp in provincial parks due to economic reasons.

I should like to inquire of the Minister if he shares the opinion of my friend from Kent who refers to the number of persons in low income areas for whom camping is about the only recreation available to them on their holiday term. Further, has the Minister received other petitions from groups which also have complained about the increase problems and the costs of trying to run as economic a vacation as possible in a one- or two-week period for a family where the income of the family is in the $2,000 or $4,000 level?

Could the Minister answer those points, namely, the one dealing with the level of facilities, the one dealing with the reservation of income for the development of facilities, and the one dealing with the daily fee and whether or not it is compatible with these facilities?

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the complaints that have been made. I see no point in repeating all the arguments that have been made. I have received many complaints from people who oppose these increases. I merely wish to place myself on record as opposing them. However, I should like to ask the Minister whether he is intending to attend the trailer conference early in July, I believe, in Aylmer? And if he is, I should like to pass a friendly warning to him, not to expect a warm reception.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, in summing up what has already been said by previous speakers who have shown their opposition to the increase in camping fees, I am sure their comments have reflected the general attitude of people all across the province. Before I quote from an article in the Toronto *Daily Star,* by a camping expert who has spent a considerable number of years camping in the parks of the province of Ontario, I would as a very last resort ask the Minister if he would not consider exempting pensioners from the additional cost of admittance to the provincial parks, in the same way as we have asked him with regard to the implementation of a fishing licence, which comes into effect on January 1 next year.

I think this is the least we could do for people who are still young at heart and would like to go out into our parks and enjoy the great outdoors and the facilities that are available to them. You are imposing a hardship on this group of citizens which makes it prohibitive for them using this facility. I think we owe this to our senior citizens who are still enjoying good health and are able to get out and enjoy those facilities. I think they have paid their way over the years and should be exempt from any additional increase in the cost of living and what little enjoyment they are able to get.

The article I am going to quote is from the *Star* of June 15, 1968, and it says:

> Campers are no longer getting good value for the $2.50 per day they are being charged in Ontario provincial parks. In fact, they aren't getting anything more for the extra dollar they paid this year than they did for the $1.50 they paid last year. The new rate puts Ontario parks amongst the highest-priced public-owned systems in North America and makes them by far the costliest in Canada.

If you look at the statistics from *Canada National Parks Accommodation Guide* and the supplement for the fees effective April 1, 1967, where we charge $10 for admittance for a vehicle into a public park in the province of Ontario, the national parks charge $2 per vehicle, or $3 for a vehicle with a trailer, for the whole fiscal year; and here we are charging $10. For sites with electrical hookups in the national parks it costs $1.50 a day; in a provincial park it costs $2.50 a day. National park sites with electrical connections, water, and sewer hookup cost $2; and we charge $2.50 a day in our provincial parks and a good many of them do not have these facilities. So this is clear proof that the park facilities in the province of Ontario are certainly the highest priced in Canada and a good many of them do not provide the amenities that are provided in a good many of the other jurisdictions with a much smaller fee.

Continuing with the article:

> The rate is on a par with many privately-owned camp sites, but in most of these there are running water hook-ups in each camp site, and the use of flush toilets, hot showers and laundromats is usually included in the flat rate. Electricity is available at each site for a nominal charge of from 25 to 50 cents extra per day. These extras are also to be found in a great many public parks in other provinces and most of the national parks operated coast to

coast by the federal government. Ontario, once the leader in establishing provincial parks, is falling behind the modern camping trend. Only 195 of the more than 17,000 camp sites in our parks have electrical hookups, none with running water hookup, and only a minimum number of parks with flush toilets.

Camping associations and clubs have already vowed to boycott Ontario parks in protest. They say they will also try to influence others outside the province to do the same when they visit here. Parks branch officials of The Department of Lands and Forests say the higher rates are in line with policies set down a number of years ago by the government.

In ending the article he said:

It almost makes you wonder if the idea isn't to drive the camper out of the provincial parks.

And I can assure the Minister from the kind of flak and the kind of objection I have been getting from people in the north with regard to the increase in park admittance, they are just not going to use the facilities. So what revenue you did have from this source for the maintenance cost, I think you are negating it, you are going to lose it as a result of the increases and you will be right back where you started. I would suggest to the Minister that if the Treasury board wants another source of revenue that they look elsewhere, other than the only thing we have left to us with regard to enjoying our national heritage.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any further debates on this point? The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I hesitate to criticize this Minister because I like him, I think he has the best smile of the lot over there, but I do not particularly like what he is proposing to do. I cannot understand how he can have so much backbone and gumption as to fly in the face of the people, especially the people in the north. I have never seen an issue that has promoted more table pounding and harsh words among the men of the north and the women of the north than this Department of Lands and Forests and this Minister.

How it could possibly feel that it could fly in the face of the people this way and say: "And not only are we going to increase the camping fees, but we are going to also increase the hunting licence. And besides that we are going to give you a fishing licence. We are going to do it all the same year." Just like that. "However, we are going to let you know sufficiently in advance so you can think these things over and let us know how you feel."

Well you know how the people feel. I have a petition here, I have letters. There are all kinds of things to do and to attend to when I go back to my riding, and I have to spend my time listening to people complain about the proposals of this department. It is not so much that they cannot afford it or that they will not pay it; but they resent it, they have always felt that: "Well, the one thing we do have is the wide open spaces up here. Our forefathers came up here years ago, and had the courage and the backbone to come up here and work in this land and open this land up, and that is the one thing we have. We can go 20 miles down the highway and we can hunt and we can fish, or we can camp out." But now along comes this department and it is taking these freedoms away. They are saying to the people: "You are free to use these things if you want to pay."

I was very proud last evening and today to see so many members of the Liberal caucus rise and speak out against these proposed increases. I am very proud of it and, believe you me, when I have had the opportunity to report back home to the folks back there, they have been extremely proud of it and happy. I think the Minister has heard enough now and he has seen enough to know that it is not the will of the people whom he represents and serves and his department serves, that these increases go ahead.

I have a letter here from the Thunder Bay fish and game association, which was addressed to the hon. Minister. I have a copy. There are somewhere from 1,000 to 1,500 members in this group. They are very representative of the feelings of the people, I think, the outdoors people in the north, and they do oppose the increased camping fee along with the other increases.

Mr. Chairman, I would certainly be remiss if I did not rise in my seat now to speak. There is hardly an argument that has not been advanced this afternoon opposing this camping fee increase. I would say that I think we are going to find that a lot of our Ontario campers are going to camp elsewhere. They are going to go out of the province to camp. From my part of the country they will go down to Minnesota or they will head out across the west, but just out of sheer resentment. They are tough-skinned and they are stubborn, and because they resent this thing to such a point, they are going to leave, they

are going to go somewhere else. I think a lot of them will let their camping gear rot out in the back shed or they will camp out in their back yard.

I really hate to see the people that I know and especially care for up there so bitter about anything, but I have not seen them more bitter about anything than this. It is just as though you are charging them to go and park in their own back yard. They figure this land is theirs, and they take this as a very personal and a very deep offence, and they cannot understand how a Minister and a department could have the gall to raise everything all at one shot. That is why all of these letters I get and all of these resolutions do not pertain to just one phase of these proposed increases, but all of them together. And that is why I am discussing them all at the one time.

Mr. Sopha: He is a big spender.

Mr. Knight: I am at a loss to find sufficient arguments to add to what has already been said. I really do not know how to approach this Minister to make him change his mind. But that is what I am trying to do. I want you to change the mind of the Minister. I want him to say to the people, "All right, we respect your feelings, we have had enough representation now. We will put the dollars and cents aspect aside. We will curtail our programme to some extent, and we will not charge you the fee, and let us see what happens. Let us try it for a year, or two years: We will give you a break on this."

Like the Minister, I come from northern Ontario. I know how the people feel. I know how possessive they feel about their land, about their right to hunt, their right to fish. I want the Minister to say, "I know how deeply you feel about Americans coming in and occasionally taking your favourite haunts. So out of some respect for your sentiment, for your feelings up there, we will delay this thing. We will hold it off for a year or two and we will see what happens."

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a lot said from that side of the House about the need to assist our people in occupying their leisure hours, of which they are going to have more and more, it seems. This is a wonderful way to occupy leisure hours. It is a lot better for a family to pack up and head out to a provincial park and camp there, than to sit at home in front of a TV set or in a movie theatre, or some of the less wholesome activities. I think we have got to go about encouraging people to do this.

There is a wonderful movement afoot now in the province for people to take advantage of these outdoor locations and government has got to encourage it.

We all know how the cost of living has gone up. Taxes have gone up. It seems as though everything has gone up. And it seems as though governments gear their increases in taxes to the affluent. The people who can afford it pay it. So the more the people can afford, the more we charge them, the more we take out of them. Well, what about those who are not affluent? They cannot afford this. They get poorer and poorer, and the rich get richer and richer. Those in the middle start falling behind. I feel that we are at that stage right now.

I know the people of the north feel that now it is not enough that we have got to pay more for gas and pay more in our property taxes, and more all around for necessities of life. Now they are biting into the things that we had for nothing before now. Even these are gone.

Someone more experienced in this parliamentary field has suggested that I move that vote 1105 be reduced to $1; and if I have a seconder, I would be very happy to do that.

That is how strong I feel about it. Thank you.

Mr. MacDonald: I would like to add a brief word. I am not going to spend much time adding to the crescendo of protest to which the Opposition has given voice, and which has emerged all across the province of Ontario. The last speaker spoke primarily on the views of the north, but as others have indicated, this is also the view of people all across the south. In fact, I invite the hon. Minister from Stormont (Mr. Guindon) to send to the Minister of Lands and Forests some of his clippings from the Cornwall *Standard Freeholder*, and what they have to say about this. They are a little scalding. I think the Minister might almost be persuaded, in spite of the Scrooges from the Treasury board who have put the screws on him to raise these taxes, to change his mind.

However, there is one footnote I would like to add to this, without elaborating on all the protest which has gone on.

As has been pointed out, it now becomes clear that the government has decided—whether this Minister or the government imposing it on the Minister, we do not know—to make The Department of Lands and Forests much more of a revenue-producing department. If I may just comment on one remark of the last speaker when he said

that the taxes are geared to the affluent—unfortunately if they were geared to the affluent, they might be more acceptable, but they are most regressive taxes. They apply across the board, and hit the person who has not got the means. Therefore they are undercutting the trend towards camping, which is a very desirable thing and a very necessary thing in a time with higher costs of living. The average family can get some access to the great heritage of Canada, the great outdoors, only by trying to beat the cost of living through cheaper holidays—if they are going to have a holiday at all.

But in this revenue-producing department, if I can get to the footnote that I wanted to ask, the Minister, under the guise of accepting the suggestion of the Smith report, in effect implied that what we were doing was imposing a higher fee now—really higher than was justified—but doing so for the purpose of being able to establish a standard fee for the next four or five years. In other words, it is not desirable to be increasing fees every year, so what we do is we "wham it up" now, and it will be there for four or five years.

But I draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the significance of the schedule. What, in effect, the people of Ontario now have been told, is that the fees are up in this oppressive way until just beyond the next provincial election. And beyond the next provincial election, they can expect another "wham," as they say in the funny papers. Well, I think it is time that the people be alerted to the basic policy of using this as a revenue, and also the cycle of raising it now more than is necessary to get a standard fee for four or five years in the hope that people will forget about it. Then after the next election is over, if the people make the mistake again of putting this government back, they will be whacked once again. It is for that reason that I think the amendment is a worthy one and we will support it.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any other speakers before the Minister? The member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, as I listen to this debate and the wave of protest that rolled across the floor to this Minister I thought that a word should be said in addition about the protest of the urban dwellers, the people who live in Metropolitan Toronto. It is not only the people from the north. Not only the people from the smaller communities, but the people from the big cities are concerned that the government is encroaching upon some of the few free pleasures that they have had in the past.

You would be amazed, Mr. Chairman, at the number of people who have telephoned me and who have written me, to ask how far this goes. Somehow, in this day of ever-increasing taxes, they have just had their municipal tax bills. Sales tax goes up. Cigarettes are up. Liquor is up. You name it and that tax has gone up, and the substantial part of it has been put up by this government.

Those people who look forward to inexpensive though pleasurable vacations, now find that they have park fees to pay, licence fees to pay, and so on, and they are most concerned and most unhappy because they like to believe that something in this province belongs to them, and that in all of the taxes that they pay that come into the provincial coffers, there is going to be some little compensation that comes back to them in the form of the right to enjoy their parks and use them as they have in the past without this kind of taxation being applied.

What has happened, Mr. Chairman, is that the government—having been caught up in the grandiose election campaign promise about the shelter relief which is going to cost $150 million and which is not going to achieve at all by itself the purpose for which it has been designed, and which is going to be almost impossible to administer on an equitable basis and the tenants by and large are not going to get any benefit from this $150 million—the government has had to come to this unfortunate Minister, and I say deliberately, this unfortunate Minister, and say: "Minister of Lands and Forests, it is up to you. You are going to help bail us out." Yes, we will raise liquor taxes, we will raise gas taxes, and we will raise cigarette taxes, and we will raise any other taxes that we can. We have to be a little careful because we also made a promise in the election campaign that we were not going to raise income tax or sales tax, so we will not do that; but we have got to scrape the bottom of the barrel to get every last dollar that we possibly can because we made this unfortunate promise.

In the meantime, this government, Mr. Chairman, has set up the select committee. The member for London South (Mr. White) chairs this committee. They started to work, and I am told by my colleagues that they are putting in a lot of hours, but they are

charged with examining the recommendations of the Smith committee and bringing back to us, in a package, recommendations as to how the report of that committee can best be implemented for the good of all the people of Ontario.

So what happens, we jump the gun in the middle of an election campaign to promise the shelter relief. We jump the gun in the middle of the election campaign to apply relief in the administration of justice, and then the Minister comes in and he tries to justify what he is doing on the basis of another remote clause.

They pick, bit by bit, but it makes no part of a sensible hole and they unfortunately mistreat by regressive taxation the people who can least afford it. The people have come to believe sincerely—and they should—that they have the right to enjoy certain of the natural resources of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, the people in Metropolitan Toronto, the people that I represent in great numbers, resent this kind of approach to the financing of this province. They want that view expressed and this is why I join with my colleagues in supporting this motion.

Now more important than that, Mr. Chairman, I think it is going to be interesting to see the government members who will have to be called in to vote in favour of a tax put on their right to use the parks. And, as each Conservative member is going to have to rise in his place this afternoon, let me remind them, Mr. Chairman, that they are going to be voting in favour of taxes on the use of the parks and taxes on fishing licences. This is the sort of fruit that you are going to have to reap at this time, because you have gone into an attempted financial re-organization without thinking about it—with a big thick report that you do not properly understand, that you have to set up a select committee to advise you about, but notwithstanding that you have manoeuvered yourself into financial chaos. This is why, unfortunately, we have to tax the use of our parks in this unreasonable retrogressive and unfair way, and this is why we are going to vote against the Minister in this vote and the Tories. Let it be on their own consciences. The Tories will vote in favour of taxing the right to use parks by the people of Ontario, and let that be shown clearly in the record.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on another matter not directly related to this vote, so I suppose before the motion is put I will have to speak on this.

Mr. Singer: Do not fall into that trap.

Mr. Chairman: If it is within the vote 1105, the member may continue the debate.

Mr. Stokes: I would like to see a proposed park that was advocated by the people of Nipigon and the surrounding area, and the one at South Bay which is on the southwest corner of Lake Nipigon, developed as a provincial park. There was considerable correspondence with the Minister of the day, the hon. Kelso Roberts, and with the Minister of Reform Institutions, the hon. George Wardrope, and at that time they were given considerable encouragement with regard to that. I have spoken to the district forester about it, and at that time the only reservation to it by The Department of Lands and Forests was that it was quite a bit off a travelled highway, off Highway 17, and it was their experience that people would not visit the park.

Now, there are thousands and thousands of square miles of wonderful country in the Lake Nipigon area and in that whole watershed there is only one provincial park and that is on the east shore up near Beardmore, about 50 miles north of Nipigon on Highway 11. The people of Nipigon, the chamber of commerce and the town council put a pretty good case up for the development of a provincial park at South Bay, and the department at that time did not see fit to put a large sum of money into it because it did not think that it would attract too many people because of its distance from Highway 17. But they came up with another angle, and I would just like to read this letter into the record with regard to how this could be paid for. For the benefit of not only the travelling public, but the people in the area who really do not have a provincial park that they can visit within easy distance of the town of Nipigon.

Now here is a letter to the reeve:

Dear Reeve Waghorn:

> I noted in the copy of an address by an officer of the Ontario Hydro Commission that since World War II the commission has paid more than $12 million to the Niagara parks commission in the form of water—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: On the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I understand there is a motion before the House. Am I correct?

Mr. Chairman: That is correct.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This discussion does not seem to me to be connected with the motion.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

The motion is simply that vote 1105 be reduced to $1. Now we are discussing vote 1105 which is the parks branch, and in the opinion of the Chairman anything within the purview of the parks branch on vote 1105 may be debated before the motion is put, because if this motion is defeated the entire vote is carried.

Mr. MacDonald: The only way, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General can get us off the hook is that we have a discussion of our rules and say that if we vote on a specific estimate we cannot come back to it, but we would not be precluded from discussing other items in the general estimate before the House. Our rules, as they now stand are that if you pass that general estimate, on a vote dealing with one aspect of it, you cut out discussion of everything else.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared, of course, to abide by your order, but it seems incongruous to me that you can have the motion to cut the vote to $1, then you get up and talk as if you were supporting the idea of this estimate. I do not know how you are going to vote afterwards. I would take it that the hon. member who just sat down is perhaps saying we need this estimate for this project, and that is perhaps how you can say it is related to the motion, but it seems to be a rather incongruous position in which we are placed

Mr. Chairman: The motion itself does not make reference to any specific portion of the parks branch vote. It is simply that the total vote be reduced, and there is no mention of any specific area within this vote, and the Chairman cannot find any basis for restricting the debate.

The member for London South has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General and I had a small difference of opinion in the early days of this session on this very point. I could hardly accept the proposition that I was in any way in error, and yet his assurance and confidence in making the point led me to privately study the parliamentary procedure of May. There is absolutely no doubt, sir, that the Attorney General was right on that occasion and that I was wrong. The rules very clearly state that, in an amendment of this kind, the debate must be confined specifically, and directly, to the terms of the amendment. I am going to try to turn up the reference here and the page number for you.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I would point out to the member for London South that, in the chair's opinion, this is exactly what we are doing. The motion, I again read simply says: "That vote 1105 be reduced to $1."

Now vote 1105 includes many areas of consideration within the parks branch, but we are dealing with a motion to reduce the total parks branch vote to $1, therefore it is the opinion of the chair, the members may debate anything within the parks branch.

Mr. White: No, the debate must be confined to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: On a point of order, the member for Sarnia.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Now we have had the member for London South get up and give us complete generalities about his agreement now and his lack of omniscience for one occasion.

Well, give us the rule. I ask you this, Mr. Chairman, let us have the rule.

Mr. White: I am looking for it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why did you rise in the first place if you did not know it?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: To continue, sir, with reference to water rentals, it was new to me and I wrote to the Hydro for some clarification of the subject. The reply outlined the procedures by which Hydro for years, had paid the province of Ontario a water tax or a rental for all waters pouring through generators in the province. This rental money, accounting for more than $6 million per year, goes into the consolidated revenue fund of province and is used to support the development of the provincial parks system throughout Ontario.

Here is a portion of a letter I wish to quote at this time:

> The rate paid by Hydro is $1.50 per horsepower and on this basis some $500,000 a year is being paid into the consolidated revenue fund of the province on water passing through the generating stations of the Nipigon River—266,000

kilowatts or 358,000 horsepower. It would seem reasonable and logical to me that Nipigon, if it desired one, is in a strong position to demand a large provincial park in the scenically enchanting Nipigon country.

Do you see some merit on this suggestion, based on revenues flowing into the provincial Treasury from Nipigon water rentals paid by Hydro? I would be interested in your comments. Looking toward a discussion of this subject, perhaps at our next directors' meeting.

Yours sincerely,
Northwestern Ontario Development Association
Alexander Phillips, Manager.

Now, I suggest to the Minister that if he wants to spread things around, there is $500,000 being paid by Ontario Hydro to the consolidated revenue fund of the province of Ontario, which money could go toward the cost of developing parks. I do not deny a request such as this to the people of Nipigon. That money is generated there. It is money that was earned by water rentals in northwestern Ontario, where they have few enough parks, particularly around Lake Nipigon. It is the junction of Highways 11 and 17, and it is generally considered to be the hub of the forest-products industry in the riding of Thunder Bay. It has everything going for it. They have all kinds of rivers and streams, wonderful fishing in Lake Nipigon, boating, beaches. All they want is a park. I was wondering if the Minister would care to take this under advisement and at least conduct a survey to see whether such a scheme is desirable.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, if I may deal briefly with the last item for the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight). We will give it further study, but I am advised that this park is in the Port Arthur area and this is a park reserve for development as a provincial park when the demand warrants it. The figures for last year for parks for that area are: The Black Sands park was only used 18 per cent, and Sibley park used only 24 per cent, and in view of the limited funds that we have, I think that the member will agree—

Mr. Stokes: You did not look up Rainbow park?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: These are the figures that I have and they indicate that these parks were used very lightly. However, as I said, we are prepared to give it further consideration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks by the various members. First, may I say that we started in 1956 with only eight provincial parks, and today, in 1968, within 12 years, we now have 96 provincial parks, and a couple under development for this summer. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that we should be proud of our parks, we have some of the finest in Canada. Last year we introduced a parks classification. We have five main classifications, and we will have a master plan. Each provincial park is being given a master plan. Within our provincial parks, we have nature trails. In a certain number of parks we have interpretive programmes. We are trying to make our parks as effective as possible to serve the great diversity of people's interests.

Some are only interested in swimming; some in wilderness camping. Now, I think, generally speaking, there are some very good suggestions made. I have not too much to say. First, our policy. We believe that the people who use the services should make a fair contribution for the use of them. Now, for those incomes that the hon. leader of the Opposition mentioned, of the very low income group—and I think that we all agree that our concern should be for these people in the low income group—

Mr. MacDonald: What about pensioners?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: With regards to pensioners, I am not too sure. There are many people today, who, when they reach the retirement age of 65, are sometimes in a much better position than the young married couples who have, say, an average of four to six children. There are many people today, who reach retirement age, who are in a very good financial position. Now, I realize that there are others who are not.

Now, with reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Kent, also with regard to parks. Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, there are many people who forget that we have, in the province of Ontario, about 400 access points, which are places where we have boat launching facilities, picnic tables, outdoor privies, fire grills, and where not one cent is charged, of this cost. This costs money, and this year alone, we are spending over $100,000 for garbage collections. Now, with reference to the hon. member for Kent, as I said earlier, we are very concerned about the small wage earner, and I think that there is room for improvement and seeing if we can-

not work out some sort of amelioration in that class.

The hon. leader of the Opposition brought the matter of the lack of co-operation—if I understood him correctly—among the various commissions who administer parks. The Ontario integrated park board is the board comprised of the Niagara parks commission, the St. Lawrence parks commission, the conservation authorities and provincial parks; and I would say to him, sir, that there is very close liaison.

It was mentioned that we were influenced by tourist operators. Mr. Chairman, this is not so. We were not influenced by individual tourist operators. Our main concern is to try and provide as good facilities as possible within our means, and we are trying to charge the people who use the parks a reasonable cost—the operational costs.

Mr. Nixon: Your means are based on a $3 million budget!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Last year we spent in our provincial parks, $3.7 million and we took in $2.1 million, a deficit of $1.6 million. This is operational costs.

With reference to the hon. member for Waterloo North, I would say that the state of Michigan—whether we are the jurisdiction that has the highest rate—are charging $2.50, and those who use electrical power, 50 cents more. It is the same in California. I met with the state of Minnesota about three weeks or longer ago, about the advisory committee of the Quetico-Lake Superior provincial park and they are also in the process of raising their daily fees to the same as ours.

The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside mentioned the conference at Aylmer about the trailer park. If I am available, and if the House will still be sitting in July, of course, I, or a representative from the parks branch, certainly will be pleased to attend.

With reference to the hon. member for Thunder Bay, saying that the private camp sites have facilities similar to ours and sometimes charging less. I would say to him that generally speaking our parks have far superior facilities. For example, as I mentioned earlier, we have outdoor theatres; nature trails—we are really intensifying the facilities in our parks. Our beaches; our comfort stations; we are paving several of the park roads. Today, as you know, people demand the best and this costs money, and this is why, I think, in view of the hon. member's concern for the small wage earners, maybe we should be giving consideration, the same as the people in the Legislature. Some drive Chevrolets, and some Cadillacs. Maybe we should have parks where the fees are catered or geared to those in the low income group.

There have been some very good suggestions, Mr. Chairman, and we will certainly give them every consideration.

Mr. Sopha: Consideration for the people of the province?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I said we will give consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to say that there are people today who have trailers who want electrical outlets, who want dumping space; and there are other people who are satisfied with a tent. In fact, there are many people who prefer to camp with a tent, to be in the great outdoors; and therefore they do not need the same facilities. So therefore it might be advantageous, there might be merit, in charging an additional fee to those who want the very luxurious facilities.

Mr. Chairman: We have a motion before us.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I forgot to say, Mr. Chairman—it is very important.

It has been said that people will not be using our parks. Well I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that these are the figures up to June 16, 1968. It goes up to June 16 which I believe was last Saturday.

It is interesting to note that camping parks in seven of our eight districts situated south of the Mattawa and French Rivers, did report that to the period up to June 16, an increase in campsite days used from 23,182 in 1967 to 26,801 in 1968, an increase of 11 per cent.

Last year we had 10 million visitors in our provincial parks and approximately 2 million campers. I would venture to say that this year the increase could well be higher than 11 per cent by the end of this year.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur has moved that vote 1105 be reduced to the sum of $1.

Those in favour of the motion please say "aye". Those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the "nays" have it. Call in the members.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise.

All those opposed to the motion will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 24; the "nays" 37.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost; and vote 1105 is carried.

Vote 1105 agreed to.

On vote 1106:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister, through you sir, do I infer correctly from the annual report of the department that the economics branch of the department numbers one person?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am sorry, I wonder if the hon. member would mind repeating that question?

Mr. Sopha: I am asking, Mr. Chairman, if I infer correctly from the annual report that the personnel of the economics branch of the department is comprised of one person?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, we do not have an economics branch, but in the timber branch we have some of the foresters who specialize in forest economics, plus one in research.

Mr. Sopha: The Minister is a man that means what he says and says what he means and in the annual report on page 15, the research branch I take it—no I am wrong, I must confess I am wrong in this.

The heading, if the Minister will look, is "research branch" in bold type at the top of page 15. Then apparently the forestry section of the department, which would fall into the timber branch, begins on page 16. I conclude then that the economist is not attached to the research branch?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There are four forest economists in the timber branch and there is one in the research branch.

Mr. Sopha: Well that is what I said originally. Now, the one in the research branch, would the Minister give us an idea what he does? Is he the person referred to in the first paragraph on page 19?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The economist's, also referred to as a scientist in the research branch, work consists of the study of the relationship between forest resources of Canada and those of eastern Europe with special reference to the USSR, the principal competitor in the world for forest products and forest product markets.

Mr. Sopha: Does anyone in the department, and specifically in the research branch, study the uses to which our forest resources might be put?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The timber branch does this sort of work. The four economists in the timber branch do this work.

Mr. Sopha: So this branch we are dealing with is concerned mainly with the generation, the growth, the cultivation, all those things connected with silviculture?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That is right.

Mr. Sopha: Right. Now, it is intended, perhaps as the result of a little stimulus from the Opposition, that the programme of this department and its activity, is going to be increased. I do not expect you to agree with my premise, but may we expect that the activity is going to be increased in this area?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I would say so. As I mentioned yesterday, we are spending $1.6 million. This is the highest amount of money in any province in Canada for research, and I know the hon. member is suggesting we should be spending more, and I am hoping that we will be able to spend more. I would like to mention that we—

Mr. Sopha: Well, let me ask this question then. I can do this by analogy, if the Chairman will permit. The other day there was a very naive article in the *Globe and Mail*. I am glad the *Globe and Mail* is not present for the time being. There was a very naive article, I think it was written by someone by the name of Watkins, and the heading of it was—this article was about the Minister of Mines—"The Minister of Mines Oversees the Mining Industry" which is exactly what he does not do, but we will deal with that when we come to those estimates. The one thing he does not do is oversee the mining industry in this country.

Now, in this department, can the Minister tell us whether, in any genuine way, this department oversees the activities of people utilizing our forest resources in respect of advising them what and where? What species they will cut, and where is the best place for them to cut them, and the best method of transportation, the best ways to create those avenues of transportation. In fact, everything else about their operation. Does this department intervene under that rubric, to manage the industry, sort of? I am trying to convey, in an umbrella-like fashion, do these people, utilizing our forest resources, have to resort to this department in respect

of the details of how they are going to utilize them?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well our research branch's main purpose is to specialize in new information and my understanding is that pulp and paper companies contact our timber branch for the direct relationship. Now for instance in the forestry research carried out at Maple, we are primarily interested in the re-establishment of forest stands after logging and wildfire. To accomplish this our forest research activity is engaged in developing a thorough knowledge of the requirements of our native species, and how disturbed stands must be treated to provide the desired condition.

We are also doing quality wood research. it has been continuing in collaboration, as I metnioned yesterday, with the Ontario research foundation, working very closely with them. And it is essentially concerned with more precise definition of the qualities which have made several Ontario species premium raw materials on the world market. At present, laboratory studies are wholly concerned with black spruce, which has been, and still is, the top premium material in the province, for the wood fibre industry and particularly for the production of newsprint.

Also we are carrying out studies in northern Ontario as far as drainage is concerned. You know, we have a tremendous amount of wood in the north and many persons feel that maybe we should be giving further study to the drainage and the physical and chemical properties of items such as the peat in the Cochrane clay belt, to provide a much better understanding of the regeneration problems. All these studies are being carried out through our research branch at Maple.

Mr. Sopha: One scarcely ever runs into a professional forester working outside the department who has a good word to say about the department. But their views are not necessarily reliable. But the place where I take my stand is that I firmly believe that government should know more about the aspects of our province than any other body or any other group of people. Government should be, if anything, the final repository of information and the accumulation of facts about our province.

Now we are dealing with one area, our forest resources. Is the Minister prepared to assure us that, in respect to our vast forest resources, government and this department, knows more about the forest resources, cultivation, harvesting of the forest, than any other group of people in the world.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well I would say, Mr. Chairman, that we have some very competent persons. During the past month, for instance, we have sent someone to the United States, to the southern states. As you may know, there is a tremendous expansion in newsprint production in the southern states. One of our forest economists went to these states. I believe there are about ten states, including Louisianna, Mississippi and Alabama. He went to study exactly what is going on in those areas.

Another of our foresters went to a seminar at Yale to meet with representatives of other jurisdictions. Some have gone to Europe, also attending international conferences. So I would say, Mr. Chairman, we have some of the top experts in our department on matters concerning forestry.

Mr. Sopha: Well, how many foresters do you have in the research branch? How many are there—professional foresters?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have 26 scientists, 20 technicians, and seven clerical staff—that is, in the forestry section of the research branch.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I would have to say as a layman that it is not enough. And what bothers me about it is that, to go back to my earlier remarks, it just seems to me that this department is too distracted in other relatively unimportant things. Now, for example, you have a highly qualified man—his name just escapes me—he is a very nice fellow, with very high qualifications, and seems to coalesce within his cranial spaces a good deal of intelligence—and he is preoccupied in making —what do you call it, not a survey, it is something more than a survey—an assessment, a compilation, in what is now called the Georgian Bay recreational area. Maybe that is not the exact title.

I am satisfied that man knows just about everything there is to know about that geographic area that he has outlined on a map. He has counted almost the rocks and seashells on it, and he has compiled all kinds of charts and maps and pictures and so on. Now I would like to be satisfied, and I am not, that in respect of the greatest resource the Canadian people own—the greatest single resource that the residents of Ontario own, that is to say our forest resources—I think I am correct, and somebody is going to set me straight if I am not, that the harvesting of our

forest creates more jobs and generates more dollars than any other single industry, and indeed employs more people, in all its force. I would like to be satisfied that this department knows more about our forest resources, their silviculture, their regeneration, the soil technology, climatic environment, and everything else connected with our forests than any other group of people anywhere. I would like to find out if that is so. We now have in northern Ontario several big operators harvesting our forests—particularly in the pulp and paper field. Now, do those people know more about forest technology and science and growth than the people in this department? Or do they resort to this department when they run into difficulty, and is this department able to furnish them the help, assistance, the information and advice that they might expect to get from it. Now what does the Minister say to that?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier, we have very competent persons in our department; we have 172 foresters—these are graduate foresters—and they are mainly concerned with the management of our force.

We have our research branch at Maple. And I would say that we have the most competent people in the province. For instance, the pulp and paper industries have at Pointe Claire, near Montreal, a research centre. Our department works very closely with this centre.

Also, we work very closely with the federal government. They have, of course, substantial funds, more funds than we have, and we work very closely. I remember in the last year or two we have lost some our men to the federal government.

Mr. Sopha: Well it is a very difficult problem and I want to see it in the light of the statements such as the one that I read yesterday that in the next 20 years we have to double the production from our forests. And I suppose that means Ontario's production has got to be doubled in order to meet the demands made upon our forests. Under the next vote, I am going to have something to say about some of the nature of those demands. But, how can I be assured; how can the people of Ontario feel quiescent that suddenly, this year, this department lurches forward with a significantly increased vote for research?

We are entitled to wonder just what have they been doing all these years in respect of silviculture, and is it a case of pushing the panic button that they suddenly realize that they have got to catch up. Well, for all we know, as laymen, the catching up or the endeavour to catch up in a short space of time might mean that when the demands are made upon the production in our forests, Ontario will be found wanting; that we will not have that supply of raw material that will be necessary to meet the great demands.

When you talk about doubling production, and I am thinking now more in the field of pulp and paper products, when you talk about that, then that is an immense amount of work that is going to be required handy to the mills, because they cannot drag this wood from Great Trout Lake or some place up there, it has got to be relatively contiguous to where these mills are going to me; and the Minister talks about planting, well, that is fine, they have planted their billionth tree or was it their two billionth tree?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: One billion.

Mr. Sopha: One billion. That is a lot of trees; he did not tell us how many survived of that billion and I do not know what the survival rate is. But he does not tell us anything at all, scarcely anything, about the regeneration of fast-growing species, or the development of that species. And who knows, if we had 1.6 million a few years ago we might be in a position of competing with Georgia. Is it Georgia that is always pointed to as being the place that they produce these species that are a threat to our pulp and paper industry?

Well, again, I go back and I say it fearlessly. I tramp on a lot of people's toes of course. Here is the problem in a nutshell; if you want to look at an idiotic book, if you have a spare moment, there is one published by The Department of Economics of this government that used to be under the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall), and it has moved over to the Frost building now, and it is now under the new Department of Revenue.

They put out a book called "A Survey of Northwestern Ontario" and they count the telephone poles, the number of outhouses that there are in northeastern Ontario, and such other significant facts as that. But, when they come around to the last page, and they can get all their conclusions on one page, the last paragraph refers to the potentiality of northern Ontario as a tourist region; that is the way they see it. It is going to be a tourist region.

I am just afraid that that syndrome—I would call that a syndrome of stupidity—has

in some way affected The Department of Lands and Forests. And, when I see all this activity related to recreation, I am beginning to wonder whether this department has lost sight of its chief purpose—this was The Department of Public Lands. We used to have a picture, maybe the picture is still up in the members' cloakroom, of the first mutton-chopped individual—he looked extremely well fed—that was the first commissioner of Crown lands in this province. And out of that grew this department—Lands and Forests.

There is nothing in the name that says anything about recreation, but I am just afraid that down at head office here that the balance has been lost; the thing has got distorted. You never hear anything about our forest resources; nobody ever mentions those except tangentially as they may come in with respect to the fact that KVP is worried about the Brown forest industries now; worried about damming up some lakes up in the Onoping chain. All they talk about is recreation and land used for recreation.

As I view it from outside, I say: What have we become here in this department? Is this department sold on the syndrome that northern Ontario is going to be a little Switzerland? Is that what it is going to be? Another Switzerland?

We are going to fritter away our heritage and our birthright in the utilization of these great resources. Well I have some evidence to support that view when, this year, there is a sudden increase in the research branch of this department. Why not 10 or 15 years ago? Had there been a proper healthy preoccupation with the development of our great forest resources and the consciousness of the number of jobs that we can create by their proper utilization?

Well, the world of competition and the pulp companies are always screaming about the competition that they get from abroad and it would seem to me that the sensible approach would be to determine whether the raw product can be improved for its utilization. That is where you start. You start with the product. And you know you can rule out the Hudson Bay watershed, because you know that the black spruce is not going to grow very fast in that swamp and muskeg, with winter imposing itself for about eleven months of the year.

You have got to start down in more southern climes and see what the soils will produce in a fairly short space of time, instead of these pulp companies having to continue to reach further and further away from the mill to get their raw materials. So I have got to be very pessimistic about the future of silviculture, unless this department will initiate something of a crash programme. Perhaps the member—or the Minister of Municipal Affairs—he is not here; but permit me to take some comfort from the fact that I mentioned this last year and tried to make an issue out of it.

I am very encouraged that there is a great leap forward in this realm, a year later. But I want to see more. Now that we have opened the door to some really directed research into this, I wish, I hope in the future that we will not just be out planting trees, the billionth, or the two billionth, but we will be planting trees that are going to ripen and mature for their use in something like 12 or 14 years, which seems to me to be about the optimum for them.

Mr. Bukator: Seventy-five years!

Mr. Sopha: I say this to the Minister: Go over and take a look around some day at the head office and say, "Look fellows, we have got to cut some of the splash out here—this obsession with the tourist industry—and we have got to get down to business. We are farmers."

Basically what they are in this department, they are farmers. They are farmers of the forest, in the same way as my friend from Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) is a farmer of the soil. The chief *raison d'être* of this department unquestionably is the preservation and the cultivation of our forest resources, as an integral part of the economic life of this province. A very important and valuable part of that economic life.

And $1.6 million, compared to $1.8 million —as my friend from Downsview quoted in the Sudbury *Star*—for the horsebreeders; $1.6 million is not much of a ripple.

This Legislature would cheerfully vote a goodly amount more than that. Very obligingly and very enthusiastically it would vote a lot more money than that for some kind of a decent programme of investigation into all aspects of silviculture.

While the Minister talks about sending people over to Scandinavia and Russia and those places, we would be willing to go a little further than that. Bring a few over from there. Hire a few away from them. They have got some pretty good foresters over there, and they have been at this business of harvesting of forests—farming the

forest—for a long time—a lot longer than we have. One gets the impression they do a tremendous job of it.

Canadians are not against borrowing the techniques and the skills of others. That is the story of our life, our national life. I urge upon the Minister that, because I have some ideas and I know he shares them. I have some ideas, that I am going to address myself to the next vote. This is a *sine qua non* for the realization of those ideas, and those ideas involve maximizing the use of all resources by and for Canadians. We cannot do that until we get the basics complied with.

The basics must involve that this department knows more than any other person in the world about our forests. No one should outshine them.

That is not true with mining. Everybody that breaks up a piece of ore knows more about mining than The Department of Mines, but that ought not to be true of The Department of Lands and Forests—this department of forestry should not be beholden to any other persons as far as knowledge goes of the art of cultivation of the forests. And to that end, this Minister can make a great contribution, being a northerner that he is. And he can make things happen, make them happen in the realm of forestry.

Start tomorrow and say this is the direction we are going to go, because you know they talk about products becoming obsolescent. There is one resource that I dare say will never become obsolescent.

Our poor friend from Oxford (Mr. Innes)—not our poor friend, our good friend from Oxford—he may be threatened that they get substitutes for milk, but you never are going to get substitutes for our forest resources, because they are too versatile. They can, indeed, substitute for many other products. Tremendous versatility in clothing and furniture and manufacture of paper products, chemicals, medicines. Indeed, a whole range of products that can be produced from our forests.

If we are going to really herald that day that we maximize the use of them, this department has to lead the way. That is why I say in that light that this Minister could make things happen.

I am an easy fellow to get along with and I would be agreeable—turf everybody out of that department that does not work directly or reasonably tangentially in connection with the forests. Get everybody else out. Lend them to The Department of Tourism and Information. Ship them over there.

They can build a dream of building a Switzerland over there, as well they might. Then this department gets down to the business of pre-occupation—total obsession with our forest resources, our lands, and conservation of it, to the exclusion of all else.

That is what this research branch is about. That is what it is about. So come in here next year—after we get inured to voting money, $1.8 million for the horsebreeders—walk in here and say, "Look, give us $6 million. We have got a line on three or four skilled people in Sweden that we would like to bring over."

Maybe a few could escape outside of the iron curtain. And the Russians apparently have done tremendous work in Siberia, in the generation of species. We are dragging our feet in this country and we know it, and anybody with a little interest knows that.

You drive through the countryside with a forester and he will point out to you some of our shortcomings. When he comes to a clump, driving up around Nipigon or Geraldton, and sees the second growth of scrub—birch, poplar, balsam—it looks like nothing else on earth. He says, "If they cared about out forests that would never be there; that would not be there beside the road. They would be ashamed of that. The Department of Lands and Forests would be ashamed of it. They would come in and cut that down."

You would not find that in Scandinavia. They plant some species there that will grow up fulsome and viable and really look like a tree. The trouble is that a lot of our trees in northern Ontario do not look like trees. It looks like limp dishrags, that second growth stuff. The reason for that is that we have not done enough in this area of cultivation of proper species of trees.

I must confess, I have been here too long a time, until I really got interested in this. My eyes were really opened up to see the amount of time we have wasted in this and how that waste has assailed us and how we have let this department become a tourist department in the way that it has.

I have not checked with my leader. He and I will be here next year—my friend from Downsview, city folk and farmer friend from Kent, and all our northern Ontario associates here. I predict that you come in here with a crash programme in forest research and really spend some real money, if you can wedge it out of that Treasury board. Of course, you go and talk to them and they probably will not know what you are talking about, knowing the personnel. But talk to

the Premier (Mr. Robarts)—talk to the Premier himself about it. I urge upon you, seriously, to come in here and ask for some real money in the field of research and we will be delighted to assist you and vote it to you with alacrity.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): With regard to the annual report on research: I see on page 17, in southwestern Ontario, they have been studying the dreaded elm disease. I am sure that everyone is aware that this has really made an indentation in the tree population in western Ontario.

I might say it was rather depressing to travel through that area and see the vast trees standing there, naked like, without any green foliage, due to this dreaded disease. I think that this government has been very backward in not doing something about it, or at least, doing more than—it should be doing more—than they are. They claim they have not found the answer to stopping the disease but if they cannot stop the disease, I think they should do something to destroy the diseased trees. Some municipalities, as you are aware, probably do this on winter works programmes. Fifty per cent of the cost of destroying dead elm trees is paid for by the federal government. Then the provincial government, the great custodians of the province, back down a little bit. And sometimes I think of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) who gets up and gives some great spiels about what the provincial government is doing for farmers, but not always, I think, quite as much as he says. They back down and give 25 per cent towards the destroying of these diseased trees and the municipality which has limited resources, must carry on with the other 25 per cent.

I think this government should immediately, or on the first of October of this year if it is necessary to make a crash programme or get extra funds for that extra 25 per cent, make a clean sweep of western Ontario, southwestern Ontario and have all the diseased trees destroyed and I think this could be done during one winter.

We have lots of people that would be glad to do this type of work. It is very invigorating to work out in the wintertime, I think most of us are aware of this. I know in my own municipality that I have had the pleasure of heading and for a number of years, have done this. We may be a little more fortunate and can afford to do some, but for a lot of the municipalities, it is impossible, due to their range of taxation. I think this government should by all means take this project on this fall.

We do know that with co-operation of the federal government, that they would be responsible for only 50 per cent of this. To see this, ride through, take a train or a car through, and see all this. It is very depressing to anyone and it just makes you wonder what we are doing to a heritage that was given to us in the past hundreds of years. We are doing nothing and I think that this department is the one that should look after it and no other.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I have one brief comment to make on this.

I noticed that the Minister is spending some $500,000 with regard to the spruce budworm infestation up around Burchill Lake and Lake Shebandowan. In a recent press release, I noticed that the weather had been against them and there was some apprehension as to whether or not that particular programme was going to be completed in time before the budworm developed into a stage where they would not be able to do anything with it.

I would just like to find out, from the Minister, how you find out about these infestations before they get so far advanced. Do you have foresters go around checking all areas or do they develop to such magnitude?

I understand that in the neighbourhood of 250,000 acres are going to have to be sprayed at a cost of in excess of $500,000.

Now I was wondering if it is necessary to let these things get to such proportions before we take action. I understand, in speaking to one of the people who is resident in that area, that at one time is was confined to a four- or five-acre plot in a jack pine grove. I was wondering whether there is any foundation to this or whether it was of this magnitude before the department even heard or found out about it.

I realize that you have no alternative right now, but to take the only action left to you, to spray 250,000 acres, but I was wondering if there is some way that you could contain this before it got to such proportions?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, first with reference to the hon. member for Thunder Bay, there is only one day's work left and they were waiting for good weather and it could be completed.

How do they find out about this? This comes under the insect rangers, under the

federal forestry, and work, of course, in close co-operation with our own people and throughout northern Ontario these insect rangers are located. They are the ones who find out about the infestations. Now these do not affect the jack pine. They only affect the spruce and the balsam.

Mr. Stokes: Is there nobody under the supervision of The Department of Lands and Forests that is concerned about these insects?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We are very concerned, it comes under our forest protection branch, but the persons who are mainly responsible for going out in the fields, who work very closely with our Lands and Forests personnel, in the districts, and are the main body responsible for detecting this, are these insect rangers under the federal forestry. But they work closely with our own people in each district.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have had communications suggesting that these massive sprayings for budworm upset nature's balance.

Now I understand in this instance that you are using a new insecticide—it is not DDT but one, the name of which escapes me, that comes from Japan, as I recall. Is it accurate, that in the use of insecticides earlier, there was any evidence of nature's balance being upset? Namely, that something more than the budworms were killed? Are you gambling with the new insecticide? Have you any assurance that it is no more or any less of a threat in terms of consequences beyond killing the budworm?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the chemicals that we are using in northwestern Ontario, in the Port Arthur area, have been tested in other jurisdictions and they are very safe chemicals and not injurious to wildlife.

We have co-operated closely with the authorities in the United States. This is a chemical that is in use in certain areas in the United States, and I believe that is was also used in Europe. Now prior to this I guess that there were certain instances where the chemicals were injurious to wildlife but what we are using now has been approved and is quite safe.

Vote 1106 agreed to.

On vote 1107:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, it is a natural continuum, having laid the groundwork in the last vote, to now deal with the guts of this department. Now we will get down to the real business at hand and the way that I want to approach the utilization of our timber resources, and what I think ought to be the function of this branch, is to take in hand one example of our failure to properly utilize the great heritage of the people of the province in their forest resources.

I made a little survey. This will become very clear to those in the House who attend to what I have to say. But I recite a little survey of the activity in the forest industry, and the realm of pulp and paper in northern Ontario. It involves what goes on in the use of our pulpwood. If we start at Smooth Rock Falls, where the Abitibi company—I am going to start from east to west—produces newsprint.

Further to the west in Kapuskasing, we have the Spruce Falls Power and Paper Corporation. These names may not be exact, but it is engaged in the production of newsprint. At Marathon, we have the Marathon Paper Corporation, producing newsprint and sulfate pulp for export. At Terrace Bay, we have the Kimberly Clark Corporation, which like the plant at Marathon, produces pulp for export and newsprint. At Kenora there is the Ontario-Minnesota plant, again producing newsprint. At Fort Frances there is the Ontario-Minnesota, producing newsprint. At Dryden, we have the Dryden Paper Company which produces newsprint. I think that I am correct—I could not ascertain this—but I think that it is the only company in Ontario that produces any kind of fine paper. At Espanola there is the Brown Forest Industries, formerly the KVP company, which produces kraft and parchment paper, bleached pulp, and a product which is turned into a finer paper at Hamilton by the Appleford Paper Company. At Sturgeon Falls, we have the other branch of Abitibi Company, which produces a very rough grade of corrugated paper, such as is found in cardboard boxes and that type of thing. The annual report of the department is printed on paper produced in the United States. The $16,000 spent by Milton Karman, the czar of culture, in Ontario, for that annual report of the province of Ontario council of the arts at a $1.60 a copy, or a thousand copies, that paper was produced in the United States. Maybe that is most of the cost of it; the fact that it was produced in the United States.

Now, let us go back to the Marathon Paper Corporation, Marathon, and to Kimberly Clark at Terrace Bay. To the great credit of George Drew, a generation ago, when those limits were being farmed out, Drew, my researchers tell me in 1944, and again in 1947

—1944 in respect to one and 1947 in respect to another—required that mills be built.

Those companies were created as a result of the requirements laid down by George Drew, and the communities of Terrace Bay and Marathon exist as a monument to him. He required the mills to be built. In addition to the newsprint that they produce, they ship their pulp sulfate into the United States and that is turned into the kind of fine papers upon which the Minister of this department—being in charge of the pulpwood of the province—makes his report to the Legislature. He has to send to the United States for the paper to print it on.

The significance, of course, is that those mills manufacturing this paper are located generally in the northern United States. So if you went over into Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, not so much Minnesota now, those northern states of the United States, the common factor about them that immediately strikes the eye, coming from here, is that they have no forests, because they cut them down. Michigan was probably the most prodigal of the northern states in cutting their forests down. They hired woodsmen from Buckingham, Quebec, the Gatineau and that area, in the 1890s and the first decade of the century to cut the forests down. But having denuded themselves of their forests, they did not lose out on the jobs to be created from ours. They sequestered us into a situation where the activities of our people in our forests of the north are coalesced with the design that our raw material will pass into Michigan and Ohio to the mills, where the work of our people will be reflected in the jobs created for Americans producing the paper of this report, which they will sell back to us.

Now for every dime, you see, we get for our pulp sulfate that goes to the States, we pay a dollar to get the finished product back. That is why it costs Milton Karman $16,000 to produce that collector's work of art. That is why it cost a probably tidy piece of money to get this report of Lands and Forests printed. Now, future generations will look at us, you see, and they will really wonder what kind of weird group we were that we are content to allow our raw materials to be taken away from our forests, to go south of the border to create wealth and jobs for other people and then sell us the finished product back at a premium.

Now that is the story of the timber wedge. That is the story of this branch of The Department of Lands and Forests. And try as I might, other than the activity of George Drew a generation ago in at least requiring that the newsprint be manufactured at Marathon and Terrace Bay, I cannot find another single example where The Department of Lands and Forests has ever exercised any stimulus to require the manufacture of finished products from our forest industries in our country. For to do so would mean that it would be breeding new ground.

I really wonder if the northern part of the province is indeed to become the link between east and west of this country; whether there is any hope in the future that this department will take the necessary action in respect of those who would use up our raw material, to demand that the finished product be made in Ontario. To say that is to cite the story of our failure as Canadians. Now put conversely, it means that the timber branch of The Department of Lands and Forests has, in effect, in the last 25 years allowed those from abroad to come into Ontario and rip the wealth off the surface of the ground and cart it away to create jobs and wealth elsewhere. That is the indictment of this department or this branch of this department that forms the very central core in relation to this department. All else is mere dressing. All the rest is unimportant. When you examine this department from this point of view, you have to see this department in relation to its timber branch, and what the timber branch is going to do to ensure that the resources of northern Ontario—those wide expanses of forest—are going to be used in the best way possible to create wealth and jobs and opportunity for Canadians; for Canadians first; for a much larger population than we now have.

Now in that regard I want to mention this significant fact. The Prime Minister can talk all he wants about Ontario as a place to grow and a place to stand, and he likes to say that, but there is a bald fact that I want to tell him —if he were here. The fact is, that in three of the districts in northern Ontario that were famous for their harvest of the forest resources—the district of Rainy River, represented by that fine young man who spoke here yesterday; the district of Manitoulin; and the district of Timiskaming—the population is declining.

Population is declining year by year. Your people live in those districts and the net migration, the net migration out of those districts exceeds the natural increase. And to our eternal shame, the people migrating out of those three districts that were once rich in forest resources are the young people. It is the young people who are leaving. Now how can you say, in relation to at least those

three districts, that Ontario is a place to stand and a place to grow? And of course, the principal reason for that is that we have failed in this century. We have failed in the last 25 years to direct the utilization of our resources with the goal that we are going to foster activity and development and industry in the northern part of the province. That should be a first demand.

That is not chauvinism, that is not a nationalism that has escaped the balance of reason. That is common sense that we should do so. We think of ourselves first. We make a proper requirement that you people that come here and use up our resources that you must think of the development of this area first. Well, put in that light, I say: Have we got any business—at International Falls, Fort Frances and International Falls—in shooting pulp across in suspension? That is what we do. We have a pipeline there. I would not be surprised if that pipeline is built with public funds. I do not know, I must look into that.

We have a pipeline that takes our pulp, cut in Ontario in the district of Rainy River, across to a mill in International Falls. Now, I think they shoot some back to us. I think they give us some back.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It comes back to Fort Frances.

Mr. Sopha: I think what they take over there they use to make the fine papers and they send us the guck to make the newsprint. I think I am correct in that, because we do not make fine paper. We pay the big price.

What business have we got in shipping pulp sulphate in the way that we do to mills outside? What is wrong in the modern world, of us saying to these people, "Look, build your mills here." That is what George Drew did back in 1943 and 1947. You put up a fine paper mill here. All the paper for the New York *Times* is produced at either Smooth Rock Falls or Kapuskasing. I forget which it is, it is one of them. What is wrong with our saying to that fine newspaper that has such a tremendous circulation; such an impact on world affairs. We say: "Fine, if you want to produce newsprint, start to make some fine papers in Ontario and employ some men in the production of the fine papers."

But it is a very fine arrangement for the Americans. One thing you can say about the Americans, you never note them for lack of shrewdness. They used up their resources in this century. They cut their trees down in Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York state. They cut them down, and then they look covetously at ours. They said, "Now we will come and get yours." And coming across the border, they do.

My goodness gracious, Canadians are the friendliest people in the world to help them cart it away. In this department, the timber branch says, "Come on boys, and we will help you." We will help you cart them away in order to provide jobs elsewhere.

Well the truth is, that the only manufacturing industry we have got in northern Ontario, outside the mining industry, is the pulp and paper industry. We have not got any other. And the pulp and paper industry is degraded to its lowest denominator. It makes the coarsest papers; the worst papers; the most inferior papers. That is to say newsprint, cardboard boxes, paper bags, and all that type. Nothing aside from Dryden—and I am unable to find out just how much fine papers they make at Dryden—but other than that there is no sophisticated development of the pulp and paper industry whatsoever.

Now another day, when I come back here on June 26, I will be prepared to say something about the timber, about the saw logs and how we have wasted that part of our resources—and I fear that is very much of a diminishing resource. We were much better off in pulpwood than we are in saw logs. Unfortunately, back in 1949, through no fault of this department, I think it was 1949—it was around there somewhere—there was burned down one of the last stands of white pine that existed in this province in the great Mississauga fire. But that was no fault of the department, and it could not happen now, let it be said in fairness.

The forest protection measures are of pretty high order in this department, and the fire would, in the absence of gale-like winds, no doubt be restrained to a very small acreage.

But let me just make this remark about the timber industry in saw logs, that there are all kinds of products into which they could be rendered. Think of the realm of furniture, for one thing, furniture for which the essential ingredient is wood, and go into northern Ontario and try and find a furniture factory of any size. Now with the resources we have in saw logs, would you not expect, at some time in this century, that this timber branch would have fostered the development of at least one furniture factory?

Then you go into the realm of clothing. rayon and the textiles that can be made out

of wood. You wonder why, in the whole of Ontario, there is not some utilization of forest products in that regard.

They tell me that trees can be turned into food for cattle. They tell me that it makes a very wholesome fodder.

I do not know how many over there have read that book *The Coming Age of Wood*. How many have read it? It should be compulsory reading. It has been on the market now for close to 20 years and that author—let us say this to his credit—was an American—came from somewhere in Europe, and apparently came with a good deal of qualification behind him in silviculture.

He looked around the forests in the United States and he wrote a book and set out the many possibilities of the use of forest resources. He was talking about the United States.

They have realized a lot of the possibilities. We have not! And by the holy smokes, I just hope that those thousands of young people that were at Nathan Phillips Square yesterday grow up and demand of politicians that we make maximum use of our own resources for our own people—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: —and we stop this senseless business of the shipment of our resources outside the country to provide jobs elsewhere. That is where I am going to pitch my tent.

Mr. Chairman, we are all going to get to the election campaign—it is about one minute to six—and when we get back here on Wednesday next, some of us will be smiling and others will not. But I think we will be the ones that will be smiling. I do not want to see this vote carry. There are some other remarks about our timber and forest resources that I want to make.

With your leave, I would like to break off at this point if the House leader will put a surcease to the proceedings.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of Agriculture and Food is going to put a surcease?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1107.

Mr. Singer: No, No!

Mr. Sopha: No, No!

Mr. Chairman: The chairman did not indicate it was carried.

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves that the committee rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): When we come back on Wednesday, June 26, we will go to the order paper; then the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General, followed by The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): No night session on Wednesday?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No night session on Wednesday.

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:00 of the clock, p.m.

No. 128

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

5

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Teachers' Superannuation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 4801

Ontario School Trustees Council Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 4801

Teaching Profession Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 4801

Magistrate Frederick Bannon and Magistrate George Gardhouse, statement respecting, Mr. Wishart 4801

Metro Toronto garbage collection, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Nixon and Mr. T. Reid 4811

Rental review board for Ottawa, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. MacDonald 4811

Vending machine installations in the Hepburn block, questions to Mr. Connell, Mr. Sargent 4813

Transfer of certain prisoners from the North Bay jail, questions to Mr. Grossman, Mr. Shulman 4813

Magistrates Gardhouse and Bannon, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Singer 4814

Northern Telephone Company strike, questions to Mr. Bales, Mr. Stokes 4815

School Administration Act, questions to Mr. Davis, Mr. Pitman 4815

Abuses in auto, radio and TV repair fields, questions to Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Sargent 4816

Marginal drivers, questions to Mr. Haskett, Mr. Sargent 4816

Garbage removal in Metro Toronto, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Sargent 4816

Mobile dental clinic services, questions to Mr. Dymond, Mr. Sargent 4817

Pollution of the Great Lakes, questions to Mr. Simonett, Mr. Sargent 4817

Halton Centennial manor, questions to Mr. Robarts, Mr. Shulman 4817

Subdivisions of land, questions to Mr. Yaremko, Mr. Shulman 4818

Stuffing in upholstered and stuffed articles upon their manufacture, sale and renovation, bill to control the content and identification of, Mr. Rowntree, second reading 4819

Art Gallery of Ontario Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading 4819

Workmen's Compensation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, second reading 4819

Lord's Day (Ontario) Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading 4825

Royal Ontario museum, bill respecting, Mr. Davis, second reading 4835

Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Welch, second reading 4838

Air Pollution Control Act, 1967, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading 4838

Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading 4838

Mining Act, bill to amend, reported 4838

Fire Departments Act, bill to amend, reported 4838

Police Act, bill to amend, reported 4838

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 4841

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2:00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Once again today we have many visitors in our galleries. We are pleased to welcome in the east gallery students from Lakeshore public school, RR 1, Beamsville; and in the west galleries students from John G. Althouse public school, Islington; and in both galleries students from Springfield public school in Cooksville. Later this afternoon, we will be joined by students from Sacred Heart school in Sarnia.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO SCHOOL TRUSTEES COUNCIL ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario School Trustees Council Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE TEACHING PROFESSION ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Teaching Profession Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Has the Minister any statement on the introduction of the bills?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, all these bills will be going to the education committee. They are basically housekeeping in nature, along with one or two references to Bill 44.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister if there is any reference in The Teachers' Superannuation Act to assistance to teachers who have been retired for some years?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is no reference to that in the legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Attorney General has the floor.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I wish to make a statement respecting Magistrate Frederick Bannon and Magistrate George Gardhouse.

Over the period of the last three months the Metropolitan Toronto police force in the course of certain criminal investigations came upon information relative to the behaviour of these two magistrates. This information was placed before me by Chief Mackey and the chairman of the Ontario police commission. That information warranted further investigation and this was subsequently carried out by a special detail of officers who were assigned to this task and who have been working in co-operation with the law officers of my department.

As the investigation progressed it became clear that the administration of justice and the interests of these magistrates required that they should not continue to preside in court during the balance of the investigation, although the nature of the latter prevented disclosure to either the public or the gentlemen involved. It will be appreciated that if the information which was brought to our attention should upon investigation prove true, then to permit the magistrates involved to continue to act would leave the administration of justice open to severe and justifiable criticism. The administration of justice being our first concern we were bound to act to protect it. We were also concerned that if upon full investigation the information should prove to be wrong, nothing should be done to injure the reputation of the magistrates. The chief magistrate was therefore

advised of all the circumstances and acting on my instructions and in accordance with his authority under section 19a of The Magistrates Act, he did not assign these magistrates to any courts effective Tuesday, June 18, 1968.

In my capacity as Minister of Justice and Attorney General, my first duty must be to the administration of justice—that responsibility demanded that this investigation continue to completion without any disclosures that might conceivably prejudice the fullest investigation possible. The matter therefore proceeded as quietly and quickly as possible with no publicity whatsoever. This would be our normal course of action in a matter of this kind. We regret very much any publicity attendant upon this case, but it did not emanate from either my department or the Metropolitan Toronto police force. We all realize the desirability of full disclosure in those cases where it is possible, but at the same time we must recognize that the public interest in the integrity of the administration of justice must be protected.

The investigation has now reached the point where I may advise this House that the Honourable Campbell Grant, a justice of the Supreme Court of Ontario, has been appointed under the authority of section 3 of The Magistrates Act to make an inquiry into and report upon the circumstances revealed in the investigation as they relate to the behaviour of Magistrate George Gardhouse. Under the statute, this inquiry will ensure that the magistrate is afforded a full and complete opportunity to hear all evidence and adduce such evidence as he may deem desirable and, of course, he will have full opportunity to cross-examine all witnesses either himself or through his counsel.

Magistrate Bannon, who has only been on the bench for six months, may not have in law the right to the inquiry provided for in The Magistrates Act. In order to ensure that he has the same rights as Magistrate Gardhouse, the Honourable Campbell Grant has been appointed a commissioner under The Public Inquiries Act with the same terms of reference in respect of Magistrate Bannon as those which he is given under The Magistrates Act in respect of Magistrate Gardhouse. In appointing the same judicial inquiry with the dual capacity we will ensure that the matters, which are related, will be dealt with concurrently and in the same context.

At the present time there is no evidence arising from the investigation that involves any other magistrates or impugns the system of the administration of criminal justice in our Metropolitan Toronto magistrates' courts. The information that is available, however, is such that it must be in the public interest to permit its full review before a judicial inquiry in the presence of those concerned. While this type of controversy must cause grave concern to all citizens of this province, I am certain that the procedure which we have adopted will maintain the integrity in our system which we are all entitled to expect and at the same time provide complete fairness and equity to the magistrates concerned.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me to question the Minister to make some clarification of his statement.

Are we to gather from the Minister's words that this hearing will be *in camera*?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would not think that would necessarily follow, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, surely the circumstances of the so-called investigation should be made clear to this House. If it is in fact going to be a public hearing then we in this House, who are responsible with the Attorney General for the administration of justice and the reputation of those who administer justice, should know what these allegations are.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, this matter was in the public realm a week ago Monday. It was only ferreted out, I suppose, by people investigating this and made public a few days ago. The House should surely now be informed as to the nature of the circumstances of the investigation and what these charges will be in that it resulted in the Royal commission.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this being an inquiry under The Public Inquiries Act, the charges will be made known in due course and all the evidence will be presented there. I think that is the proper place.

To comment in any way now, or to make statements which are based upon information which has come to our attention, is not evidentiary. Perhaps I am free to disclose the nature of the evidence, but to make these statements now, I think, is not fitting or proper in view of the fact that an inquiry—a public inquiry under The Public Inquiries Act—has been established. That is the place where the evidence should be presented and that is where it should be weighed and assessed.

The hon. leader of the Opposition said this became public some days ago in the press. I would point out that all that became public—because there was no evidence of any nature given—all that apparently appeared in the press, as far as I am aware, was that these two magistrates were no longer acting in the courts. As the press used the term "suspended", that was wrongful, that was incorrect. The magistrates were simply and quietly asked not to accept further duties.

There was no publicity offered by The Department of the Attorney General or by the investigating police. The terms of reference will appear in the order in council and I could give those to the House.

I shall read the order in council with respect to Magistrate Gardhouse.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Can we have a copy of that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I can have copies made.

This is the recommendation. I do not have the order in council, but the same language will be used:

> With respect to Magistrate George W. Gardhouse, that the Honourable Campbell Grant, one of Her Majesty's justices of the Supreme Court of Ontario, be appointed to inquire into and report upon the circumstances respecting the behaviour or misbehaviour of Magistrate George W. Gardhouse; and respecting his ability or inability to perform his duties properly, including his association with the person known as Vincent Alexander and other persons.
>
> The undersigned further recommends that pursuant to the said Act, the Honourable Campbell Grant shall have the power of summoning any person, requiring him to give evidence on oath and to produce such documents and things as he deems requisite to the full examination of the matters into which he is ordered to examine.

The usual language of the order in council; and the same terms, the same language, apply in the order in council with respect to Magistrate Frederick J. Bannon.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Attorney General a question arising out of his statement. He says on page 2—he has been good enough to furnish us with a copy of his statement—page 2, the last sentence of the first paragraph, at the top of the page:

> The chief magistrate was therefore advised of all the circumstances and acting on my instructions and in accordance with his authority under section 19a of The Magistrates Act, he did not assign these magistrate to any courts effective Tuesday, June 18, 1968.

Now, the pertinent subsections of section 19a are these, sir:

> The chief magistrate shall have general supervisory powers over arranging the sittings of magistrates and assigning magistrates for hearings as the circumstances require.

By itself that section perhaps might give to the chief magistrate the authority that the Attorney General now claims for him, but it cannot be read without subsection 3, which reads as follows:

> In the arrangements of the magistrates courts and the assignments of the magistrates thereto, regard shall be had to:
>
> (a) the desirability of rotating the magistrates within each county or territorial district, and
>
> (b) the greater volume of judicial work in certain of the counties and districts.

Now I would ask the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, how he can possibly justify the sentence in his statement "in view of those sections of the statute", and how he can justify the Attorney General, of all people in the province of Ontario, breaking the laws of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this is nonsense. Subsection 2, which the hon. member read, clearly says that the chief magistrate shall assign the work to the magistrates. I have not the section before me but that is what it says, he shall assign. We simply suggested that he not assign work to these two magistrates.

Mr. Singer: Assigns sittings for hearings?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, and we direct him not, in these circumstances, to assign these magistrates to sittings of the courts.

Mr. Singer: How does the Attorney General explain away subsection 3?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Subsection 3 does not take anything away from subsection 2.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, there are two points on which I would request some clarification from the Attorney General.

On page 1 of his statement he indicates that in the course of certain criminal investigations over the past three months, the Metropolitan Toronto police force had come across this information, and then it had been passed on to him. May I ask the Attorney General: When was it passed on to him?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not have the actual date before me, Mr. Speaker. I could get that. I may say that the investigations were of a nature which were carried on by police for some time before they came to my attention. Actually, it was some time before the significance of the relationship of the evidence they had discovered was apparent, as it affected these magistrates. It was brought to my attention, as nearly as I can say at the moment without having my diary before me, some three to four weeks ago. And we then had to study it and see what action might be taken.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my second point of query to the Attorney General is: In the course of the police investigation with regard to these magistrates, did they wire-tap the activities of the magistrates? If so, for how long, and under what authority?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, that does not arise out of the statement, and there are certain questions I have on the order paper—

Mr. Speaker: The member is quite right and he rose at the same time as I was about to speak. That is not a point of clarification of the Minister's statement. If the member has any further points in the statement that he wishes clarified I will be pleased to give him the floor, otherwise the member for Grey-Bruce has a point of personal privilege to raise.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I will hold my point of privilege until the Attorney General's matter is dealt with; may I, please?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the only thing I want to add to what I have already said, on a question of clarification, is that in calling for a public inquiry, the Attorney General has left the House and the people of Ontario completely in the dark as to the nature of the allegations that eventually will be put before the two gentlemen concerned.

In the terms of reference that he read to the House a moment ago, he mentioned some person by name; I do not recall the name offhand. But it seems to me that if we are going to be conducting this thing in a fair, straightforward and democratic way, it is the Attorney General's responsibility to give the nature of the allegations against these men to this House. It would then form the basis of the investigation of the public inquiry and the people of Ontario would then know just what is being investigated.

Surely, for purposes of clarification, the Attorney General should add detail to what he has said in the House so far.

Mr. MacDonald: Specifically following the leader of the Opposition, may I ask the Attorney General whether the investigation involves the clean bill of health given by the magistrates to the Lottman Imperial Bakery, of Baldwin Street?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, that name does not ring any association in my mind in this matter. It may be, but I do not recall it.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General were to give us a statement with at least the basis for the allegations, then there would not be the sort of thing that has come from the member for York South, and which will certainly come from people across the province.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I can only say again to the hon. leader of the Opposition, this will be a public inquiry Actually I do not think this House should be debating evidence, or discussing evidence.

Mr. Singer: You put the muzzle on again.

Mr. Nixon: You have brought the charges, whatever they are.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not put the muzzle on. The rule which we have acknowledged for years, Mr. Speaker, is that when a matter is before the court for adjudication, we leave the court to do that.

Mr. MacDonald: What is before the court?

Mr. Nixon: We do not know.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

The Minister has given a statement, the leaders of the two Opposition parties, I believe, have read it, and I have read it.

In the statement, the Minister has set out the actions which have been taken by his department, and he has read to the House the terms of reference of the inquiry being set up. It is my opinion and my ruling that that now concludes debate on this matter, in view of the rules of the House and the rulings of preceding Speakers, which are very plain, and which I have had the occasion, thanks to the courtesy of the leader of the official Opposition, to look up, and which were looked up before this afternoon.

There is no objection to any clarification which the Minister may give to members of the House, but he has already stated that what he has to say is in the statement. Therefore, I feel that there is little more to be gained by continuation of this line of questioning. If there is any further question with respect to clarification of the statements made by the Minister, I will be most pleased to have them put to the Minister.

The leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, actually I rise on a point of order, which I feel will not transgress the ruling that you have just made.

The matter, by virtue of the Minister's statements, is *sub judice,* and I would say that I have already expressed our dissatisfaction with the way that he has handled it. But I want to refer, as a point of order, to a matter that we discussed in private this morning when it was my intention to move, sir, the adjournment of this House, so that we might discuss a matter of urgent public importance with regard to this very matter. It seems to me that that particular rule of the House is designed for specific occurrences such as this, where in the view of at least some members of the House, the government has been derelict in its duty in bringing forward information regarding these matters.

In the discussion with Mr. Speaker, it became apparent that at least he would entertain favourably the possibility of such an adjournment for a debate of this nature in the House this afternoon. However, in reading the rules of the House, it becomes apparent that if this were to come to pass then no further discussion of this particular topic could take place in this session. I simply draw this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, as an example of a rule that might have had good justification in years gone by, but which surely does not serve the democratic purposes of this House under any modern understanding of what we are here to do.

I would say to you, sir, that, as my point of order, I would suggest very strongly that we, as members of the House and under your direction, if that be the decision of the House, undertake an upgrading of these rules so that a reasonable discussion of these matters can take place.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Has the member for Humber a question with respect to the statement?

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): I rose on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I am just trying to find out whether it is a point of order or a question.

The member for Humber has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. Ben: My point of order is this, Mr. Speaker, that I disagree with the contention taken by you and also by my illustrious leader. It may be *sub judice* with reference to whether or not these magistrates were properly suspended, but an order in council was passed which requires the expenditure of public funds. We as Her Majesty's loyal Opposition are entitled to debate whether these funds are properly spent in holding a public inquiry and we are entitled to have the business of the House set aside to debate whether the Minister was justified in ordering public funds to be expended to hold a public inquiry. On this, I think we are on good grounds. I suggest that the leader of the Opposition ought to press to have the business set aside, and have the Minister justify his conduct, to satisfy this House that he was justified in ordering the expenditure of public funds through an order in council to have this hearing.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the member for Humber that if the leader of his party wishes to take any such action, I am sure he will do so in accordance with the rules and I will be glad to discuss it with him as we did with the other matter. But it is not a matter which can be raised for a motion at this time. The Minister has a reply.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply briefly to the point of order raised by the hon. leader of the Opposition. First of all, I would like to make it clear that the course of action which I considered taking and which I have now taken, as reported in my statement to the House, had no reference whatever to any plans he may have

had and which were discussed with you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: Well, I said that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, right. On the question, I think it is proper to say that one of our great concerns—I would hope that the members of the House would accept this—is that these magistrates shall not have bandied about, either in this House or in public, allegations or statements which this House is not in a position to assess or weigh or prove or deny. And to make statements which I am being urged to make and say they are charged with this or they are charged with that is, I think, wrongful and harmful. The pupose—

Mr. MacDonald: It is the way we normally seek justice.

Mr. Singer: That is what you have done.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The whole purpose of placing the matter before a public inquiry is so that there, in the full light of day and before a judicial body, allegations then must be made in proper form and proven or disproven. To do what I am urged to do, to start bruiting abroad, even in this House where I am at liberty to say perhaps almost anything I like, would be wrongful and harmful—

Mr. Sargent: That is privileged justice.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It would be wrongful, harmful and would go entirely against my sense of justice.

Mr. Singer: Shocking! Your sense of justice is perverted.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And I am backed by—

An hon. member: Oh, big political halo.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Withdraw that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The hon. gentlemen who sat in the mother of Parliaments, who sat in the Parliament at Ottawa and in this House down through the years have respected the rule of *sub judice* for the very reasons I put forward.

Mr. Singer: It is being abused by you.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Ben: You have to justify the expenditure of those funds.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You would have to do that for every OPP man who hands out a summons or something like that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But that rule affords a fair and proper hearing and does not allow to go abroad rumours, unproven statements, allegations of any kind whatsoever.

Mr. Nixon: You are in a position to make them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, may I deal briefly with the point of order, if it is a point of order, raised by the hon. member for Humber. If he has any question about the right of the government to spend money on this inquiry, and he speaks of the Attorney General taking this action, I would say that if it is not covered in the estimates which were voted to my department last year then certainly the hon. member and all the members of this House would have the right to deny me the funds when my estimates come forward, shortly I expect, in this session.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order, I do not think that the hon. member for High Park intends to deal with the same matter.

Mr. Speaker: That is right, and you may proceed in a moment, but I would point out that changing the rules of the House, as has been drawn to my attention, is not really a point of order. But since we are discussing it, I would be glad to have the member for York South put his views on the record too.

Mr. MacDonald: I was hoping to get them on the record before the Attorney General replied. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the point of order, what puzzles me is that as I understand it, the leader of the Opposition has withdrawn his intention of introducing a motion of debate of a matter of urgent public importance, because if that were debated and decided it could not then be referred to in this session.

I know that there is a rule in the book with regard to this, but I draw to your attention, sir, that the rule has been there for years with regard to any motion put before the House. And I am a little puzzled as to why suddenly you see fit to say that if this is debated we can never refer to it again, whereas we have not applied the rule to any motion in an amendment to the Budget speech, or the Throne speech. We

have not, because, quite frankly it is inapplicable, and could muzzle the House on a matter that should be discussed at various periods through the course of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I solicit from you at some point an explanation as to why suddenly you have become so insistent in applying the rule in this issue; and using the application of the rule as a means of keeping debate on the matter at the moment to come before the House, whereas the rule is not normally applied.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps Mr. Speaker should reply with respect to this matter before the member for High Park has the floor. This morning I had a discussion with the Clerk of the House, the leader and the deputy leader of the Opposition, and up to that time and some time thereafter, I had not spoken to anyone else in any party with respect to the matter. We discussed these various matters, but I certainly did not lay down any ruling that members would not be able to discuss it at any later day.

I drew to the attention of the leader of the Opposition, supported by the Clerk of the House, that that is probably what would happen, and the leader of the Opposition and his deputy considered it and left me to decide. Before any further action could be taken, I received a call quite properly and politely from the leader of the Opposition saying that under the circumstances, and considering the fact that the rule was there and more than likely would be applied as the rules of the House provide, they did not wish to proceed at this stage at least with the motion. That seemed to be very sensible.

In the same discussion the point arose that something might happen just as it has happened. I pointed out to the leader of the Opposition that the government could bring in a statement or a report indicating that a judicial enquiry of some sort, or Royal commission, has been appointed, and that also would limit discussion of the matter by the *sub judice* rule in the House. That also was in the minds of all four of us as we discussed it this morning.

I think that that is a fair statement, I hope, of what took place this morning. There was no definite ruling, and I did not say to the parties concerned that I would so rule, but I pointed out that was the rule and as far as I was concerned that would be followed. In that, I was supported by the Clerk of the House, who is our authority on precedent in this House. That is a brief background of what happened, and perhaps will put in proper perspective the remarks of the member for York South.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me I can say that what you have recounted to the House is essentially correct, and this was the spirit of our discussion. The only other thing that entered in was the fact that the rules, of course, provide for only ten minutes of debate on this from each participant.

Mr. Singer: Including the Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker: Right. I neglected that, and we discussed it and it was pointed out by all of us to each other that ten minutes would not give the Minister the proper opportunity of explaining and giving answers to all questions that would be asked, if he were of a mind so to do. The member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, there is one matter that disturbs me. Have the two magistrates been informed of the allegations against them?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

This does not arise out of the statement. I think that the matter has been dealt with. The member for Lakeshore has the floor.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I have an ancillary matter which does, I believe, arise out of the statement, on page 2, where the Attorney General says:

> The chief magistrate was therefore advised of all the circumstances acting on my instructions, and in accordance with his authority under section 19a of The Magistrates Act, he did not assign these magistrates to any courts—

Effective on a certain date.

My question for clarification and comment with respect to what has happened—

Mr. Speaker: Clarification only.

Mr. Lawlor: —is concerned with the powers and procedures possessed by the hon. Minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order. This matter has already been discussed this afternoon upon the question of the member for Downsview.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the suspensory powers in the operation of that are defective in that—

Mr. Speaker: The member is out of order. In the first place, it is not arising out of the statement, and if it is, it has been discussed in answer to a comment or a question by the member for Downsview.

Mr. Shulman: On a point of order, I wish to draw your attention to the statement setting up this enquiry and I would like to suggest, sir, that inasmuch as this statement has said that such an enquiry is being set up, it is quite pertinent for us to know if the persons involved have been informed of what the enquiry is about. It seems very strange, Mr. Speaker, that an enquiry can be set up and a statement can be made in this House about that matter, and I should be able to ask whether the persons whose behaviour is being looked into even know what is being looked into. It is incredible.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. As you know, sir, I have before you and I imagine the Attorney General has been advised, some four pages which include 14 questions. One of the questions deals very amply with that, and at the appropriate time I intend to ask as many of those questions as I may be permitted. I do not think it is reasonable that any other member of the House to be able apparently on a point of order to start asking questions—

Mr. Speaker: I think the member for Downsview is quite in order in the procedure that he is suggesting, and in due course his questions will be considered by me in view of the enquiry which has been ordered. Questions as to the powers and authorities are not questions of clarification, they are questions of criticism. Therefore, I would rule that both the member for High Park and the member for Lakeshore are not in order with their questions of clarification.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, am I correct in assuming that your ruling now is that I cannot direct questions further to this statement because the matter is now *sub judice?*

Mr. Speaker: No, any member who wishes to ask a question of the Minister in clarification of the statement he has made—not as to the basis of it or as to the legality of it, but in clarification of it—is quite entitled to do so.

Mr. Bullbrook: Perhaps you would explain one thing to me, just for my personal edification. The member for York South directed a question to the Attorney General, mentioning some bakery. The Attorney General took it upon himself to answer, "To the best of my recollection, I do not recall that name." Either the matter is *sub judice* or it is not. Either the Attorney General should have said, "I refuse to answer any questions of any kind," or he should permit me now to ask further questions in connection with the gentlemen named in the order in council. Am I not correct there, sir?

Mr. Speaker: I would agree that the member has good basis for the remarks which he has made, and if the member wishes to ask such a question, then in view of what has transpired and the ruling I have made, I will undoubtedly rule it out of order. If the Attorney General endeavours to answer it, in order that we do not have a continuation of this useless discussion, I will rule him out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: Most respectfully to you, sir, I do not think it is useless at all. I submit to you—

Mr. Speaker: It is useless in view of the attitude taken by the Attorney General in the statement which he has given to the House.

Mr. Bullbrook: I exemplify no attitude and I do not think the Attorney General exemplifies an attitude, but the point I attempt to make is this, either the Attorney General should have said to the member for York South, "It is *sub judice* and I will answer nothing," or should not have mentioned at all not having a recollection of any name.

I want to direct this question to the Attorney General: Who is the gentleman named in the order in council; who are the others referred to? In giving jurisdiction or the terms of reference to the hon. Mr. Justice Grant, as I recall, the order in council read, "and including his association with one Vincent Alexander and others." I ask the Attorney General if he, as Attorney General, considers those terms of reference specific enough in the circumstances, and, secondly, I would ask him to indicate to us in this House who are the others contemplated in that order in council.

Mr. Speaker: In view of what I have just said, I would rule the question and all further discussion of this particular matter out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: I accept that, sir.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): I would like to address a question to the Attorney General on a matter I think requires urgent clarification from his statement, and I refer to page 4 of the Attorney General's statement:

> At the present time there is no evidence arising from the investigation that involves any other magistrates or impugns the system of the administration of criminal justice in our Metropolitan Toronto magistrates' courts.

That statement bothers me considerably, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask the Attorney General if he cannot at this point tell the House that there is no further wide-ranging investigation being conducted by the Metropolitan Toronto police or any other police agency into the administration of justice in the metropolitan courts. If there is such a continuing investigation being carried on by the police into the administration, then I would ask him to seriously consider making that a public enquiry under the terms of reference, which would be open for the scrutiny of the public. It seems to me that it places the administration of justice in serious jeopardy if in fact at the present time the Metropolitan Toronto—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member is now making a statement and not asking a question of clarification.

Mr. J. Renwick: It is simply clarification, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to point out that if the Metropolitan Toronto police are continuing their investigation of the administration of justice, it means that every case which is before the courts—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member is now making another statement saying that it means something. The member is out of order, I have ruled he is so, and the Minister would be out of order in answering it.

Mr. J. Renwick: I would ask the Attorney General if he has gathered the substance of my concern and if he would comment upon it.

Mr. Speaker: The Attorney General will be out of order if he replies, and I would be glad, in order that this can be concluded, if the Attorney General would discuss the matter with the member, because I gather that he is in a position to do so.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I simply point out and I ask you to take it into consideration, that what is involved in my question is every single case coming before the magistrates of the courts in the Metropolitan Toronto area. I think in the light of the comments which I have made upon the nebulous statement of the Attorney General it requires an answer immediately, and I understood that the Attorney General was prepared to so answer, and I would ask that it be permitted—

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the member that a ruling that further discussion of this matter would be out of order has been made with respect to several members' questions, which probably are of equal importance, from the official Opposition. I have made the same ruling with respect to the question by the member for Riverdale, and I have also said the Attorney General, in attempting to pursue this matter further, would also be out of order.

If the House is of the opinion that it would like to have this matter pursued, by the question now having been asked, being answered by the Attorney General, even though it is out of order and even though I have ruled it so, the Speaker is subject to the ruling of the House. But I feel that this matter is not going to be clarified by further discussion along the line on which we have now discussed it.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the point of order, I do not believe that there should be a time limit on the clarification that is permitted under the rules of the House, and you, sir, have said you would entertain questions, and in fact have done so already this afternoon. Surely if the member has asked questions which are designed to clarify the Minister's statement, then I would suggest that they be allowed, with great respect, and since the Attorney General is willing to further clarify it, perhaps it would be in order if he were to proceed.

Mr. Speaker: I would be very pleased to do that, but I do not wish to be in the position of cutting off questions for clarification by some members of the House and allowing others to make them. That is my point and the leader of the official Opposition has agreed to this one. I am quite agreeable if the Attorney General is agreeable to answering it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, you have made a ruling and now you are in the process of withdrawing it. What I wanted to draw to your attention is that if you do

not permit an answer to this question, because it is out of order all the questions that the hon. member for Downsview is subsequently going to ask are out of order.

Mr. Speaker: The rules of the House indicate nothing is to be anticipated and the member is endeavouring now to anticipate what Mr. Speaker might do. Mr. Speaker is quite capable of dealing with that in his own way, subject to the view of the House, when the time comes. The Attorney General is very anxious to answer and we will allow it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your ruling and I shall confine my answer to the matter of clarification. I think I can assure the member who asked the question that the investigation, insofar as it is now being carried on by the police officers in the intelligence branch is simply to relate those pieces of evidence which appear to have some relation, and have been discovered and brought to light. There is no wide-ranging investigation into the administration of justice. I thought that my statement made that clear, and I would like to say that the magistrates' courts have a high repute. This matter concerns, so far as we are aware, only the two magistrates whose names are mentioned in this statement, and any work that is now being done in the continuing of the investigation is to relate the bits of evidence which led us to take this action.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to page 1 of this statement, fourth line from the bottom, where it says, "Nature of the latter prevented disclosure to either the public or the gentlemen involved." I would like to suggest to you, sir, that it is a matter of simple justice if the police at the present time are conducting an investigation into the matter.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have already ruled that these matters are out of order.

Mr. Shulman: Sir, I am asking for clarification here.

Mr. Speaker: I have ruled that the member's seeking of clarification of this point is out of order. Now I would also point—

Mr. Shulman: May I just complete my statement, my question, sir?

Mr. Speaker: No. The member is out of order, and he has already made that point, and has been ruled out of order.

Mr. Shulman: But it is simple justice.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I have before me questions before the orders of the day with respect to this matter from the leader of the Opposition, the member for York South, the member for Grey-Bruce, and the member for Downsview. These are questions, many of which at least, will require considerable study before I know whether or not they fall within the prohibition in our rules which I think is quite proper, and which has been debated and discussed here today. I will be pleased to go into them and by tomorrow have a ruling on them, or if any of the members mentioned wish to rephrase their questions, or resubmit questions in the usual course tomorrow, I will deal with them, and they can be before the orders of the day tomorrow.

At the moment it is not possible for me to decide, because I do not have a copy of the terms of reference, whether these questions are in order or not. I would ask that the members in question leave the matter in that respect.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, and in regard to what you have just said, I am quite prepared to abide by your suggestion insofar as most of the questions I have put here—in my 14 questions. However, I would draw your attention, sir, to question No. 3 which does not relate to the ordering of the inquiry, but relates to whether or not the magistrates have been informed. I think this question is in order, is not concerning the matter that is *sub judice* and should be asked. I am quite prepared to discuss with you at a later time, the rest of the question, but I think I should be entitled to ask question No. 3, sir.

Mr. Speaker: At the moment is not the time and place for the member to put that question. I will consider it in the meantime, because there are certain other questions by the deputy leader of the Opposition. My automatic reaction to this is that I would not accept any of these questions without having the opportunity to consider them further against what I have heard here today. If the member presses me I will so rule, and then we will have to have a Speaker's ruling, and that will have to be decided by the House. If the member wishes to leave it until I can consider it, I will be glad to—

Mr. Singer: With the greatest respect, sir, I think that question No. 3 can be severed from the previous discussion, and I would

ask you to reconsider that now, sir. If there is going to be a ruling that I cannot ask question No. 3 this afternoon, with great reluctance, sir, I am going to have to suggest that your ruling on that be challenged.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I have not said that, and I have also said that in the normal course of events questions from the leaders of the official Opposition and the New Democratic Party, and those questions which are left over from a previous day, always come first. I do have several of those questions, and it was my intention to have those questions asked. That was my original statement while I considered the question of the member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: I will wait my time.

Mr. Speaker: There is a question for the Minister of Labour from the leader of the Opposition. It is some days old now, June 18, and I do not know whether he wishes still to place it. It is: "What steps is the Minister contemplating to assist in the effort to resolve the dispute between Metro Toronto and local 43 of the Canadian union of public employees?"

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, there is another question from the hon. member for Scarborough East, which is along the same lines, and I was going to give the same answer to both.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would then place his question, and I will let him do the work himself.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): What initiative has the Minister taken to provide an alternative service for Metropolitan Toronto garbage collection, or to get the workers back to work by expediting settlement of the dispute? Mr. Speaker, there was a slight mistake in the wording of the written question.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, my department's conciliation officials, last Friday, brought the parties together and negotiations have been continuing since that time. We have not as yet been able to reach an agreement, but I would say to the hon. members that on Monday last an agreement as to limited operation of essential water and sewage services was arrived at, and that agreement still holds. Negotiations are continuing at the present time in my own department and I will advise the House as soon as there are further developments.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South has a question of the Prime Minister.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question of the Prime Minister is: Has the Prime Minister received a communication dated June 6, from Mayor Reid of Ottawa, requesting the city be empowered to set up a rental review board? When can the municipality expect a reply and what is its likely content?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I did receive a communication, I believe it came into my office about June 10, containing the resolution from the council of the city of Ottawa asking for a rental conciliation board. I am having this examined to see all the inferences that might be involved in it, and I will in due course, answer the letter. I could not at this time however indicate what the possible content of the letter would be.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce has a point of personal privilege, and also a question from June 20.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, at the last sitting of the House, on Thursday, I raised the matter of the partial closing of the University Avenue subway, which cost over $45 million, and which I termed a $45 million mistake. I asked the Prime Minister what justification he had in spending $20 million in grants and public money, when the rest of Ontario has never received equal spending. The Prime Minister stated categorically that there were no grants to the University subway. Mr. Speaker, I accused him of misleading the House. He told me in effect to put up or shut up.

In the Toronto *Daily Star* he is quoted as saying that it is a clear fact that there were no grants to the University subway. I have here, from The Department of Highways, a summary reviewing the total spending of $17,061,276 towards Toronto subway projects.

Now I further charge, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Prime Minister was misleading the House when he said there were no grants. He knew I was not talking about the Montreal subway; it was the Toronto subway I was talking about. I would like to know now, Mr. Speaker, the total amounts of moneys—

Mr. Speaker: Order. What is the member's point of personal privilege? He is now placing a question.

Mr. Sargent: Well, the point of personal privilege is this, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was misleading the House. He said there were no grants towards the University subway. My point is that we are talking about subway programmes; I am not breaking it down to any subway—I am talking about subways.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sargent: He said there were no grants.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The member's question was on the University subway. I recall it distinctly and he said so again today. Now the member is changing his terms to "subways", and that of course, is neither proper under any circumstances, nor is it in accordance with his introductory remarks.

Would the member state his point of personal privilege, so that the House may be aware of what is actually the point?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, my point is that when a member of this House asks about the spending of such amounts of money I said $20 million but it amounts to $17 million. Basically, he is correct; he calls them subsidies. These are grants of public funds going into a project. They are money belonging to the rest of Ontario. We cannot get that spent in the rest of Ontario and we want to know why he did not tell us the truth.

Mr. Speaker: Is the member going to state his point of personal privilege or is the matter to be concluded as being out of order, because that is the only alternative?

Mr. Sargent: My point is that he said put up or shut up. There is the figure of $17 million. And further I asked, Mr. Speaker, I asked him if there were any outright loans and that information has not been forthcoming—whether there were any outright loans to the city of Toronto. I understand that there were and I think it is about time we had, tabled before this House, the complete amount of money—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

If the member wishes that information he can get it in the ordinary course.

I would point out to the member that my recollection has been fortified by his opening statement that the original question in discussion was on the University Avenue subway and now the member has brought in some information with respect to the Toronto subways, not the University Avenue subway. Therefore, it would appear that the material which the member is now producing for the House has no bearing actually on the original question and original answer.

If I am incorrect in that I would be glad to have the member correct me.

Mr. Sargent: Well how does the Prime Minister justify—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Sargent: All right, you asked me how —I want to state my point.

Mr. Speaker: No, but state it to the Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: How do you justify spending $17 million on subways other than this one?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

I asked the member to state it to the Speaker and it would appear that what the member is now doing is endeavouring to place a question which is not on the order paper.

Mr. Sargent: My point, Mr. Speaker, is that I think the Prime Minister was evading the point that there was this amount of money spent—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, order!

I would say to the member that I can see the point he is trying to make. But I can also see that if what he has said today is correct then it is more than likely—in fact, I think it is quite so—that the answer that was given to him to the specific question was probably correct too.

I would suggest to the member that he take a few minutes tonight and re-word a question including the material he has given to the House here today, and I think he would probably get an answer.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am not terribly sensitive about what is said about me in this House, but the hon. member is insinuating or has said that I have not told the truth. I do not consider it my duty to attempt to interpret what any member may mean when he asks a question. I do my best to answer the question asked.

It is not my function, and I am quite certain I would be roundly criticized if I were to attempt to interpret questions that are asked. If the hon. member cannot put his question down in reasonable English why

should I worry about it? I undoubtedly would put the wrong interpretation on it anyway and then I would leave myself open for another of these personal attacks. I am happy to answer any question that may be asked, but I do not intend to interpret the questions of this member or any other member of the Opposition because I am quite certain they do not want me to.

Mr. Sargent: May I reply to that?

Mr. Speaker: The member, I hope, will reconsider the matter and place his question so as to elicit the information which he wishes and I am sure that he will obtain it.

The member for Grey-Bruce has a question from June 20 of the Minister of Public Works; does he wish to place that?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister advise: One, if the vending machine installations in the Hepburn block were on a low bid basis?

Two, was there a tender called?

Three, what were the terms? Who received the contract and what was the length of the contract?

Four, what policy does the government plan to follow in the future in regard to automatic vending contracts in government buildings?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the vending machines in the Hepburn block were installed by the civil service association of Ontario which has, for many years, been responsible for providing food services for government employees at Queen's Park. I regret, therefore, that I cannot give any specific information regarding parts two or three of the question.

With regard to part four, it has generally been our policy to allow automatic vending machines to be installed as part of the food service operation for any particular building or at the request of the Canadian national institute for the blind as part of its concession. This seems to have worked quite well in the past and I cannot see any reason to change this policy at the present time.

Mr. Sargent: Will the Minister accept a supplementary?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: You use the low bid process in all your other dealings, I understand. Why not in this million dollar business? Why could there not be a low bid contract here?

Hon. Mr. Connell: If you had listened to the answer to the question I do not think you would have asked your supplementary.

Mr. Sargent: I do not care—answer my question.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I actually told you we had nothing to do with it. That was the answer.

Mr. Sargent: Who has, then?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: Complete evasion of everything—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

The member for High Park has a question for—

Mr. Sargent: I have got a whole bunch of them.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but we are now doing the questions from last week. The member will have his turn shortly with today's questions.

The member for High Park—just the questions from June 20.

Mr. Shulman: I have a four-part question for the Minister of Reform Institutions.

In the specific case of Lawrence H., No. 101543, a prisoner at the North Bay jail, will the Minister arrange a transfer to the Stratford jail so that his mother can visit him to prevent the added suffering to the boy and his family produced by incarceration so far from his home?

Question two: In the specific case of Tom S., will the Minister arrange a transfer of the prisoner from North Bay to a southern Ontario jail or reformatory so that his family can visit him and prevent the added suffering to the boy and his family produced by incarceration so far from his home?

Question three: In the specific case of Richard P., will the Minister arrange a transfer of the prisoner from North Bay to a southern Ontario jail or reformatory so that his family can visit him and prevent the added suffering to the boy and his family produced by incarceration so far from home?

Question four: In the specific case of Edward R., will the Minister arrange a transfer of the prisoner from North Bay to a southern Ontario jail or reformatory so that his family can visit him and prevent the added suffering to the boy and his family produced by incarceration so far from home?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that we would have saved a great deal of time of the House if the Minister had answered the questions when we were last here.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for telling those of us who have been around here just a little longer than he, how to answer questions to satisfy him.

In my view, sir, I have answered this question quite sufficiently. This is about the third or fourth time that this same question has been asked, with a few words changed here and there. I would refer the hon. member to *Hansard* of May 17, page 3094; to *Hansard* of May 23, page 3281, and *Hansard* of June 19, page 4689, in which these questions show as having been answered and I have nothing further to add to them.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have asked these questions several times about specific prisoners. In each case the Minister had given the general answer that the policy of the department is this, that or the other. I have made specific requests about four specific men to the benefit of themselves and their families. Surely even if the Minister does not wish to answer me, the people deserve an answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member becomes the Minister of Reform Institutions he can then follow a policy of letting the public know specifically when he is moving prisoners from one penal institution to another. I do not intend to do that.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview. I have now read over the questions which have been placed by him, to the number of 14, some of several parts, and I would rule that questions two and three are in order today and not covered by the previous discussion.

The Minister in replying to certain parts of question three, if he feels that my discretion has not been proper in view of the law will be guided appropriately in his answer.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to accept that and I will discuss with you at a later time the balance of the questions, as you suggested earlier.

Question two is this: Will the Attorney General advise whether he or any other government official has the power to relieve from his duties or suspend any magistrate in Ontario?

Question three, will the Attorney General advise:

(a) If either or both of these magistrates have been informed as to why they—

Mr. Speaker: May I interrupt for one moment. We are not using the names in questions two or three. Perhaps the member would insert the two names there?

Mr. Singer: If either or both Magistrates Gardhouse and Bannon have been informed as to why they were suspended or relieved from their duty?

(b) If either of both Magistrates Gardhouse and Bannon have been informed whether or not there will be criminal charges laid against them?

(c) If either or both of Magistrates Gardhouse and Bannon have been informed whether or not there will be any investigations made in accordance with The Magistrates Act?

(d) If so, what specific information was given to them in this regard?

(e) If so, was the information written or verbal?

(f) If so, by whom was the information given?

(g) If so, when was this information given?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, there are some parts of these questions that I could perhaps answer offhand, but in order to give a full and complete answer I will take them as notice and give a full answer tomorrow.

Mr. Singer: By way of a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the Attorney General is not prepared to tell this House now whether or not Magistrates Gardhouse or Bannon have been told in advance of what happened here today that they were being suspended or relieved of duty?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: In answer to part two of the question, I believe they were told by Chief Magistrate Klein or by Deputy Magistrate Fred Hayes that they were not being assigned to duties as a result of information which had been received in The Department of the Attorney General. That is as far as I am able to go today. As I say, I will answer further tomorrow, as the question has many parts. In order to give a full and complete answer I am taking them as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour. Did the Minister receive a telegram from Atikokan, seeking his intervention in a strike involving the communication workers of America and Northern Telephone Company? If so, what steps will the Minister take to ensure full treatment of the striking employees and an equitable settlement of the strike?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, I did receive a telegram concerning the matter, but this comes within the federal labour jurisdiction, and intervention, therefore, would have to come from the federal Minister of Labour.

Mr. Stokes: Will the Minister accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes.

Mr. Stokes: I understand that Bell Telephone comes under federal jurisdiction, but the subsidiary, Northern Telephone Company, is under provincial charter.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I looked into the matter, and it comes under federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education. Does the Minister intend in the next short while to introduce further amendments to The School Administration Act, and if so will one of these amendments relate to the establishment of transfer review boards?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is perhaps aware that there is notice on the order paper of an intention to introduce amendments to The School Administration Act. I am not in a position to indicate to the member just what matters will be considered, but there will be an amendment to the Act.

Mr. Pitman: I am wondering if the Minister has any intentions of encouraging the chairman of the eduction committee to call trustees in from the Ontario teachers' federation in regard to this matter?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I said—

Mr. Pitman: Before this—

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce has 10 questions which I would ask him now to place in series.

Mr. Sargent: I have a question for the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Will the Minister advise if he has any plans to crack down on the repair abuses in auto, radio, and TV repair fields to protect the consumer against: 1. widespread abuse; 2. misleading advertising and untrue advertising in selling practices; 3. proof of replacement of parts; 4. incompetent or unbonded personnel; 5. unlimited fees for estimates?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in respect of this question may I say, in the absence of any specific case where abuse is being cited, that I will attempt to outline briefly what the policy of the department is with respect to the general areas referred to.

As I am sure the hon. member for Grey-Bruce is aware, section 1 and subsection 2 of The Consumer Protection Bureau Act outlines duties which include authority for the consumer protection bureau to "receive and investigate complaints of conduct in contravention of the legislation for the protection of consumers".

In practice, that has meant that complaints and abuses of the type referred to have been received and serviced by consumer protection bureau personnel and generally satisfactory results have been obtained through the process of mediation.

I think that it is worth pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that complaints of the type described in the question have been relatively small in number, and we would welcome any specific instances that the hon. member might wish to draw to our attention.

Meanwhile, I can assure the House that this entire area is being closely watched so that adequate measures can be evolved, based on proper study and research, if they become desirable or necessary.

As far as misleading advertising is concerned, section 31 of The Consumer Protection Act provides that where instances of false, misleading or deceptive advertising come to the attention of the bureau, it is in the power of the registrar to issue a cease and desist order. With respect to the proof of replacement of parts, or fees for estimates, section 16 of The Consumer Protection Act requires that an executory contract be entered into for the sale of goods or services,

where the purchase price exceeds $50. Section 16-2 states that an executory contract is not binding on the buyer unless it contains the specific information. Also, a duplicate original copy must be in possession of each of the parties.

I would just like to make one final comment with respect to misleading advertising and say that there have been no cease and desist orders issued, but there have been numerous areas of discussion with newspaper publishers and their staffs themselves. Through that means of mediation and discussion we have been able to correct that type of advertising which is against the policy of the publications.

Mr. Sargent: Is it unreasonable to ask why these trades should not be provincially licensed like car mechanics, to operate TV, radio and auto repairs?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, that is a fair question. The answer, Mr. Speaker, must be how far is government going to intervene in the management of business? Granted we do in certain areas, but the truth of the matter, and I do not think that any of us wants to overlook this fact, is that the vast preponderance of businessmen and electricians are reputable, responsible citizens. The intervention by way of these steps causes many of the responsible people to object, and they have recorded their views against that kind of stand.

Mr. Sargent: The radio and TV people have asked for licensing.

Two questions for the Minister of Transport. Has the Minister considered the use of Dr. Gibbs' stress analyzer, a product of the Ottawa national research council, to weed out marginal drivers? And has the Minister considered implementing a driver rehabilitation programme, wherein persistent violators who are facing either suspension or revoking of their licences, can save them by undergoing a rehabilitation course, involving both the classroom and road instruction, lasting not less than 10 hours or more than 30 hours? Would the Minister consider instituting a programme such as the one in the city of New York, to assist incomes of those dependent upon their continued driving privileges?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, we are most interested in the work being done by Dr. Gibbs at the national research council. Members of my staff have had discussions with him, but feel that the stressalyzer has not yet been developed to the point of perfection where it can be relied on for general use.

With respect to the second question, we have no legislation at this time that would permit of the type of programme that the hon. member has outlined. It appears more suitable for jurisdictions in the United States, in some of which a great many suspensions are revoked or set aside; even suspensions applied by the courts. In Ontario, as the hon. members are aware, most suspensions are mandatory under either The Highway Traffic Act, including the demerit point system or under the criminal code of Canada.

Mr. Sargent: I thank the hon. Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member ask his question of the Minister of Trade and Development, who has to leave?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

A question to the Minister of Trade and Development: Will the Minister advise the number of loans made to Indians in Ontario from CMHC under the proposed $7,000 housing loan for Indians?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): I will take notice of the question, Mr. Speaker, and get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: Two questions for the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker.

As a means of safeguard against health dangers in the hot weather, has the Minister considered requesting a garbage task force from the Canadian army to remove garbage in Metro Toronto, in view of the fact that garbage outlay in Canada will cost $300 million this year? What steps and tests is the government taking to direct certain municipal authorities to find ways and means to dissolve cans and plastic wrappers?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the collection of garbage is a municipal responsibility and so far the city of Toronto has not requested our help in dealing with this problem.

As to the matter of dissolving plastic containers and tin cans, apparently all the work done on it has met with little success so far. Our advisory committee on pollution control is actively studying all the literature in the hope that we can update and collate the information that is available to us. So far we have met with no success in this.

Mr. Sargent: I thank the hon. Minister.

A further question: Has the Minister any plans to establish mobile dental clinic services to the poor, the orphanages, the blind and the deaf, similar to American medical centres, staffed by faculty and student volunteers or schools of dentistry?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the hon. member knows, the provision for dental services is already made through The Department of Social and Family Services for the poor, and for those in institutions it is also made either by that department or The Department of Health. For many years The Department of Health has maintained mobile clinics on both the trans-continental lines, as well as has the Red Cross, but rather than separate out segments of our population for care we aim at providing as high a quality of care as possible for the total population. The mobile clinics at the present time are used to service those areas that are far distant and sparsely populated.

Mr. Sargent: I thank the hon. Minister.

A question to the hon. Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker: The Attorney General is not in his seat so perhaps the member will hold those. The member has some for the Minister of Energy and Resources Management?

Mr. Sargent: A question to the Minister of Energy and Resources Management, Mr. Speaker:

Will the Minister advise if he has a list of municipal and industrial polluters of the Great Lakes and if this list is reviewed on a deadline basis every six months? How many fines were levied in 1967 and the amount of money involved and what was done with the money? Where did the money go and what is it used for?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part is "yes". To the second part, the list is reviewed at least twice a year and in many cases more often than that. To the third part: In 1967 there were 11 fines. The amount of the fines was set by the courts and paid into the courts.

Mr. Sargent: How much money?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I do not have the amount.

Mr. Speaker: The member has one for the Minister of Highways?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister advise if all gasoline for provincial vehicles is purchased wholesale and, if so, what firm received the bid for 1968?

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, it will take some time to get the information but I will get it for the member as soon as possible.

Mr. Sargent: I thank the hon. Minister.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has some questions?

Mr. Shulman: A question for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, and it has eight parts.

Was the province's cheque for $200,000, the final payment of the province's share toward the expansion of Halton Centennial manor, given to the member for Halton East (Mr. Snow) to deliver to the Halton county council?

If so, why?

Why did the member not immediately turn the cheque over to the county?

Did the county clerk complain to the provincial government about the delay in receipt of this cheque because of the added costs of $40 per day interest charges?

Was there a one-month delay before the cheque was turned over to the county?

During this period, did the member for Halton East have possession of the cheque for one week?

Is it the policy of this government to give grant payments to the local Conservative member, who may pass them on to the local council?

If this is the policy of the government, would the Prime Minister instruct his backbenchers in the virtues of quickly passing on the money?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am informed a cheque was delivered to the hon. member for delivery to the Halton county council. It was for a substantial amount of the final payment; I do not know whether it is the last dollar of the final payment, but a substantial portion of the final payment.

Question 2: Why? This is an arrangement worked out between the council and the member. Apparently the council asked the member to assist them in obtaining this final payment.

The timing of this transaction was: The cheque was delivered at the earliest time convenient to officials of the county. The member received the cheque on Friday afternoon, May 17, which, if you recall, was a long weekend. He was unable to reach the

county officials on Friday afternoon and therefore Saturday, and Sunday passed and Monday passed as it was a holiday, so that the cheque was in his possession throughout the holiday weekend. On Tuesday, May 21, which was the next business day from Friday afternoon, he was in touch with the members of the county council and they came to an arrangement by which it would be deliverd to them—to the warden and four members of the council, at Queen's Park. So the cheque made its way back in the pocket of the member to Queen's Park and was duly presented to the warden here on Wednesday, May 22, when the warden and the councillors visited Queen's Park on some other business.

We have no record of any complaint being made by anybody about this transaction.

I think perhaps where the delay enters is that the cheque was dated March 31, but it was not issued until some days after that. It was dated March 31 because it was a payment out of the funds voted in the previous fiscal year. The government's fiscal year ends on March 31 and sometimes there is an overlap in moneys that are voted in one year and perhaps not fully expended in the latter part of the fiscal year. So the cheque was dated March 31 to bring it within the appropriations for the previous fiscal year. This may be the area in which I believe there have been some questions about interest, but that date on the cheque does not refer to the date of actual issuance of the cheque for payment to the council. The payment was arranged, as I said earlier, for May 17.

Therefore, in answer to question No. 6, the member had possession of the cheque from Friday afternoon, May 17, until Wednesday forenoon, May 22.

In answer to question No. 7: Cheques of this type are handled in various ways; sometimes they are handled by the local member, sometimes they are put in the mail. As I pointed out, too, this was an arrangement made by the member with the county council.

Mr. MacDonald: Does that same privilege extend to members of the Opposition?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not know that anyone has ever asked or ever made such arrangement. I do not think the eighth question really requires any answer.

Mr. Shulman: Would the Prime Minister accept a supplementary question; two supplementary questions?

Is it common practice to back-date cheques that are issued?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: As I pointed out to the member, it is a matter of accounting procedure. At the time this particular cheque was being issued, it just came at the end of the fiscal year and it was dated March 31 so that the cheque would be drawn on funds in the fiscal year in which they were voted by this House, if the member understands what I mean. I am told—and of course I know this to be so—that in the transactions of the government, and there are a great many of them, sometimes it is necessary at the end of the fiscal year to have a certain amount of overlap.

Mr. Shulman: A second supplementary question: In relation to my question about a complaint from the county clerk, would the Prime Minister be willing to ask the Minister of Social and Family Services if the complaint was not delivered to his department?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I had someone on my staff check with the department and the answer I received was that they had no record of any complaint being made.

Mr. Speaker: The member has a further question?

Mr. Shulman: The Attorney General appears to have left. I have a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services in four parts:

How many acres has the Minister and/or his wife subdivided in Nassagaweya township? Has the Minister subdivided any other properties in Ontario this year? On what date or dates were the subdivisions registered? And does the Minister agree with the government that uncontrolled subdividing should no longer be allowed?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, my answers are as follows:

Question 1: I conveyed, or released by conveyances, to and for my wife 172 acres more or less, she released by conveyances to and for me 80 acres more or less, in Nassagaweya township.

Question 2: Conveyances were made in respect of other properties.

Question 3: Deeds of conveyances were registered on April 29 and 30, 1968.

Question 4: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

UPHOLSTERED AND STUFFED ARTICLES

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 157, An Act to control the content and identification of stuffing in upholstered and stuffed articles upon their manufacture, sale and renovation.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ART GALLERY OF ONTARIO ACT, 1966

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education and University Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 151, An Act to amend The Art Gallery of Ontario Act, 1966.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister might care to give us some further comments on this bill. We know that the art gallery was reconstituted by a bill just a year ago, or two years ago perhaps, and he might want to explain what further changes the principle of this bill would bring about as far as the art gallery is concerned. And if there is any thought about the number of public museums and galleries that are coming under the direction of the Minister through bills of this type. Will it be through their own boards or does he see any way in which their efforts might be further co-ordinated?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure how it really relates to the principle of this bill. I am sure there are ways and means in the future of co-ordinating the activities of the various centres such as the art gallery, the museum and the Centennial centre, but I think that would be a discussion for another occasion. The bill in this instance adds two members to the board specifically from the city of Toronto because of the city's financial contribution to the art gallery. This is something that has gone on for many years and that is all that this amendment does.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Labour) moves second reading of Bill 150, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I do not have the bill in front of me, so I am just going to have to go by memory. If my memory serves me correctly, this is the bill that increases the benefit levels. Am I correct?

Again, going from memory, first of all this party is in disagreement with the maximum levels placed on earnings. I think it was increased from $6,000 to $7,000. Obviously this was the McGillivray commission recommendation, but we feel there is no justification in maintaining any maximum, this is better than it was previously. I think the maximum benefit previously was $85.64—something in that area—and this will raise it to slightly over $100 per week. I do not recall what the figures are—$101 or $100 and change.

Mr. Speaker, we do not think that there should be any maximum levels put on an injured worker. If he was earning $8,000 a year then his accident benefits should continue to relate on the basis of 75 per cent. Obviously we do not really agree with the 75 per cent there, but if that is the basis for it then he should get his benefits in relationship to the 75 per cent times the salary that he earns at the time he was injured. And so we are not in agreement with that amendment to The Workmen's Compensation Act.

Again, some of the levels are increased for the widow and the children of a deceased employee. Those levels are not adequate to meet the present day standards of living to which these people are accustomed. The earnings of the father or the wage earner of that household are not continuing to be reflected in their standard of living per the benefit levels under the proposed changes in the Act.

We think that the Act is short in that regard, that they do not maintain a standard of living that they enjoyed prior to the injury. I notice that the funeral expenses may not be a big item, but nevertheless it is an item and it is a cost and this does not reflect on the present day costs either.

I thought the Minister would have taken a more realistic position in that regard as well. The changes in the Act or the upgrading of the Act obviously does reflect improvement and I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this does not meet the requirements of the injured employees in this province. This Act does not go far enough to give them the measure of equity that they should enjoy as

far as their standard of living, working conditions and everything else that is reflected in the changes in this Act.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, in looking at the amendments to The Workmen's Compensation Act, one is struck by the futility of injured workmen, or the wives of deceased workmen, in trying to live up to the standard that their husbands had given them prior to being killed or being injured.

I notice also, Mr. Speaker, that this Act does not cover workmen who have been injured many years ago and it has not really tried to bring these workmen up to the level of the earnings and percentages that workmen get today through the added incomes that normally take place over the years.

It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that a man earning $100 a week with two children has a fairly hard time bringing up his family. A widow whose husband earned $100 a week has an impossible task under the rules of this Act. She cannot possibly bring up her children.

All this Act does is throw a bone to these people. I cannot understand why the amendments were made if they were not going to be made in keeping with modern workmen's compensation procedures or with modern thinking in connection with workmen's compensation.

In Ontario, we have 4,294 fatherless children who depend on the workmen's compensation board. And they get $40 a month; $40 a month to bring up a child in Ontario. The widow gets $75. If a workman earned $125 a week the widow still gets $75 a month, and the child still gets only $40 a month.

What we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is telling the widows of men killed in industrial accidents, "We want you to live below a subsistence level. We are not going to give you a decent income so that you can bring your children up in Ontario with the proper income." It does not matter to the workmen's compensation board if these people have to grub it out for an existence. It does not seem to bother them at all. But it seems a little unjust to the family of a man who has lost his life and limb in a commercial accident that they should suffer to such a degree.

I am wondering also, Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Labour is going to do for those workmen who were injured 20 years ago. Is the Minister of Labour in any way going to adjust the compensations that these men have received? Is he trying to adjust the compensation that these men received on the basis of a wage of, say, 20 to 25 years ago?

Is the Minister of Labour perhaps going to take a realistic look at the workmen's compensation laws? Is he going to study these laws and say these men deserve more than we are giving them? It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the philosophy of workmen's compensation as set down in the original Royal commission in 1914 was that the employer was going to give up certain rights, and the employee was going to give up certain rights, and therefore this philosophy just permeates the law today. The old master and servant relationship that evolved during the industrial revolution of the 19th century still pervades the workmen's compensation philosophy of today. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that we have got to get rid of this 19th century archaic thinking, and bring these rules up in keeping with the 20th century industrial society, bring them up to the 20th century social outlook, so that these people who are hurt and maimed and killed will have a just reward for their injuries and their deaths.

I have a case here, Mr. Speaker, a woman with five children. Her husband was killed five years ago. He earned $95 a week, which with five children is not a very high income. His widow with five children, Mr. Speaker, got a total of $240 a month—$240 a month to bring up five children; $60 a week. Is this in keeping with modern social thought? It is not.

As I said before, they are bound by the archaic thinking that permeates our society and that permeates that party. Mr. Justice McGillivray, I think, who brought down the workmen's compensation report, still insists on basing his whole report on that archaic principle brought down in 1914 that the employee, by receiving something from the workmen's compensation board, has to give up certain benefits. The only thing he is giving up, Mr. Speaker, is the added income he would have made if he had been a whole man. It seems repugnant to me, Mr. Speaker, that when a man loses an arm or a leg or a finger, the workmen's compensation board says to him, "Oh well, that is all right, you might be able to earn some income later, so therefore, we are going to cut your compensation."

I notice also, Mr. Speaker, that the report upon which I understand this amendment is based, makes many recommendations, but

one of them that it does make is that certain benefits, certain expenses, being paid by the workmen's compensation board, and incidentally paid by the employers, should now be taken over by other departments of government. I think that perhaps the Minister, when he does consider that report, should consider those recommendations and in my opinion reject them, because it is my opinion that the employer should pay the major cost of workmen's compensation, because certainly he is the major cause of the accidents in many cases.

In regards to the funeral bill, Mr. Speaker, it merely illustrates the disinterest that the Minister and the board have for expenses that somebody is going to have to pay when a workman dies. They have increased the funeral bill by from $300 to $400. Mr. Speaker, the city of Toronto will bury somebody for about $275 in a pauper's funeral. But I suggest that the Minister realizes that funeral bills cost much more and that the workmen's compensation board should pay the full funeral bill.

They have cut down the time you have to wait for the workmen's compensation to begin to pay the compensation to one day after the accident happened. They have increased it by three days. In other words the workmen will get three more days compensation, I think, Mr. Speaker, if this bill is according to what was set out in the McGillivray commission report. I think the Minister has missed the point completely, Mr. Speaker, and he has spent the public funds for nothing in bringing down this report.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on two areas of this bill on the matter of the widows. The position of the widows has been well stated. I concur with what was said, that the amount that is being suggested at this time is not nearly adequate. We have all come across widows in our ridings receiving workmen's compensation payments, and we find that they are, generally speaking, living a life of deprivation. It should not be necessary, in a province with affluence such as this, that they should be forced to live in this fashion because their husband was killed performing his tasks.

The other portion of the bill that I want to ask about, is the change under section 12. It says that if the workman is under the age of 21 years and so on and so on, the money can be paid to and a number of people, such as the spouse, a committee or public trustee. I think that we are coming into an enlightened age; I hope we are. The debate that we had two weeks ago reducing the voting age, certainly showed that there was unanimity among the parties for a reduction. Surely if we are considering reducing the voting age, we ought to be considering reducing the age at which a person is considered to be legally capable and able of handling his own money.

The workman earns the money. It is paid to him because he is losing wages. Surely the age 21 is not firm. It would be much better if we were to reduce this to the realistic age of 18, or for that matter make it, "to any person employed."

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on the amendments to The Workmen's Compensation Act. The position of our party has been well stated with regard to the payments that it provides in any given instance, whether it be the payment to the injured worker, or the survivor in the case of the death of the injured worker, and the funeral benefits. But this amendment is wanting inasmuch as it does not change the policy of the board for those who are being rehabilitated, where you find that they are on temporary, or partial disability, where they cannot be returned to their former employment. They are, for all practical purposes, released by the board saying that they should be sent back to the former employer and placed on light duties for an indefinite period of time.

It is common knowledge that a good many of the employers do not have light duties for these people to perform. In many such cases it is impossible for the injured worker—or a worker who is forced to spend in many cases, months or years recovering from lower back injuries, or incapacitated for injuries such as that, and forced to live on sometimes $50 a month—it is impossible to keep a family on this. They are not in a position to be re-employed, and there is no provision made for this at all. I think that there is a responsibility on the compensation board to assure the injured workers that they will get a decent level of income to sustain their families or themselves until they can be completely rehabilitated, and I see nothing in this bill that would make any provision for that.

There are so many cases coming up today, as I say, with lower back injuries. There, operations cannot contribute toward their

rehabilitation, and it is just a case of letting it mend. In a good many instances it takes months and sometimes years. I can point out several specific instances to the Minister where the employee is forced to go to welfare agencies for assistance, when I think that the responsibility of the compensation board is either to rehabilitate him or to provide the necessary funds to keep him and his family until such time as they are on their own again.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak to this before the Minister? The member for Humber.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I think that it was about a year ago, when the compensation board was before the committee on government commissions, that I got after the workmen's compensation board for collecting their premiums annually. I asked how much was lost in premiums, because it appeared to me that every time I picked up a list of the creditor in bankruptcy action, the workmen's compensation board was undoubtedly on there as being one of the creditors, and it was minimized by the Minister saying that they lost only about 1 per cent.

So I said, "Well, tell me how much is 1 per cent?" He replied that they took in $100 million a year. So I said, "Well, my goodness, 1 per cent of that is $1 million a year that they lose in premiums."

I tied it in with my question as to what you are supposed to do for a man who comes to you and says, "Mr. Ben, I was injured on a job and the workmen's compensation board tells me that I should get a light job, and I cannot get a light job." The only thing that he can do is swing a pick-axe. The only thing that he had to offer was a strong back and strong arms.

When this individual is injured he is completely incapacitated. So they say, "Well, the hardest thing to prove is a back injury. You know, we have got to be careful about these things." So I started to think, and I pointed out at the time, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the $1 million, that not only does the workmen's compensation board lose $1 million in premiums, but if it was collecting the premiums monthly, as they do the excise tax, for instance, just consider the interest that they could be earning even if they only loaned the money to government departments for, say, 6 per cent.

They would be collecting the money at roughly $800,000 a month! At 6 per cent on the first month's premiums that would be roughly $48,000 that they would take in interest, or a little less because it would be for 11 months; so divide that by 12 to get $36,000 a year.

On the next $800,000, they would be earning interest at the rate of 6 per cent for 10 months, and so on. If they were to collect their premiums every month, they would not lose $1 million, and also they would be earning interest on the moneys that they would be collecting, as I say, at approximately the rate of $36,000 a year, on each month's premium. They would be able to pay all these doubtful claims and still be in money.

Under those circumstances, my hon. friend from Dovercourt would not have to get up here and concern himself with these labourers who are completely disabled once they injure their backs or lose an arm or leg. Now, when in heaven's name is this department going to smarten up and start collecting the premiums monthly rather than annually?

Mr. Speaker. The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I will make a few brief comments on this bill. They relate to an individual who has been paying into the fund right along and becomes injured and as a result collects workmen's compensation. He goes back to work and can no longer work in the job that he originally worked at. As a result he is told that his services are no longer required because they do not have employment of a lighter category.

During the period that he was paying compensation, no payments were made into the unemployment insurance fund, so that when he is eventually laid off and goes to collect unemployment insurance, the period of time for which no payments were made were deducted and as a result he does not get the full benefit of unemployment insurance that he would receive were he physically able to be working all the time.

My suggestion to the Minister is that during the time that workmen's compensation is being made, workmen's compensation should also pay the unemployment insurance of that worker, so that he will not lose any benefits whatsoever when he has to collect unemployment insurance.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, the portion of this bill that I am interested in is the fact that up to the time of passing of this bill, when it gets Royal assent, the widow of a worker who is killed on the job gets only $300 for the life; with the new bill it will be $600. It strikes me as pretty cheap to buy the life of an individual for $600.

The $600 that this bill will provide after the death of a worker on the job strikes me as a very small amount of money for his life. I would think that there ought to be an insurance of a type that the widow in this day and age should get at least $5,000. There are not that many people killed on jobs that the government could not afford to provide that kind of money.

Just recently, a widow with a child approached me with her problem. They collect $40 a month, and this will be greater now, and for her husband's funeral they could collect $300. But for the death of that man they collected $300, and now only $600. It appears to me that provision should have been made for a greater amount for that life.

The other thing that I have had to deal with often in regard to the workmen's compensation is when a man is not really injured or cannot prove injury on the job, but is not working because of a sickness or some pain that cannot be determined.

Some workers can collect sick benefit from the job on which they are working simply because the unions have been able to persuade the industry to pay sick benefit to these men. But I am wondering whether there is not a duplication here of services to that same individual whose work is not satisfactory.

If he is injured, the workmen's compensation pays the bill. If he is sick then he collects sickness benefit from some insurance company. And I wonder whether these two services could not be co-ordinated or brought together into one. It would appear to me that the administration would not be that great.

It would be much simpler and the money would come that much quicker because there are cases where the workmen's compensation does not pay because they did not determine that the man was sick on the job and the sick benefit has to take over and pay him a portion of his wages until they determine who pays the full amount.

These two points have stuck with me for many years and I think this would be a good time to try to forcibly bring to this Minister the feeling that I have about this very serious problem. I think you could give this money to the patient that much quicker.

What I am trying to determine here, Mr. Speaker, is that the individual who started on that job was a well physical being; he did take sick in some fashion or another, whether it be playing baseball or football with his youngster in the back yard, and wrenched his back. Often they try to say that it happened on the job but I think this determination ought not to be made.

The fact remains that this man was well, and now he is sick. Someone ought to pay and I think that money should come immediately from the workmen's compensation. I realize that it will cost industries more, I realize that they will have to make a bigger contribution, but I do not know of better places they could put that money.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): I would like to go through the matters that the member for Windsor-Walkerville has put forth. I think perhaps you can work in reverse order as he had mentioned, beginning with clause 10 paragraph 1 where under this paragraph it mentions 75 per cent of his average weekly earnings—this is if he has a total disability. In many cases in the construction trades, persons will be unemployed for about four or five months and then they go back to work. In some cases they do have a serious accident and their earnings from compensation are only based on perhaps their total earnings for that year, say $3,000. Yet they are laid off for a period of four months and their earnings could have been $5,000.

When a person ends up with $136 per month total pension disability, this is rather low. I think this is a little bit too rigid here. Perhaps in a case like this where a person has started back to work, they should take the week that he has worked and base it at 75 per cent of that week instead of going back and taking the average for the year. This brings his income down a little bit low.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak to the bill before the Minister replies? The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the general principles of this Act, and in so doing attempt to touch on the matters that have been raised by the various members. In many instances they have raised questions concerning the extent

of benefits. I think we have to bear carefully in mind that the basis of this Act was a report in 1915 that has been brought up to date continually since then. This is an Act whereby industry provides payments to the workmen's compensation board, so that a workman who is injured on the job shall receive benefits during the period of his incapacity, and shall be assisted in a variety of ways, back to normal, and returned to employment.

I would point out that money is paid not only for compensation but also for medical and rehabilitation services. And industry is responsible for the full payment of these moneys to the board. It is not a contributory arrangement. The workman, on the other hand, as one of the members pointed out, has given up his right to a civil action in these kinds of industrial accident cases, and through that he perhaps sacrifices something. On the other hand, however, he has gained a great deal.

Over the years, the benefits to be paid to a workman's widow have been increased substantially, and at the present time we have recognized, as did Mr. Justice McGillivray, that the payment to the widow of $75 per month was too low and we wanted to see it increased. Today, with the increase provided in this Act to $125 per month for her life or until her remarriage, this payment becomes the highest of such payments in any province. We do not take particular pride from that, but we are anxious that a widow should be paid just as much as feasibly possible to help sustain herself and her family. In addition to that, of course, there are benefits paid to the children and we have increased the amount that shall be paid to her on the basis of a widow with three children to $275 per month.

There have been various other suggestions made about lump sum payments and so on. The hon. member for Niagara Falls referred to payments of $600. I am not quite sure where that arose but there is an initial payment increase to $500 from $300 and that is an immediate cash payment. But over and above that, you will appreciate, she receives the pension as well as payment of allowances for the children who are under a certain age. A lot of these things we have accepted, and we carefully considered the report of Mr. Justice McGillivray on the workmen's compensation board. I may say that there are a substantial number of recommendations in that report; a number of them are administrative and in the great bulk of those cases those changes have been made or are being made.

The board is anxious to do all it can to increase the efficiency of its operations and to assist the workmen through the board itself and its operations. We have to bear in mind the cost to industry in these things. We want to see the board be as generous to victims of occupational accidents as we can, but we have to bear in mind the cost to industry. In this province the board collected some $100 million last year from industry for this operation, so there has to be a balance maintained in this regard so that industry can continue to be prosperous and continue to provide the jobs and the money that are required for these and other matters.

Raising of the level of maximum earnings to $7,000 rather than $6,000 is to raise the maximum amount that can be paid to the workman who is injured, and it does raise the maximum payment to $5,250 in the year. I would particularly point out to the members, and I am sure they are aware, that those moneys are free of income tax. I also would point out that these changes in compensation benefits to injured workmen will be in reference to accidents which occur after the effective date of the legislation.

Mr. Justice McGillivray did not recommend that the increase in widows' pensions should be to widows whose husbands had died previous to the effective date of this Act, but only to women who became widows after passage of this Act.

We have adopted measures in this bill so that all widows receiving benefits under the Act will receive the increased pensions.

In all of these things, therefore, we have attempted to bring the Act into line with present practices as far as we are able and we are anxious that the workmen's compensation board should have legislation which is up to date and of the greatest service possible to the workmen of this province.

The board administers a great many claims in one year, and in the last year there were some 375,000 claims processed by that board. It is a large operation. It is a costly operation from the standpoint of money going through their hands, and yet I must say to the members that the actual administrative costs of that operation are kept in line. I think those matters have been dealt with extensively before the committee on commissions of this House.

There will be detailed consideration of this during the course of the committee of the

whole, and I would also say to the members that I will ask that this bill be taken to the standing committee on labour, to be considered there in further detail.

Mr. Bukator: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The initial payment was $500; the Minister was correct, I was wrong in my figures.

THE LORD'S DAY (ONTARIO) ACT 1960-1961

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General)) moves second reading of Bill 53, An Act to amend The Lord's Day (Ontario) Act, 1960-1961.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Speaker, if you recall when we were discussing Bill 51, it was brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that I would have an opportunity to discuss this bill further when it came up for second reading.

I want to take the stand that I did on the previous bill in connection with Bill 51. I do not in any way approve of Sunday racing. There are many reasons for the position that I take in connection with this bill and one of them is strictly a business proposition. In considering this particular bill I find since I spoke in the House on my objection to Sunday racing there are some 600 employees of the racetracks that now work every holiday, Saturdays and Good Friday included.

They are family men who feel that they ought to have a day with their families. They also feel that the only day they have to be at home with their families is on a Sunday and they do not want to be deprived of this privilege that many of us enjoy. I understand the racing days that are allotted to the Jockey club are not going to be interfered with in any way. If they race on Sunday they will take a day off through the week. Using that argument, the family man who works on Sunday cannot be with his family through the week because the children go to school.

I know that the second argument that I make to you is not valid and sound but yet there is some merit in what I have to say. People in the neighbourhood of the racetrack along the lake, and I think it is called Greenwood now, have sent a petition to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) giving their reasons for not wanting this bill to be passed in this House. Their argument is as sound as anything I have ever heard. They now have to wait to determine when their services will be, when their weddings will be and they have to fit it in between the people going and coming from the racetrack.

Many hundreds of the homeowners in that neighbourhood, because of evening racing, are not able to get in and out of their driveways. And when the Minister answers my question I am sure he will say that it is left entirely to the municipality; they can pass a bylaw to allow Sunday racing. But I say to this House, through you, Mr. Speaker, that we ought not to put the elected representatives in individual municipalities in a position where they can or cannot pass this particular bill.

I was informed by some that we, as legislators, have no business trying to legislate the morality of individuals. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are here for that very purpose. Everything we do is a law of some type; every statute that we pass is a deterrent on someone from not doing something or imposing something on them that they ought to do. This is our function. We owe this to our people to take a stand for and against statutes.

The most important point I make to you, Mr. Speaker, is that the principles under which each one of you have raised your children, the churches that you attend—and I have even tabulated that; I know where each one of you have attended and I have letters from many churches telling me that they do not approve of Sunday racing.

I think that this is an improper Act. Under no circumstances can I support it. I only wish I had someone to second my motion to hoist this bill, to put it on the record to find out where you gentlemen stand. I cannot see how these youngsters are taken to church on Sunday to be given the more spiritual bringing up that I have had, and I am sure they have had and then, having taught our children all these years that Sunday is set aside because it is the sabbath, we stand here and pass a bill allowing people to do the very things that we ought not to do ourselves, and I talk about Sunday gambling.

I want to make this to you very forcibly. If there is a mafia type of activity in our country, if there is syndicated crime, you are opening up another day to that particular group of thugs to exploit their fellow men. Under no circumstances ought we to open the door to them, to allow them to get in on

the $.5 million additional revenue on which they can also run their books on a Sunday. Under no circumstances can I see how any hon. gentleman of this House can support this bill.

I have before me letters from individuals and from churches that I do not care to read into the record. I have been very much encouraged by many people who believe as I do. Each one of you stands condemned if you vote for this bill conscientiously and support it.

I can see no way by which a man who had been brought up in the synagogue, a man who is a Protestant, a man who is a Catholic can stand in this House and support Sunday gambling. I know better than anybody that we cannot legislate morality. There are many ministers struggling now—and it might be their fault, I do not know—to try to maintain their churches and here we are putting another roadblock before them.

We are not setting the example to them that each one of us has been taught in one church or another, the Christian principles that I believe in, that I have taught my children. The sabbath ought to be a day of rest, the sabbath is a holy day and we have no right, under any circumstances, to alter that. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, it has not been an easy time for me in this House since I made that speech, because the opposition is great. There are many prominent men in the business field who have condemned me for my stand. The odd one has said, "I do not agree with you but I do admire you for your principles."

I have before me a resolution. If I could get a seconder, I think I would like to divide the House. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) said he would second it, which would give me the resolution. I did not prepare myself too well because I—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): It is out of order anyway.

Mr. Bukator: No, it is not out of order. Does the member want me to refer him to the section?

Mr. Nixon: Certainly it is in order.

Mr. White: Certainly it is not. One cannot introduce a resolution during a debate on a bill.

Mr. Bukator: Oh, well, let me tell you what I have in mind. I might not have used the right wording. I give my—

Mr. Nixon: If the member did not, that political expert, the member for London South, will catch this member.

Mr. Bukator: I would like to know just where and how we can face our people. As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, we have been taught and we have taught, and ministers have preached to me many years in all churches, and the principle exists. I do not think we ought to put any municipality in the position where they now pass a bylaw rather than a vote, at least that portion should not have been taken out. And I have before me a resolution, moved by myself and seconded by the member for Grey-Bruce, that Bill 53 be not now read for a second time but be read a second time this day six months—

Mr. Speaker: I would draw the attention of the members to the fact that this is a type of motion which in my opinion—I trust it is correct—is peculiar and used only on certain occasions and it has been moved by the member for Niagara Falls, seconded by the member for Grey-Bruce, that Bill 53 be not now read a second time but be read a second time this day six months. May the Speaker have a moment? Yes, it is debatable.

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, I presume that motion is debatable, and I would further assume that when it is put, it would be put to the House as any other amendment to second reading is put, in the normal procedure.

Mr. Speaker: That would be my view but I just wanted to be sure. I have had some difficulty today with other things. So now we have a motion for second reading and we have a motion that the bill be not now read and the floor of the House is open for debate. The member for Waterloo North has the floor.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I would rise to support this motion. I strongly feel there are many areas in which the government has the responsibility to lead the way. I speak, of course, of matters of housing, education, social reform and welfare, but I think in matters where there are morals and religion concerned, the government does not have the responsibility to lead the way but should be pushed by public opinion. In my view, this is a matter for any people of morals.

Consequently, I think until such time as the people of Ontario show a willingness and the need and the desire to have legisla-

tion such as this brought in, the government should not accept this responsibility. I think we must realize the fact that pressure to have this bill brought in has come from only one source, the racing people themselves, and I certainly am not convinced that they are in the position that they need to have this special privilege showered upon them. I am not all that convinced that their tracks are going to close down if they do not get this privilege, or if they do not get that privilege; I think racing will go on as we know it.

Let us just look at racing for a minute. The racing people themselves have probably asked for this and brought the pressure to bear. At the present time the racing industry is perhaps the most favoured of any in the country for one reason—that it has, in fact, control of the only legalized gambling in the province. Horse racing in itself would be nothing more than a dog show or a horse show if it were not for the gambling and I cannot myself be convinced that the people of Ontario are ready to have gambling legalized on Sunday. This is the only basis that this bill is being introduced; it is for a commercial money-making scheme for those promoting the horse racing industry. I am of the opinion that in questions of this nature, the government should lag behind the opinion of the people, and I do not think the people of the province of Ontario are pushing this. Consequently, I believe the majority of the people of Ontario are not interested in furthering legalized gambling on Sunday and I must support this motion.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): May I say that I consider it a privilege to back the member for Niagara Falls in this motion, to stave off another inroad in the legalized gambling on Sundays. I am no moralist, as you all know, but I think we do have a responsibility to our children, to our family institutions, to our churches. A great majority of my people are in favour of this motion to defeat this bill. The fact is that the profit motive is here; the motivation is certainly not on the part of the Treasury to make money, it is the motivation on the part of the interests to have possibly another 14 per cent revenue per year out of the people's pockets by allowing gambling on Sunday.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that when the vote does come on this, we will have again in front of us, showing full force, the automation that we have in this age. In other words I do not think it necessary for the members of the government to kid us a bit; they are automation, they press a button and they all stand up and do not have the courage to state their own convictions. We have data processing in large scale in force now. The Prime Minister can press the button and these members who pledge themselves to carry out the wishes of their people have not the courage of their convictions to stand up and vote for what they think is right. We will see when the vote comes that automation is here even in the government benches.

I do take a great deal of—

Mr. White: Oh, do not be so silly.

Mr. Sargent: We will see what happens. When the button is pressed you will jump up like a little automated card.

Mr. White: Do not be so insulting.

Mr. Sargent: So, Mr. Speaker, I consider this a privilege to back this motion and commend the member for Niagara Falls for his courage in bucking the big interests.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I might speak to the motion, I must begin by commending my friend, the member for Niagara Falls, for presenting a motion and to inform you, sir, that it will not be possible for me to support it. The bill before us is one that does impinge on personal principles and the member for Niagara Falls and others have made this abundantly clear.

I know you remember, sir, when a companion piece of legislation was before this House some weeks ago that some opposition to the principle was expressed not only by the members who have already spoken from my party but by representatives of the other parties here in the House. The members themselves, I do not believe, are present today. Nevertheless, as has been stated, this is a matter of a great deal of personal concern. I feel myself, and I feel it quite sincerely, that these matters are matters of personal and family responsibility.

While it is not my intention to avail myself of the opportunity to visit the track and bet on Sunday, I do not feel that we are unreasonably imposing authority on others when we simply make it permissible that this be carried out under municipal bylaw. Of course, it is unfortunate that we on this side are not agreed in our position and therefore it is obvious that when the vote is taken, if in fact it is, that each member in our party will be representing his own views in this important matter.

I have already expressed my views previously, but certainly under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make them clear not only to my colleagues but to you.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to moralize here today, because to me it is not that much of a moral issue. For those of us who are Christians, the good Lord lets us decide for ourselves whether we wanted to sin or whether we wanted to lead a straight life, and I do not think it is up to us to determine for any of our fellow men how they should lead their lives. But there is something that is important to me, and that is the fact that I am a Liberal, and I am a Liberal because for generations and almost centuries the Liberals fought to make a better world for people to live in. They fought against children working in the mines for long hours. They fought to cut down the number of hours a man has to work every week.

The hon. member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid) was talking about education and preparing ourselves for leisure. The Minister of Education was doing the same. We have arranged our working hours to the extent that we now take a holiday on a Monday regardless of what date the event falls on. The only days we still celebrate on the dates they fall on are Easter, Christmas and July 1. Other holidays we put on a Monday so we can have a long weekend, the idea being that we have a number of consecutive days of leisure—or rest—so that we will not confuse the words "leisure" and "rest"—for either leisure or recreational activity.

What disturbs me about this legislation is that in essence it is going to compel people to have to work on days when other people are entitled to have consecutive days of rest. It is easy for us to say we are passing permissive legislation. That is an easy way to pass the buck, so to speak—that we will not be permitting Sunday racing, we will not be permitting people to work on Sunday, we will not be compelling people to work on Sunday. No, it is going to be somebody else who is going to be doing it. We just give them permission to do what they want. Let the municipalities take the blame. Well, I do not believe in passing the buck that way.

Earlier in this session we had before us a bill which would cut down on the number of overtime hours an employee can work. We thought it was important to restrict the number of overtime hours that a person could work, and the Minister was commended for bringing down such legislation. I think it is just as important that a worker be entitled to have so many consecutive days of rest and one of those be the day he observes as the sabbath. Everybody does not observe Sunday as the sabbath day, in fact the sabbath day is Saturday. We have Seventh Day Adventists who observe Saturday. We have the Jewish faith that observes Saturday as the day of rest. The fact is we have come into the position in our society where we now have a number of consecutive days, one of which is the sabbath day, be it Saturday or Sunday. This to me is important, and we should not be put in the position where we are permitting other jurisdictions, answerable to us, to compel people to lose those days.

Then we talk about air pollution in this House. To me there is something special about a Sunday. The factories have been closed Saturday. The westerly winds have blown across our skies and have blown away all the smog that existed and all the pollution that was put in the air by chimneys, and when you wake up on a Sunday, first of all you can see the sky. It looks blue. The sun even seems brighter. You can get a suntan on a Sunday that you cannot get any other day of the week, it seems, unless you get it out of a bottle. You can hear the birds singing because they are not drowned out by all the automobiles rushing up and down the highway. To me there is something important about being able to do that, and what this legislation does is deprive a lot of the people in this province of having that pleasure every Sunday.

Sure, some people have to work on Sunday—the police have to work on Sundays, politicians have to work on Sundays, especially during the summer when they have to go out to all these picnics, but that is the life they chose. Nobody is compelling them to do that. The fact is I say these people should be entitled to have Saturdays and Sundays as days of rest or worship however they choose to observe them, and this to me is the important thing. That is why I am going to support the amendment.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I also rise to support the amendment moved by the member for Niagara Falls and I do so for two reasons. First of all it has already been mentioned that we are in effect passing the buck in this legislation to the municipalities. This legislation

should either say, "We are saying you can have Sunday racing anywhere in Ontario," and we take the responsibility ourselves, or we should decide here whether it will depend upon public demand, or in having plebiscites to so demand legislation enabling this Sunday racing.

I think it is completely ducking the issue for us in this House to pass the Act as it now stands. It should be either the responsibility of this House to put forward legislation permitting Sunday racing anywhere in the province and decide upon it right here in this Legislature, or we should not have these clauses or these points in the Act whereby the municipalities may, without a plebiscite, make the changes. I think that the points already made by the member for Humber and the member for Waterloo North in this regard certainly are very valid ones and we should think about them when we vote on this bill, and the motion before us now.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. W. G. Pitman (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I want to make one or two comments on this legislation. I think it is a very difficult piece of legislation—difficult for both the government and for the Opposition. I think this is the kind of legislation which should be decided by a free vote rather than being decided as a government bill. Not that I wish to take the government off the hook, so to speak, nor that I wish to take Opposition parties off the hook, but I think there are things in this pluralistic society that make it no longer, in a sense, a puritan "blue-Sunday" kind of society that we once had in Ontario. Perhaps this bill itself is a reflection of a new kind of Ontario, and more cosmopolitan Ontario, more sophisticated Ontario, and perhaps an Ontario which considers itself more concerned about real issues.

In saying this I realize I may very well anger those who are very strong Christians, but I am just a little bit disappointed in the position that they have taken in relation to this particular piece of legislation. I find it quite amusing in some ways, all the letters I receive about racing on Sunday. And yet I see very few letters about the problems of housing or the fact that families are being kept apart because of it. In other words, why is the church not here, criticizing or applauding? I would be the first to suggest that there are things that have happened in this Legislature during this session that the churches should have stood up and said, "That is the right thing. This is a basic matter. We are doing something to improve family life."

I do not think this legislation is either going to strengthen the moral fibre of Ontario people nor do I think it is going to disintegrate the moral fibre of the people of Ontario. In other words, my feeling is very strongly that it is a peripheral matter, but because of the fact that it is so close to the hearts of many people in their religious beliefs, I do think that I would like to see this piece of legislation delayed for six months. I think I would like to see it thought out. I think I would like to see it come before this Legislature as a matter which will allow a free vote.

We have seen examples of this in the federal House, when the whole question of capital punishment came before that House, Mr. Speaker. That was something too which impinged upon the consciences of the people who sat in that Legislature. They were concerned about their religious beliefs as it affected the vote they made. As I said a moment ago, it may be easier to say, "Well, why allow a free vote to get all of us off the hook?" But I think that is not quite true; it also allows all of us to vote by conscience.

I think that some of the things which are expressed about the hypocrisy of politics, and the "sleaziness" of not being here when the vote is taken, or speaking one way and voting another way, are unfortunate, and I think they bring a certain degree of disrespect to this chamber. I do not think this is true. I think politicians on the whole have to stand up for their beliefs more often probably than any other people, of course—very few people do have to stand up—and make comments on their beliefs, and put their vote down where it is going to be seen by everybody in the community. So I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that although I am not supporting entirely the position that has been taken by other people, and would remove this for a six-month period.

I do not think this is the machination of an evil group of people who are trying to impose racing on the people of Ontario. I do not think there are people with money bags who are determined to crush the Christian morality of our society. I am concerned along with those who have already expressed the role of the family in our society and the problem of people being able to have one day with their families. I must say I was

much moved by the comment of those who would have to work in relation to this piece of legislation. That is one thing that I think we should be concerned about. I do wish that this was a matter that we could deal with on conscience rather than on party lines in this House.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I think that the arguments that have been advanced in this debate are confused and confusing. In fact, there are so many positions, and perhaps I will prove that there is still another position before I sit down. Let me assert at the outset that I agree with the proposition that this should be a free vote, and therefore let each person's conscience be his guide, so I am willing to state quite clearly where I personally stand. I do not think that any more can be asked of any member in this House.

For example, it has been argued by some members of the House that this should be opposed on moral or religious grounds. Mr. Speaker, for reasons that my colleague from Peterborough just advanced, I find this most unconvincing. If we have professional rugby, or professional baseball, and if you can go to the golf course and tee off on Sunday– if all of these other things can be done, why does one draw the line at horse racing? If somebody likes horse racing rather than these other things, why should he be denied the right to go to horse racing on Sunday? It seems to me that those who take this line of argument are fighting a battle that has already been lost, in many instances while they were silent. They should have raised their voices at some earlier point. I am not one to single out individuals, but there was one person earlier in the debate in the House who said he was opposed to the bill, and was fairly brave in doing this because he was taking a stand against a government bill. Yet it was pointed out to him that when he sat on the city council back home, he voted for Sunday bowling. That is hair splitting!

Let us get back to the gambling aspect. I agree that gambling is another ramification of this but I find it a bit perplexing to have people come and say that they are opposed to Sunday racing, because of the gambling, and yet I never hear those people speak about the toleration of illegal gambling, and the unwillingness of police to rout out bookies in this province.

We have played with this game for years. There have been bookies right in this building Why, a few years ago, I was talking about bookies, and somebody laughed, and said that there was a man working right in this building with whom you could place a bet any time. Everyone knows that there are bookies in every factory and office; and the radio stations oblige the bookies and everybody who wants to do illegal betting, every 20 minutes, so why does one get so exorcised with Sunday betting when one tolerates illegal betting? The government tolerates it, and so do the police.

If you really wanted to clean it out, you would just say that anyone who is caught engaging as a bookie—including radio stations —have got to cease being accomplices in the crime—so I am not convinced. Like my friend who says that he gets a lot of letters from people associated with churches, I received a lot of letters also. I would like some letters indicating some willingness to get at some of the other social issues which are just as important. To be silent on one, and very vocal on the other, leads one to believe that you have some sort of axe to grind!

However, Mr. Speaker, let me get down to the real substance of this motion, and "hoist amendment" that is now before us. The reason why I am not particularly happy about this bill, is that it is a way to get the Jockey club off the hook for what is the incompetent running of an industry.

I did not know that this was going to come up this afternoon, so I am repeating now, what I have put on the record earlier, and I have forgotten the name of the sociologist who was hired by a certain advertising firm in Toronto, to do a study of the operation of the Jocky club in racing. He came up with a pretty devastating report with regard to its incompetence. It is out of date; it is operating like a private gentlemen's club and an industry in which they really do not want to keep up to date. They are not appealing to the right "market", if they want to boost revenues. What we are doing through this bill is in effect, rescuing an industry from its own incompetence and poor marketing.

I am rather intrigued that after the man made the criticism of the industry for a certain advertising firm, the Jockey club hired that firm as their advertising agency. So I am a little suspicious and inclined to the belief that the Jockey club while being unhappy about this criticism is, at least by implication, acknowledging that there is some validity in it.

There is the further reason, as has been expressed by a number of members from the Opposition side—that this is still another in-

stance where those who work in the industry are going to be forced to work on Sunday. I think if one must work on Sunday, for essential public services, then maybe there is some justification, but for an industry which does not have to work on Sunday, I think that the workers involved have a case.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, amid all of the contradictions in the arguments, let me sum up my position. I have no particular objection to Sunday racing, because I think that battle has been lost. We tolerate many other violations of the sabbath, including the fact that the church, which recognizes the inclinations of human beings, now has cut out Sunday afternoon and evening services; so that if you go in the morning, you are free for the rest of the day for recreation. In many instances, the church has done that, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) in an earlier debate.

On the other hand while I have no objection to Sunday racing, I am going to support this motion for a hoist. I will support it because, quite frankly, it is primarily an effort to get the Jockey club and the industry off the hook because of its own incompetence in terms of keeping a modern, up-to-date industry. Secondly I think that it is imposing on people who do not necessarily want to work on Sunday, so that instead of being with their families when they are free, they will have to take their "Sunday" on Wednesday or Thursday, when the school children are at school, and the wife is engaged in other family chores; they cannot have family recreation or a family weekend in the middle of the week. I think that there is some merit in the hoist because I am not persuaded by the bill, although the general objective of the bill is one that I personally do not have any qualms about.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, practically everything that could be said concerning the bill has been said, however, I would still like to make a few comments and these would be in support of my colleague, a man who certainly has shown himself to be of extremely high convictions, and that is the member for Niagara Falls. I can recall the day when he was practically alone on the floor of this Legislature, or at least was the original member to speak in opposition to the bill.

I have not received any communications from anyone in my riding in support of such legislation. I have received many phone calls. They were not necessarily from church people, nor from those who look upon the sabbath as being a day of rest, but they were opposed, due to the fact that there are sufficient racing days available now. In my own community we have the Windsor raceway, that would stand to profit by Sunday racing. They have adopted a new policy where they have racing six days a week; twice on Wednesday and on Saturday. So in a six-day week, they have eight sets of races. Now, if we open up Sunday for them, we will give them an extra day; so in a seven-day week, they may have nine different racing events.

I think that the six days are sufficient for them; they do not need Sunday. The employees certainly would like to have at least one day a week off, and they certainly are entitled to it. In fact one of the mutuel employees' associations, I think, have written a communication to each member of the House, registering their strong objections to Sunday racing.

I think that if the government were sincerely concerned in having a loosened Lord's Day, they should have simply asked that this legislation be passed as is, rather than making it permissive, and giving the municipality the responsibiliy of allowing or permitting Sunday racing.

I do not look upon this as being a moral issue. I look upon it more as being one of right, where the employee should be given the time off and should not be required to work seven days a week. I look upon it, also, as one in which there is sufficient time in six davs to conduct all of the racing that is necessary.

I live in a border town, and in the state of Michigan, though you may look upon our American friends as the type that would tolerate a wide open Sunday, yet the state of Michigan has never considered permitting Sunday racing. Not that we should necessarily follow the state of Michigan, but I strongly believe that the six days of racing that we have are sufficient for any financial interests to come along and operate their racing business; they do not need the seventh day and I will support the resolution of the member for Niagara Falls. I think he is to be commended for introducing this hoist motion.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, it is with some regret that I must advise you that I cannot support the resolution of my colleague from Niagara Falls.

I would think that this bill is part and parcel of a pattern that follows the allowing of reasonably free choice to the people of

Ontario as to what they do, Sunday or any other day.

Over the many, many years that these matters have come to be considered, the government of this province has seen fit, and I think correctly seen fit, to allow the various municipalities to choose whether or not there should be Sunday sports. It comes to mind that one, Allan Lamport, promoted this issue in the city of Toronto, and as I recall it, very few of the news media supported him in it and very few of the people commenting thought that the people of Toronto really wanted to have Sunday sports. But it was put as a question on the voting paper, and lo and behold the substantial majority of the people in the city of Toronto voted in favour of having Sunday sports.

I fail to understand how we can begin to differentiate between Sunday movies, Sunday baseball, Sunday football and Sunday racing. We close our eyes on occasion, hyprocritically, Mr. Speaker, to the various activities on Sunday. For instance, we did for a substantial time allow private golf clubs to function and there was a great hue and cry that public golf clubs should not function.

I do not think that our laws should be so framed to allow privilege to groups in our community and it would seem to me that there are many, many people who get the opportunity to enjoy racing on Sunday if they so aspire and, if the municipal council would go along with it, they would not get the opportunity at any other time. Unfortunately, sir, I cannot accept the argument that a vote for this would be a vote for extending working hours.

The same argument was made when we began to talk about Sunday movies. As a matter of fact, I understand that many people who operated the moving picture industry would have been just as happy to see moving pictures confined to six days a week because they thought that people would only go to see so many movies a week, and if they only had to do it on six days the operating cost would be cut down. So that there was substantial objection by the moving picture theatre owners against Sunday movies because they thought that they would just have additional expense.

However, the public spoke, and the public spoke loudly and clearly and they said they wanted to go and see the movies on Sunday. Now, although the question of hours of work and rates of pay are the subject of different statutes and our unions have a great deal to say, and properly so, about working conditions, I would think that the people who are concerned with working at the racetracks are going to work for a number of hours a week in accordance with their employment conditions. And if this involves working an extra number of hours either other people will be employed or overtime pay will be paid.

I do not think there is any question today that by extending racing seven days a week that the workers are going to be exploited. What I am trying to say, sir, is what I would say about the amendments to the criminal code that were talked about in the House of Commons. This has been the subject of a recent election and if something happened yesterday, it was that the public expressed certain views, amongst other things, about the amendments to the criminal code.

I think the case was properly put by those people advancing these amendments. They were not legislating freer divorce or not legislating breakdown in the morals of the community. We are bringing our legislation up to date so that people can avail themselves of the choices and we are not going to attempt to impose our moral code on all of the people of Canada who may have a different sense of values.

I want to say I respect very deeply the opinions of my colleague from Niagara Falls. I know that in talking with him about this on many occasions he has a deep moral conviction that there should not be racing on Sunday and I respect him for it, but I cannot share that view. I say that if the races are run, if people want to run them, if people want to go to them, I do not think that we, in this province, have any right to say that they cannot do this unless we are prepared to say at the same time we will take away Sunday sports; we will enforce the legislation that deals with the operation of various commercial enterprises in the resort areas on Sunday.

And I see that my friend the Attorney General is there, and I wonder how many permissions he has given for prosecution under the pertinent legislation for people who sell all sorts of materials and carry on all sorts of business in the summer time on Sundays in the resort areas. That has been talked about once or twice in this House.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. member is wandering; it is the gambling motivation.

Mr. Singer: My friend from Grey-Bruce says I am wandering, it is the gambling

motivation. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that by passing or not passing this Act, we are going to change the people's gambling habits. The gambling that goes on at racetracks goes on for six days a week, seems to go on under reasonable control, and the only thing that we are going to do if we accept the suggestion implied in this motion, saying it cannot go on on the seven-day week, is to deprive a certain number of our citizens of the right to do what everybody else does six days a week and they might do it if they had the time available.

I talk, I think, in favour of the rights of the people in our cities who work hard all week and on the weekend. On the Sundays, particularly in keeping with their principles, they want to go out and enjoy themselves. As some people can go to summer cottages, so some of these people might want to go to the races. Some of these people might want to do at the races on Sunday what other people do on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday.

So for those reasons, sir, I think we have to maintain some kind of consistency. I could have found it much easier to support this motion if the people moving it and the people speaking in support of it said: "We are going to close Sunday up absolutely and completely. Sunday is a day of rest and we will stop all these other activities. We are going to insist that the Attorney General give permissions to prosecute on Sundays, all of the businesses that go on in resort areas and we do not rent motorboats and we do not sell food or provisions and that we do not have all these Sunday activities that go on in and through all the summer resorts and so on."

I just cannot become convinced, Mr. Speaker, that this motion to hoist at this time, makes abundant good sense and is in the interest of those people. So for those reasons, sir, as I say, with some regret, I cannot support my colleague from Niagara Falls. I shall vote, as my leader has indicated to you he will vote, and I shall vote in support of it. I think this is a piece of legislation in keeping with what has been happening in this province over the last several years and gives us some indication that we are moving, even in Ontario, into the late 1960s.

Mr. White: The Liberal leader has one follower.

Mr. Singer: Tell us about London.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): A similar debate was going on some weeks ago on the same matter. The hon. Attorney General gave an exhaustive reply and a very sensible one in my opinion, which would lead, of course to rejecting the motion that has come before this House. I for one feel that this is necessary so to do. The arguments, I will not repeat them, have been mentioned here severally as to the discriminatory aspect of the legislation—if it is not passed.

And why should not the lovers of horseflesh, of whom I am not one, not say that they were being treated in a restrictive and a discriminatory way and that their rights as citizens were not given observance over against the football players and a host of other occupations? May I say that as far as the religious issue is concerned, the other side of this fence has not got all the merits, you know. For me to pass the legislation seems to have as much religious merit as the other side of the fence.

I think the matter is not of a specifically religious nature. Anything that a man does in this life that has a serious effect on guidance and future in the direction of fulfillment is a moral matter. Why should morality always be pleaded by the other boys —there is some kind of breast-beating going on. I do not think they have a monopoly on this. I feel that one may advocate or support the expansion of the human spirit, choice of various occupations, various forms of pleasure and so on, which are in themselves so far as I can see, of at least amoral, and certainly not of an immoral, nature. Those who would judge that gambling is necessarily immoral have a particular philosophy of life which is not shared, I suggest, by the great mass of the citizens of this time and history. Why, for centuries human beings could not smile on Sunday without being horsewhipped and there has been a process of gradual decline and it has all been to the good and we come down to this time in our history I cannot see how anyone can even begin to impugn the motives of others on either religious or moral grounds who would support legislation of this kind. I think it is invalid, and as far as I am concerned my grounds are specifically of that kind. It has nothing whatsoever to do with people working or not working, or the economics of the thing.

It seems to me, to be something in the veins of our contemporary time. As to good or ill, I certainly can see that it is fairly innocuous. It is a form of diversion. The people from our side of the House, from this party, look at the wide range of pleasurable

activities enjoyed by those in more affluent circumstances. If a guy who works all week wants to go to the local racetrack and put $2 on the nose, I cannot see anything possibly wrong with that.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak before the Attorney General concludes the debate on the amendment?

Mr. Bukator: I am going to put this very clearly on the record regardless of whether I am stopped or not. This with me is a moral issue. The principles that we are acquainted with in this nation of ours, the things that I am standing for, are not whether they make any money on Sunday racing or not.

Mr. Speaker: I think the member has made his point. The Attorney General?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I spoke at some length, as was pointed out in the debate today, in connection with Bill 41, which is an extension of recreational activity on Sunday and therefore was very similar in principle to this bill. On that occasion most of the members who spoke devoted a great part of their remarks—whether by mistake or in error or deliberately—to horseracing. I think the principle is the same, and I think there is no need for me to repeat what I then said. I would adopt, if I might, the remarks which were made by the hon. member for Downsview. It is not often that I do that but I thought he expressed my views and he has saved me some comments. Also, the hon. member for Lakeshore said several other things which I would have said.

I would just add these specific points: First of all there are a small number of municipalities only involved; a very few municipalities in this province. Second, the decision as to whether racing is to be allowed on Sunday rests with the municipality; that is the effect of this legislation, to permit local autonomy, and it is a permissive type of legislation. On the question of morality, I do not think that that is involved in this type of legislation at all, and having said that I would not discuss it further.

On the question of working hours, I think that the member for Downshview pointed out these things are governed by other fields of legislation. To pick out my own area, practically all the people who live there and work in industry would work for the seven days a week and have their other days off to counteract the fact that Sunday is a day of work. Having said those things, Mr. Speaker, I think there is no need for me to add further to my remarks at this time.

Mr. Speaker: In order that the members may understand how this particular motion is put, since I have had the benefit of advice from the immediately preceding Speaker and the Clerk of the House to fortify my views, the motion as made by the Attorney General is that Bill 53 be now read a second time. I think that the resolution or motion which was proposed by the member for Niagara Falls was that the bill be not now read a second time but read this day six months.

That being the case, this is one of those motions, and we have had them in this session of this Parliament before, where the first question to be decided and to be put to the House is whether the bill be read a second time now. In other words, that the words sought to be deleted be not deleted. So the vote will be whether the bill be now read a second time, and if that motion carries, then of course the amendment is lost and the original motion for a second reading is carried. I regret that I did not recognize the type of motion when it was presented to me by the member and hence there was some question in my mind.

The Attorney General moves that Bill 53 be now read a second time. The member for Niagara Falls moves an amendment that Bill 53 be not read a second time but be read this day six months. Therefore, the question to be decided is, shall the bill be read the second time now?

The House divided on the motion for second reading, which was carried on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Ben
Auld	Bukator
Belanger	Deacon
Bernier	Edighoffer
Boyer	Gaunt
Brown	Gilbertson
Brunelle	Good
Carruthers	Haggerty
Carton	Innes
Connell	Knight
Davis	MacDonald
Davison	MacKenzie
Deans	Newman (Windsor-Walkerville)
Demers	
De Monte	Pilkey
Dymond	Pitman
Evans	Sargent
Gomme	

AYES	NAYS
Guindon	Spence—17.
Haskett	
Henderson	
Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton)	
Hodgson (York North)	
Jackson	
Jessiman	
Johnston (Parry Sound)	
Johnston (St. Catharines)	
Johnston (Carleton)	
Kennedy	
Kerr	
Lawlor	
Lawrence (Carleton East)	
Lawrence (St. George)	
Makarchuk	
Meen	
Morin	
Morningstar	
Morrow	
McKeough	
McNeil	
Newman (Ontario South)	
Nixon	
Potter	
Price	
Pritchard (Mrs.)	
Randall	
Reid (Scarborough East)	
Renwick (Riverdale)	
Renwick (Mrs.) (Scarborough Centre)	
Reuter	
Robarts	
Rollins	
Rowe	
Rowntree	
Simonett	
Singer	
Smith (Simcoe East)	
Smith (Hamilton Mountain)	
Smith (Nipissing)	
Snow	
Stokes	
Welch	
Wells	
White	
Whitney	
Wishart	
Yaremko—67.	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 67, the "nays" are 17.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill 152, An Act respecting the Royal Ontario museum.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few brief comments about the bill. There has been a complaint for a number of years that the government has not accepted its responsibility in supporting the Royal Ontario museum as it should. It has not really been until the administration of the museum changed—

Mr. White: But what does the Liberal caucus think?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the member for London South, having paid his election bets, feels that he can once more enter into the debate.

Mr. White: Who do you have to talk to in London now?

Mr. Nixon: He was careful enough under those circumstances to limit them to $1, for trying to support poor old Mr. Stanfield. Now that is a late arrival from the other London seat.

Mr. Speaker, I know you are at least interested in the Royal Ontario museum and the proper financing of this very important institution, and I was saying a few moments ago, it was not until the top administration of the museum changed a few years ago, I guess two years ago, that it was brought to the attention of the whole community that it was not being adequately supported with public funds. The new director, if that is his proper title, has entered into a programme to improve the facilities there considerably. While he had practically given up hope that he would get sufficient assistance from this government, he did send letters to a number of municipalities, I guess all the municipalities

and school boards across Ontario, and particularly to the municipalities in the Metropolitan Toronto area, so that he could see his way clear toward a budget that would put the Royal Ontario museum in the position which I believe it should have—as paramount in Canada for the particular exhibits that it has in the education programmes that it undertakes.

So now we find that the government of Ontario has moved to reconstitute the museum, and remove it from the aegis of the University of Toronto, which only received government funds to pass on to the museum. It was a rather complex arrangement and one that did not work to the benefit of the museum, or to the numbers of people and students who took advantage of its important facilities.

It is unfortunate that in the last 10 or 12 years, the museum—while it is still a very imposing building on University Avenue and always has been, and I trust will be—has suffered from the lack of facilities which would give it the ability to exhibit so many of the valuable things that it has in its possession. There has been no air-conditioning, or funds for proper salaries, and this is really a tremendous hardship. I trust, however, that the reconstitution of the museum under its own statute, and making it independent of the University of Toronto, will usher in a period during which it will get the sort of financial support that it requires.

The government, of course, has committed itself to tremendous funds for the centennial centre, which is approaching completion sometime within the next two years. I sincerely hope that there will be sufficient funds to keep the Royal Ontario museum as a growing part of the education system of the province. It will be maintained independently of that system now, of course, though it is now under the tender ministrations of the Minister of Education who will be responsible for the bill, and the grants that should be made to the museum in the future.

I want to say at this time how strongly we are, on this side, as Liberals, in support of what the museum is doing, and I feel that is probably non-controversial enough even to rally my friends to support it. Further to that, I believe beyond that, we can expect the government to finance the museum much more adequately than they have seen fit in the past. It has been disgraceful that the museum has had to carry on the programmes that it has, to garner the kind of support just to keep in operation in recent years. I know that the Minister usually was able to protest that he has personally been in support of it, but I hope that accompanying this bill will be the kind of appropriations in the next few years that will re-establish the Royal Ontario museum in its prime position.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important piece of legislation which affects one of the most famous institutions which we have in Ontario, the Royal Ontario museum. I think it is more than just a restructuring of the administration and, one would hope, a refinancing of the institution, but perhaps one would hope anyway that it might reflect a new role for this institution.

In the past, as the Minister has indicated, this has been a part of the University of Toronto and as such has tended to look upon itself in the university setting rather than as a part of the broader fabric of education. A university perhaps prides itself more upon research and upon publication, compiling and gathering of materials rather than upon exhibiting and perhaps trying to influence the attitudes of people across the province.

I am interested, for example, in section 3 of the bill where the objects of the museum are set out in some detail and (a) the first object is the collection and exhibition of objects, documents and books of any kind to illustrate and make known to the public the natural history of Ontario, Canada and the world.

I am interested in the order in which this particular section places these areas. I say this, because I think in the past one of the criticisms of the Royal Ontario museum has been that in essence it has been trying to be too many things to too many people. One of the things that certainly baffles people who come to Ontario and to Toronto is the fact that we have, I think, the second largest Chinese collection in the Royal Ontario museum. And yet, if you want to see anything really unique of our Indian history and of our Eskimo history one has to go to New York.

I think this is one of the things which has baffled many people and I would hope that this legislation might begin a whole new thrust and make this a part of the province's efforts—and they have been considerable in both The Department of Education and The Department of Lands and Forests, and in other departments in government, such as The Department of Tourism and Information, in which we have tried to instill some sense of history in the people of our province.

This has been a worthwhile effort. I think it is not only a centennial year effort; I hope this is going to be part of the hangover we have had from centennial year. I hope this will be an on-going thing. But I would hope that the Royal Ontario museum would now begin a new era in trying to collect Ontario's past. I speak with a little bitterness in my voice on this matter because I was associated with the Royal Ontario museum in a peripheral sort of way some years ago when I was helping the staff of the Lands and Forests who were trying to dig up some Indian mounds in the Peterborough area. It rather bothered me and rather hurt me that five or six or seven years after this dig had been completed, after all the evidence had been in, that the exhibition and the Royal Ontario museum still stated that it was Hopewell culture and it had already been pointed out years before, it was Point Peninsula culture.

This is what I mean by a seeming lack of interest in Ontario's history as compared to the history of more exotic areas in our world. So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will be true. I hope that this will be part of the whole emphasis we have seen as expressed in the Hall-Dennis report where, I think, the emphasis is to get young people out of schoolrooms, out of the stereotype and the sterility of some of our past educational practices and get them into museums.

I think the Royal Ontario museum has started to become and will continue to become the kind of new look in museums, where we are not just simply looking at dull cases with very dull signs on very dull objects but rather we are inviting young people to almost get "into the act" and handle these objects and have an opportunity to become a part of the history which they are learning in the setting of museums rather than through textbooks.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a piece of legislation which certainly we, in this party, concur with and as I say I hope it will be an opportunity for a new future for this institution.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to participate in this debate?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the government's attention to the fact that they are making this a rather democratic organization and I would like to record our objection to the extensive democratization of the Royal Ontario museum. I see that of the 18 trustees, they are going to permit three of them to be elected by members of the museum and that the other 15 will be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council. I am somewhat heartened by the fact, of course, that in section 5 it is the board who will decide who will be members of the museum and I suppose in that way they can control any intrusion into the affairs of the Royal Ontario museum by the public at large.

It would seem to me that it would be in keeping with the philosophy of the government if they were to withdraw the bill and reintroduce it, providing that all 18 trustees should be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister wish to make any comment or participate to close the debate?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have nothing really, Mr. Speaker, to add to my remarks on first reading, other than just to point out one or two things that I think are relevant. With respect to finance, the leader of the Opposition indicated the extent of the government's support. But I think, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to state that over the last three or four years this has been increased considerably and it comes about once again to a recommendation from the committee on university affairs. It was not a government decision *per se;* the recommendation came through the committee on university affairs itself.

I share, obviously, the views of the members opposite as to the anticipated role of the Royal Ontario museum in the educational programme in this jurisdiction and I think, Mr. Speaker, we can be very optimistic about the contribution it will make.

I also say this, and this has been pointed out by the director of the museum himself, that there is a role for community participation and participation by individuals in the donation of materials and funds and that, surely, is not an area of total government responsibility. The private sector has, I think, a very real role to play.

I was, of course, interested in the observations from the member for Riverdale. It indicates his continuing interest in the structure and administration of institutions of this kind and I am sure that he will be one of the first, when this board is appointed, to welcome them with enthusiasm and become himself a very enthusiastic supporter of this

institution of higher learning in this province. I was really very pleased with his observations here on this occasion.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CORPORATIONS ACT

Hon. R. S. Welch (Provincial Secretary) moves second reading of Bill 153, An Act to amend The Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, 1967

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves second reading of Bill 160, An Act to amend The Air Pollution Control Act, 1967.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, it is just a small matter that perhaps could be raised on some other occasion, but there has been the feeling among those particularly interested in air pollution that the government has not had sufficient facilities to make the scientific surveys necessary in order to take meaningful steps to combat pollution from internal combustion engines around highways.

I wonder if the Minister in connection with this can assure us that one of the purposes of this amendment is to give him the responsibility and the power to make the surveys that would tell us more definitely just what the hazard is associated with the commuter life that brings so many of our citizens into the big metropolitan areas and exposes them regularly to an hour or an hour and a half of exhaust fumes?

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other member who wishes to speak before the Minister?

The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the purposes of this amendment. We believe that we did have the power but there has been some question raised about it and this amendment is supposed to embody that principle. It is mainly, of course, as laid down, to permit us to write regulations controlling vehicles in parking stations, marshalling yards, garages, places where diesel motors particularly are left running for long periods of time, but it does give us the power to do what the hon. leader of the Opposition suggests.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill 161, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 20th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Fnancial and Commercial Affairs): I am sorry, it was the 4th order I meant to call, the committee of the whole House. I am sorry.

Mr. Chairman: Is it the pleasure of the House that we take it as if it were the 4th order, committee of the whole House?

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor, recommends the following:

RESOLVED:

That, there shall be paid to the Crown in right of Ontario in each year an acreage tax of 50 cents an acre on any lands or mining rights to which part XIV of The Mining Act applies, as provided in Bill 118, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE MINING ACT

House in committee on Bill 118, An Act to amend The Mining Act.

Sections 1 to 17, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 118 reported.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS ACT

House in committee on Bill 146, An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 146 reported.

THE POLICE ACT

House in committee on Bill 147, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Yes, I would like to move an amendment to section 4. I will have to write it out, will I not? Anyway, the amendment is: to be added after the words "deputy chief of police" in the third from the bottom line, the words, "superintendents, staff superintendents, inspectors and staff inspectors."

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Ben moves that section 4, subsection 1, of Bill 147 be amended by adding after the word "police" in the 13th line, the words "superintendents, staff superintendents, inspectors and staff inspectors."

Mr. Ben: These are the same comments I made when the bill was read for the first time. At that time I had some strong words with the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), because from the information I had at that time and which I have confirmed since, the senior officers were led to believe that an amendment would be brought down which would take them out of the bargaining unit. At the present time they find themselves in a situation where a senior officer may hesitate to reprimand or in any way punish a policeman because that policeman may be his negotiator when it comes to bargaining for an increase in wages.

To me this is simply beyond comprehension. It is like the lowest man in the firm negotiating the salaries of the vice-president. As I say, and I repeat, the Attorney General led these people to believe that this amendment would be brought in; he shakes his head. I say it is wrong; he did lead them to believe that this amendment would bring that into effect. It would take the senior officers out of the bargaining unit. In fact the senior officers expressed the position, at least a majority of them, that they do not even need a bargaining unit, they are executive types and can look after themselves. But to be in the same bargaining unit I think is reprehensible.

I might point out that there are more senior officers in the Metropolitan Toronto police force than there are officers and men in any other police force in the province of Ontario, so the excuse that he gave the last time—to which I would now reply because he had the last word—that it would be difficult to enforce, does not hold water, because an exception could be made with reference to the Metropolitan Toronto police department.

Mr. Chairman: The Attorney General.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chariman, we did discuss this. I am looking for my copy of *Hansard* on the debate on this matter, particularly with the hon. member for Humber. It must have been on first reading that we discussed it—or was it on second reading? We discussed it at length, and I pointed out that we had had many discussions about this, not only this year in preparation of this legislation, but last year. If I recall correctly, this very subject was raised the year before.

We have approached what the hon. member is so anxious to see us implement into legislation. When he says that the senior police officers were misled by myself, I can only tell him about the discussions which took place in my office with representatives of the police association, the governing bodies, the police commission—and I think the commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police was there—in any event all police bodies were present. We had actually reached a draft of language and a proposal which we felt might be acceptable. After study, this was some months ago, we came to the conclusion—and in discussion, again I think, more or less individually with each of these bodies—that we could not find it possible to implement it this year.

It might be possible, and it might be reasonable to say that it could apply—if it is a good piece of legislation—to the large metropolitan forces such as Metro Toronto, and perhaps Hamilton, Ottawa and other large metro forces of that kind. It would be cumbersome; it would cause, in our view, difficulty if it went below a certain size of force. As I pointed out on second reading in my remarks then, it would require double negotiations—a duplication or a double approach to two different bodies within the force—to negotiate for the two associations, as it were, within the force.

And then beyond that, there is a very strong argument put forward that it is not good policy to divide a police force into what was the old army approach—the officers and the other ranks. Most groups of that kind have got away from a division of that type. If I understand the amendment, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it goes down to sergeants; not it does not.

The hon. member asks how is there to be discipline or reprimand or control by a senior member of the force when he knows that a constable of the ranks, a man on the beat,

perhaps is going to be negotiating for his pay? The same thing would apply, surely, with just the same force, to the sergeants in the force, which you are not including in your amendment. Surely the same thing applies to them. They are backbone of the force. How are they to discipline, how are they to control, how are they to direct, how are they to be the tough leaders of the police force, if they are to have in mind that their salaries, their working conditions, their conditions of work and pay and so on are to be negotiated for by the men whom they have to boss?

I do not see how the argument can be applied to one class of officers of higher ranks and not to the sergeants, and it has never been thought for a moment the sergeants should be included. Even the hon. member who makes the amendment does not include them in his motion. I think we cannot accept it.

It was very thoroughly considered. There was no misleading. I think it is fair to say that the senior officers in perhaps in the Metro force in Toronto, and I think the police governing authorities, that is the bodies of municipalities who call themselves a police governing authority—that is the name of their association, municipal police governing authorities—I think they had high hopes that this year they could persuade us to go forward with that legislation. As I say, we had long and serious discussions about it and we actually tried to draft a clause which would meet with everyone's approval.

However, they were never told and were never led to believe anything more than that we would give it the most serious consideration and take it to government and see if it would be accepted. It was not accepted, not this year, and I would only say this, that I know there will be representations, I know there will be continued study. I have some feeling that there are certain merits on the side of the division. I know the arguments on the other side. Perhaps I can be persuaded, perhaps my colleagues in government can persuade me to effect this on another occasion, but I cannot accept it in this bill.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, first of all I have to correct the hon. Minister because he was inadvertently misleading the House. I did not say that the Minister had misled the police department. I said he had led them to believe. There is a distinction. For instance, in sitting down with the police department, and on the Minister's own admission arriving at what would be called a draft which would be an acceptable draft, I suggest is leading one to believe. Another statement that the Minister made was that the police departments had expected or had hoped that something would be done—again, evidence of having been led to believe. I did not accuse the Minister of having misled.

I appreciate the point that he makes about the sergeants. Perhaps I am exercising some responsibility, as sometimes you have to do and most times you have to do. On this particular occasion I am prepared to accept the half loaf if I cannot get the whole loaf, because I have learned that this is the way you get something to eat, by only asking for half a loaf.

I think that is usually the way the government offers it, in half loaves. So I am just trying to be realistic about this thing. On the other hand what can I do if the sergeants always have an opportunity of passing the buck to somebody higher? Their grievance procedure provides for it. So there is that protection as far as they are concerned. But when it gets to the senior officers it is a different proposition.

The amendment could be made now. For instance, the words could be added to my amendment to provide that this would only apply as far as superintendents and inspectors are concerned on the Metropolitan Toronto police force, and today you can take that step which everybody has been anticipating for at least four years.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of the member's motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

On section 6:

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I move that section 6 of the bill be amended by deleting "third" where is occurs in the second line and in the fourth line.

I might explain, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment applies to cases where there is only one arbitrator and therefore mention of the third arbitrator is inappropriate.

Section 6, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 7 to 14, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 147, as amended, reported.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report a certain resolution, certain bills without amendments and one bill with certain amendments and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report that it has come to a certain resolution, certain bills without amendments and one bill with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we would like to continue with the order paper and then proceed with the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:00 of the clock, p.m.

No. 129



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Magistrates Gardhouse and Bannon, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Shulman 4845

Takeover of small police forces by the OPP, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Shulman 4848

Canadian bail system, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Sargent 4848

Purchase of gasoline by The Department of Highways, questions to Mr. Gomme, Mr. Sargent 4849

Used car dealers and salesmen, questions to Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Breithaupt 4849

Consumer Protection Act, 1966, bill to amend, Mr. Rowntree, second reading 4850

Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, second reading 4850

Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, second reading 4850

Assessment Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, second reading 4850

Lord's Day (Ontario) Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, reported 4850

Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported 4854

Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, reported 4854

Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, reported 4856

Art Gallery of Ontario Act, 1966, bill to amend, reported 4856

Royal Ontario museum, bill respecting, reported 4856

Air Pollution Control Act, 1967, bill to amend, reported 4857

Public Health Act, bill to amend, reported 4857

Content and identification of stuffing in upholstered and stuffed articles upon their manufacture, sale and renovation, reported 4857

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Brunelle, concluded 4858

Estimates, Department of the Attorney General, Mr. Wishart 4882

Recess, 6 o'clock 4883

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1968

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today we have with us in the west gallery the 159th girl guide company from Islington, who are hosting the 31st coastal Carolina girl scouts. We also have with us, in the east gallery, students from the Geraldton composite school, Geraldton, and in the west gallery, students from Holland-Chatsworth public school, Chatsworth. And we are being joined by pupils from CRCSS Holy Cross school in Port Colborne and from Stanley Park public school, Kitchener. We welcome these young people, particularly those from the neighbouring state.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a number of questions for the Attorney General, notice of which he has been given.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would wait a moment until the Minister reaches his seat.

Mr. Singer: 1. Will the Attorney General advise why it took from June 18, 1968, the date on which Magistrates Gardhouse and Bannon were not assigned to any courts, until June 26, 1968, to order the inquiries by the hon. Campbell Grant referred to by the Attorney General yesterday?

2. Will the Attorney General advise:

(a) When the hon. Campbell Grant will commence his inquiries?

(b) If Magistrates Gardhouse and Bannon will be advised in writing, in advance of the commencement of such inquiries, as to the evidence that will be brought before the said inquiries in relations to their behaviour or misbehaviour, ability or inability to perform their duties?

(c) Will all of the sittings of the inquiries be open to the public?

3. Will the Attorney General advise:

(a) On how many other occasions magistrates have been relieved of their duties under his instructions?

(b) Who were the other magistrates so relieved of their duties?

(c) What were the reasons in each case for such actions being taken and what was the eventual disposition of each such case?

4. Will the Attorney General advise:

(a) On how many occasions in the last three months in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto has wire-tapping been used in the course of police investigations?

(b) Give details of each of these occasions.

(c) On whose authority was wire-tapping used on each of these occasions?

5. Will the Attorney General further identify the person known as Vincent Alexander who is named in the orders in council referred to by him yesterday, in order to avoid confusion with any other persons who may have the same name?

6. Will the Attorney General advise:

(a) Whether there is any evidence arising from the investigations he referred to yesterday which involved any Crown attorney, assistant Crown attorney, lawyer or any other person other than Vincent Alexander?

(b) If so, what action is contemplated in relation to the involvement of such other persons?

7. Will the Attorney General advise if it is the intention of the government of Ontario to appoint a Royal commission or other public inquiry to investigate all of the aspects of the conduct of business in the magistrates' courts in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto?

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a series of similar questions which perhaps he would place?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have four questions for the Attorney General:

1. Have Magistrates Gardhouse and Bannon been informed of the allegations against them?

2. Does the Minister not agree that these magistrates should have been informed before the Royal commission was announced?

3. When are the magistrates to be informed of the allegations?

4. If they are exonerated, will the government agree to pay the legal expenses of the two magistrates?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Answering these questions, Mr. Speaker, first the questions posed by the hon. member for Downsview.

1. It took eight days, Mr. Speaker, to complete the investigation to a point where the judicial inquiry could be directed. I already explained to this House why I deemed it necessary to not assign these magistrates to courts in the interval.

2. (a) Mr. Justice Grant will fix the date for the commencement of the inquiry. We anticipate that it will be within approximately two weeks if at all possible. I might add that I had an interview with Mr. Justice Grant this morning and we are moving with that period of time in mind to get the inquiry promptly under way.

(b) The arrangements between Mr. Justice Grant and the two magistrates or their counsel will be determined by Mr. Justice Grant, who I am sure, will deal equitably and fairly with the matter of prior disclosure.

(c) The matter of the conduct of the hearings will again be determined by Mr. Justice Grant.

3. On how many other occasions have magistrates been relieved of their duties under the instruction of the Attorney General? My answer is no other magistrate has not been assigned to court on my instructions.

4. I have knowledge of only one instance, this is relating to the question of wire-tapping, the circumstances of which I do not propose to reveal at this time.

5. The Vincent Alexander referred to, lives at 7 Welbrooke Place, Etobicoke.

6. There is, at the present time, no evidence indicating any improper involvement on the part of any Crown attorney, assistant Crown attorney, magistrate or any other public official with the two magistrates whose names have been mentioned in this inquiry.

7. It is not the present intention of the government to appoint any further commission respecting the magistrates' courts in Metropolitan Toronto.

In answering the questions submitted by the member for High Park, Mr. Speaker.

The first part of the first question: "Have Magistrates Gardhouse and Bannon been informed of the allegations against them?" The answer is, as soon as certified copies of the order in council were made available to me yesterday, copies were given to police officers in order that the copies might be delivered by hand to each of the magistrates or their appropriate representatives. A solicitor, whom I will not identify at this time, accepted the document on behalf of Magistrate Gardhouse and I have not yet been advised as to whether Magistrate Bannon has received the document, although I understand that his solicitor has received it.

The second question was: "Does the Minister not agree that these magistrates should have been informed before the Royal commission was announced?" My answer, Mr. Speaker, is I do not agree with the hon. member. First, the disclosure of such a judicial inquiry must surely be made to this House before any disclosure to any other person.

Three: "When are the magistrates to be informed?" That has been generally answered but I would answer No. 3. Mr. Justice Grant will no doubt see that the magistrates or their advisors are fully informed on all the circumstances relative to the inquiry as soon as possible.

The question as to legal expenses will have to be considered at a later date, subsequent to the inquiry.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I posed two questions to the Attorney General yesterday afternoon, which he said he would take as notice and answer today. I wonder if the Attorney General has the answers to those.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I took it in the light of what discussion took place yesterday, that these were the questions which had been taken again to your office and reviewed, as you had indicated you might be doing. So I took these questions as the total that was being asked of me today. If I was wrong in that I will consider those questions again but I had not come prepared because I thought these were the reviewed questions.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, certainly it was not my intention to withdraw either of the questions that were posed yesterday. Ob-

viously there has been a misunderstanding, but the Attorney General has those questions and I would like an answer to both those questions that I put yesterday as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: Those are questions two and three on the sheet?

Mr. Singer: Two and three.

Mr. Speaker: I will ensure that the Attorney General receives a copy.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I will certainly consider them now and come forward with some answer as I see fit, but I must point out to the House and the hon. member that I really was under the impression that they were not being asked.

Mr. Speaker: I think the Minister is quite justified in his understanding of it, because I did not make sure that when I sent these questions that it was in addition to those. The ones I recall that were asked yesterday were with respect to the authority to relieve and—

Mr. Singer: Yes. The third question was dealing with notice, the form of it, and when it was given, by whom, and so on. It was a multipart question.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Will the Attorney General accept a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: What is the question?

Mr. Shulman: My first question here was, "Have Magistrates Gardhouse and Bannon been informed of the allegations against them?" And I understood you to reply that they had received a copy of the order in council. Sir, this does not contain the allegations; when do you intend to inform them of the allegations against them? That is what my question is.

Mr. Speaker: May I point out to the member that the Minister, so far as my recollection is concerned, answered question No. 3. If I am incorrect the Minister will—

Mr. Shulman: Let me reword my supplementary question then, sir. Inasmuch as the magistrates have apparently still not been informed of the allegations against them, does the Minister not agree they should now be informed of the allegations against them?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, that question is really answered, although it is worded a little differently now by the hon. member. The answer to question No. 3 is that they will be informed, I am certain. The inquiry having been set up, they will be informed before they come before the inquiry—and promptly, I am sure—of the nature of the allegations or charges against them. This will be done promptly by the commissioner who is in charge of the inquiry.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a further question.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I have some further questions for the Attorney General on another matter, sir.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, I do not have copies of those.

Mr. Shulman: These were submitted yesterday, sir. It is question 720.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member would send that to me and, while I look at it, proceed with his questions for the Minister of Reform Institutions.

Mr. Shulman: I have seven questions for for Minister of Reform Institutions, Mr. Speaker, on the same matter.

1. Was one Roger Whiting arrested April 13, 1968, and was he subsequently incarcerated in the Don jail?

2. Was Roger Whiting an epileptic who has been receiving medication with Valium, which had completely controlled the epileptic attacks?

3. During the five weeks in the Don jail, was Roger Whiting refused medication with Valium?

4. During Whiting's stay in the Don jail, did he suffer from 30 epileptic seizures?

5. Are all epileptics treated similarly at the Don, or was Whiting's case an unusual one?

6. Are medications prescribed by the jail doctor, filled at a drug store or from supplies at the jail?

7. Has the medical situation at the Don jail been improved since the discussion under the department's estimates? Specifically, has the jail doctor been supplied with a secretary; has the practice of general practitioners doing mental examinations been discontinued; has the patient load on the jail doctors been lowered; have facilities for the suspected mentally ill been improved; and if so, how?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, obviously it is going to take some time to get the information required to answer these questions, and I will therefore take the questions as notice—although I would suggest to you, sir, that a closer examination of question No. 7 implies a fact which has not necessarily been proved, that a "practice" should have been "improved" since a certain date.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding I would just like to point out that I thought the Minister had agreed that these conditions needed to be improved. But if he thinks they are fine, then I think that establishes the situation very well for this House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is that a question, Mr. Speaker, or a supplementary answer?

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. It is a five part question.

1. Has the Attorney General read the briefs sent to the members of this Legislature by the president of the Fort Elgin police department, the vice president of the New Hamburg police department, the secretary of the Southampton police department, and the treasurer of the Wingham police department?

2. Will the Attorney General agree that many local police officers have been unfairly treated and that they have lost their jobs through no fault of their own?

3. Will the Ontario Provincial Police enroll these officers on a probationary basis, until they are brought up to OPP standards?

4. Will the Attorney General take immediate action to relieve the hardship to those officers who have been rejected by the OPP?

5. Why have promises to—and I quote—"safeguard the future of the members of the affected forces", made by the chairman of the Ontario police commission on May 19, 1967, not been carried out?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have answered and set forth on two occasions at least in this House, the policy of the Ontario Provincial Police in the takeover of small police forces. This is only done on request of the municipality concerned, and after lengthy notice and urgings to the municipal authority to re-employ the members of their forces. Also there is the policy of interviewing the members of the forces to locate as many of them as possible as members of the Ontario Provincial Police force.

Now, with respect to the publications mentioned by the hon. member, I would like to take, to that extent, the question as notice, and I will read those publications and answer fully and completely as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the House the group in the east gallery. These are pupils from the composite school in Geraldton; and they have travelled over 800 miles to attend here today. These students themselves raised $1,800 to provide their transportation here, and with the co-ordination of Mr. Enders of that school, and one of his teachers, and interested parents, they were able to make the trip down here. They have thoroughly enjoyed themselves, and the sights of southern Ontario. All but a few of them have never been out of Geraldton before. One young chap comes from the Indian reservation at Satchego, which is 1,100 miles from the Legislature, and I think that they are to be commended for their interest in parliamentary processes that prompted them to travel this very long distance to be with us here today.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, if I might?

Mr. Speaker: The Attorney General has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, two questions were asked of me yesterday by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent). I now have the answers for these and I should like to read them into the record.

Mr. Speaker: Would the deputy leader of the official Opposition approve?

Mr. Singer: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The first question, sir, number 726, from the member for Grey-Bruce reads: "Does the Attorney General agree with the statement of Crown attorney Bull, that the evils which exist in the Canadian bail system are abuses of administration, and not the fault of the law?" Second: "Will the Minister advise what steps his department has under way to advise magistrates and judges to release without bond?" Third: "How many bench warrants have the words, and I quote, issued in 1967 in Ontario, unquote, for persons failing to appear?"

In answer, I would say that I am not familiar with the statement which the hon.

member has attributed to Mr. Bull. If the statement was indeed made in the form quoted, then I do not agree with the language. I do agree that the law respecting bail is clearly set out in the criminal code of Canada, and the application of that law rests in the discretion of the particular judge who applied it to the particular case as he sees fit.

Question 2: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of advising the judiciary as to how they should exercise their discretion in the granting of bail. The law permits a judge to release a person on his own recognizance, if he considers that to be the appropriate relief. This is a judicial discretion dependent on the facts of the case. It would be grossly improper for me, or any other person, to direct a judge as to how he should exercise that discretion. The Crown attorney may make submissions on the subject, and this is done in the light of the facts of each case.

I would add that we do have frequent meetings, or seminars as we sometimes call them, of magistrates and judges, where they discuss among themselves the principles of sentencing and the principles which should apply to the granting of bail. Those meetings are addressed by experts, members of the judiciary, eminent members of the bar, and the principles which should relate to the administration of justice, particularly in our courts, are discussed by the judges and magistrates on quite frequent occasions particularly with a view to reaching, shall I say a consensus, as to the principles we should apply in sentence and in the granting of bail—those two subjects particularly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: Very little of that gets through, though.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is a matter of opinion.

To the third question, "How many bench warrants have been issued in 1967 in Ontario?" I do not have that information, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member has a particular case in mind, and if he would tell me about it, I think I might be able to assist him.

His question number 730, Mr. Speaker, was:

"Will the Minister advise what protections are exercised in Ontario, similar to that exercised in 15 states of the United States and in the military force, to provide for a review of criminal sentences in appellate courts?"

My answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the matter of reviewing sentences imposed by the courts in Ontario has never been a matter within the purview of the Lieutenant-Governor in council. If a convicted person is dissatisfied with the disposition of the case by the court, then his prerogative is to initiate and appeal to have the matter reviewed by a higher court, and this relates both to the issue of the conviction and to the matter of sentence.

There is, Mr. Speaker, an Ontario statute entitled The Fines and Forfeiture Act which permits the Lieutenant-Governor in council to remit in whole or in part, any fine imposed relating to provincial statute. There is no authority to consider such a remittance on a fine imposed pursuant to a federal statute, with the exception which I have noted, Mr. Speaker. I believe the best system has been followed, that of permitting the courts to deal with all aspects of the trial of an accused person.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Highways.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in answer to question No. 732 asked by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce yesterday. My answer is: Most gasoline used by the department is obtained from government-owned pumps and purchased wholesale. Where this is impractical, gasoline is purchased from local service stations by credit cards at retail prices. Location of government pumps is designated for each of the highways districts and individual one-year term contracts are tendered publicly and awarded to the low bidder.

I am tabling, for the benefit of the member for Grey-Bruce, a list of firms that presently hold contracts for the supply of gasoline.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I see that the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) is in his seat and I would like to provide the answer to a question which he had asked some time ago.

The first part of his question had to do with the definition of the meaning of the term "public interest". Well the public interest in the context of section 4 of subsection 1 of The Used Car Dealers Act, 1964, has been interpreted as meaning that, having a proper regard for the interest of the public, registration should be granted only to persons who have a good reputation for honesty, integrity and fair dealing and who can show financial responsibility at least to the extent of provid-

ing a personal bond of $1,000 in the case of salesmen and $5,000 in the case of dealers.

Now with respect to the second item: The question was: "How many hearings has the registrar held since the inception of the Act? How many hearings resulted in refusal to register, to renew registration, or to cancel?"

The answer is that the registrar had presided at 121 hearings up until April 30 of 1968, since the inception of the Act. There were a total of 54 refusals to register. I am informed, however, that separate figures were not kept with regard to dealers and salesmen prior to January 1, 1968.

Since that time and up to and including April 30, 1968, there were eight dealers' and 15 salesmen's applications denied.

The third question is with respect to how many 1967 registrations have not been renewed, where the applicant has made application for a renewal and has not been given an opportunity to be heard nor been advised that his application for renewal has been refused. The answer is "none".

Fourth, with respect to section 16, subsection (1): How many decisions of the registrar have been reviewed by the director where the decision of the registrar has been (a) overruled and (b) upheld? Seven decisions have been reviewed and four have been overruled. Three reviews have not been completed.

Fifth, with respect to section 16, subsection (a): The director must review decisions of the registrar, except with the consent of the person who requested the review, within 30 days. Should there not be a limit to the time the director takes to render his decision?

I am informed that, for practical purposes, the word "forthwith" as applied in section 16 of the Act could be taken to mean that the director must serve written reasons to substantiate his rulings within 10 days of making his decisions.

Sixth: How many of the registrar's decisions are now before the director for a hearing and review? Four.

Seventh: In the case of Madell Motors, 1624 Eglinton Avenue West, Toronto, Ontario, where the hearing and review of the registrar's decision before the director was held in December of 1967: Why has the decision of the director not yet been rendered? The decision in the case of Madell Motors, 1624 Eglinton Avenue West, was rendered on May 23, 1968.

That completes the answers to the questions.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister for a very complete answer to the question.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 1966

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 135, An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS ACT

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill 154, An Act to amend The Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves second reading of Bill 155, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves second reading of Bill 156, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The 7th order, committee of the whole House: Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

THE LORD'S DAY (ONTARIO) ACT, 1960-1961

House in committee on Bill 53, An Act to amend The Lord's Day (Ontario) Act, 1960-1961.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on section 2 of the bill I would ask seriously that the Minister consider amending the definition of "municipality" to include a borough municipality, but not to include a metropolitan municipality. A problem which arises only with the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto is that if a bylaw is passed under this Act it will, in fact, mean that the race-courses within the whole of the metropolitan area will be governed by that bylaw, whereas in the east end of Toronto at the Greenwood track there are serious local problems of a specifically local nature arising from a bylaw passed by the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, that may not be of concern to others than in that area, which falls within the city of Toronto proper.

It would appear to me that the interests of the inhabitants of the area immediately adjacent to the Greenwood racetrack will be much better protected if the city of Toronto is the municipality which has the authority to pass the bylaw.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that there was a very large meeting in the east end of Toronto to discuss this bill. It was very interesting that the 500 or 600 people who subsequently submitted a petition, through the alderman for that area, to the Prime Minister on this point, after quite a lengthy discussion took no view on the Sunday racing aspect of the question but were very concerned about the traffic congestion, the appearance of the area, the number of racing hours, the general disruption and deterioration caused in that area by the operation of the Greenwood racetrack. They point out very clearly that a few short years ago it was open for only one week's racing in the spring and another week in the fall. And when compared with this season's staggering total of 192 days and nights of racing, spread over approximately nine months, and the threat of one more extension, Sunday racing, it is small wonder that the residents of the community are alarmed. And it would appear to the residents of that area that in view of the specific kind of immediate local impact of the operation of the Greenwood track in that area, their interests will be much better protected by the city of Toronto as the municipality which has the authority under this Act to pass the bylaw.

I do not know whether the brief, which was submitted through the alderman and supported by a petition of some 400 or 500 persons who signed it, came to the attention of the Minister or not. But rather than at this point submit an amendment and divide the House on the question—because it is of such a local nature that the views of members right across the province are not of that much merit on this particular point—I would ask the Attorney General if he would not consider the validity of the point of view of the residents of that area to bring whatever view they may wish to express to the corporation of the city of Toronto and the council of the city of Toronto to protect their immediate local interest, rather than leave it at the rather remote level of the metropolitan council of the metropolitan area which does not have that close intimate relationship or indeed, if I may say so, concern about the impact of Sunday racing in that part of Toronto.

The points raised by the residents were seriously considered, the points are all valid, having to do with parking, the dilapidation of the area, the general deterioration which has set in in that part of Toronto because of the inordinate increase in the number of racing days up to some 192—and now with the addition of Sundays, over 200 days' racing in what is predominantly, and will continue or should continue for a long period of time to be, a residential area of the city.

I would ask the Attorney General if he would consider the comments which I have made in the light of that brief, and would amend the section so that it includes a borough or a city but does not include a metropolitan municipality.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, I received the brief to which the hon. member refers and I also arranged at the request of certain persons who were interested and who are signatories to the brief, for a meeting with them. That meeting took place, I think, about three weeks ago, just after the introduction of this Bill 53. The delegation was led by Controller Somerville and Controller Archer, if I recall, and supported by several of the persons who signed the brief.

There is nothing in the brief on this point; there is no request in the brief that the definition of "municipality" be altered or modified. I was at pains myself to point out to the persons who saw me that I thought they might raise this. Controller Somerville, in her letter, in discussing getting together for a conference, did raise the question but

the prayer of the petition nowhere makes a request for this change.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Alderman.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Alderman, I am sorry. Alderman Somerville; thank you.

There is nothing in the petition whatever on this point. We did discuss it to some extent and my feeling was that while this is a borough of a metropolitan city, it was in that council of the metropolitan municipality that they should make their plea for consideration. As I say, it was not asked in this petition.

Another reason which I have to recount—at least, one of the reasons why I cannot accept the suggestion is that in Bill 41, which is an amendment to The Lord's Day Act, we have used this definition in exactly the same terms, the same words. Perhaps this is not a very forceful argument, Mr. Chairman, but the racetrack here involved is one which serves not just the borough or the city of Toronto, but a very wide area; and I think Metropolitan Toronto has a very great interest in the operation of this facility. Perhaps, as I say, that is not a very strong argument, perhaps the borough should have the authority. But in The Metropolitan Toronto Act many powers are given to the Metro council which concern really, one could argue, the boroughs themselves, simply and particularly.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I would have to reject the suggestion of the amendment.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if I may comment, I agree with the Attorney General in that his arguments are very weak on the point.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): So was the submission, it was not even in the brief.

Mr. J. Renwick: I may point out—and since the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs has interjected—I would suggest that when meetings of citizens take place to discuss matters of concern to them, they are not meetings of those versed in the technicalities of the government structure of the country. And they happen to have had the benefit of the views of the two aldermen who represent the area, who in their covering letter to the Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts)—and as the arguments were so specious I think I will have to read portions of it into the record—did in fact make this request. The letter is dated April 26, and it is addressed to the Prime Minister. It is signed by Alderman Alice Somerville of ward 8 and Alderman Thomas Wardell of ward 8.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is the letter, Mr. Chairman, to which I referred, and I have mentioned that she brought this to our attention in the letter.

Mr. J. Renwick: Yes, that is why I want to repeat it because the Attorney General emphasized so much that it was not technically in the brief. That is quite correct. But obviously the Attorney General has missed the point. All the aldermen were trying to do was to point out the way in which the interests of the residents, as expressed in the brief and at the meeting, could be accomplished to some degree by bringing it into closer relationship with the government most closely associated with them, namely, the corporation of the municipality of the city of Toronto. This brief is supported by a petition signed by some 450 constituents residing in this area. The view is that subsection 1 of section 1(a) as proposed should be amended so as to redefine the municipality and that the jurisdiction under this bylaw should remain in the hands of the area municipality.

I think the Attorney General will agree with me that at a public meeting it is unlikely that many citizens would be aware of the specific provisions of subsection 1 of section 1(a) of clause 2 of Bill 53, as being the technical amendment which would bring their views into effect.

Now the second point is that while it is true that Greenwood racetrack, the former Woodbine racetrack, is of interest to the whole area of Metropolitan Toronto, it is also true that this government has permitted over the years the Jockey club of Ontario to increase the number of racing days, from one week in the spring and a week in the fall, to two weeks in the spring and two weeks in the fall, until it has now become a source of considerable irritation and nuisance to the area. That is a residential part of the city. If municipal government is to mean anything, then that particular area should be protected against the operation of this track. The actual request in the brief, of course, is to expropriate the Greenwood racetrack and to require them to relocate in another more adequate area of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. That is the substance of their brief.

I was trying to bring their argument foursquare with the principles of municipal government under this bill, so that those citizens

would have the opportunity of bringing their view to bear through their elected aldermen—not through the second-tier structure which this government has imposed on the metropolitan area where there is no direct electoral representation, but in that area where they, by their vote, can influence what the mayor and the board of control and the council of the city of Toronto will do—because of the noise, because of the deterioration of the area, because of the drop in value of properties, because of the deterioration in the merchandising facilities in the area, because people are bypassing the area.

There is no parking permitted, or the parking that is permitted is taken up by patrons of the racetrack, and for the many other reasons which are set out in this brief. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Attorney General should give serious concern to the views of residents of the city, and especially in that portion of the city where most of the people still do have the Sunday to themselves. You are adding to that the traffic congestion, the parking, the noise and the clatter of a public racetrack open on Sunday. As I said at the beginning, it has nothing to do with horseracing as such or the moral values or otherwise, it is simply that those persons in that residential area—if this government is at all interested in maintaining residential areas in the city of Toronto—deserve protection.

We are not asking this government to give them protection. What we are simply asking is that they be given the protection that their aldermen can afford to them as elected representatives in the city of Toronto. I am asking the Attorney General in the light of those arguments, and in the light of the obvious speciousness of his own arguments, that he do seriously consider either rehearing the petition or amending this very simply to provide that it will be up to a borough or a city and it will not include a metropolitan municipality.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment to section 2, it gives the municipality permissive legislation to adopt a bylaw that provides for Sunday racing. In addition to that there were arguments placed at second reading that people should be able to participate at the track either as observers or bettors, and really on a voluntary basis, so this is another voluntary aspect of the bill—the permissiveness of the municipality on a voluntary basis, the people participating on a voluntary basis.

But the point that I want to raise, and I think that ought to be in section 2, is that it should be voluntary on the part of the employees at the track, because it appears to me that there is no protection for the employees at the track. The employment will not be on a voluntary basis. They are going to be forced to work on a Sunday even though it is a day of rest and a day they can participate with their families, and this will not be a voluntary thing.

As I point out, it should be written in here that those employees should be able to participate as workers on a voluntary basis. Someone might point out that people work in industry on a Sunday, but I might point out, Mr. Chairman, on a voluntary basis. If the track wants these people to work there on a Sunday, then it ought to make the wages attractive enough so that they can do it on a voluntary basis. They will have no problems of getting people if they put the wages on an attractive enough basis.

I am not suggesting for a moment—and this is the reason I voted against this at the second reading—that I am not in favour of maintaining the Victorian era in the province of Ontario. I think we want progress, and obviously if the people want to voluntarily go to the track that is their business in my opinion. But I vote against it because I could see that the employees of this track are going to be forced to work on Sundays. Somebody is going to have to do the job, and I think that that would be wrong. Not giving those people the protection would be wrong, when on the other side of the coin in two areas it is on a permissive and voluntary basis, so I think the employment at that track should be on a voluntary basis as well.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I have little to say further, returning to the suggestion that the definition of municipality should be amended. I can only say again further that my argument which the hon. member was kind enough to call specious, I think was not specious. I admitted it was weak on one point.

Three things I put forward. I did say the petition did not request this. I did say I had discussed it. I say, and I reiterate, that I think this is a place where the metropolitan government of the metropolitan area of Toronto should take care of its borough. The welfare of that borough is surely closely

related to the government which has been set up for that metropolitan area, and if it is not concerned with it, surely an argument can be made at first instance there by the aldermen who represent the borough of the city of Toronto. We have this definition in The Lord's Day Act now, and in the bill we passed earlier in this session.

The suggestion put forward by the hon. member for Oshawa, it seems to me, is not related to this bill now, whether the people work voluntarily or whether they work under an agreement. I presume they have an association. Their hours of work and their rates of pay are things which we would certainly not insert in this bill. I certainly agree with him that I should hope to see them well paid, and with proper working conditions—vacations and so on—but I am sure they have the means of achieving those things. In addition to that we have legislation on hours of work, vacation pay, and so on, and so many days' work in a week.

These things are outside the ambit of this legislation, but I agree with his point of view that they should be safeguarded, but not here. If they are not properly safeguarded, there is a place surely where we could approach those problems and deal with them, and I would go along with him. But I cannot amend The Lord's Day Act to take care of that.

Section 2 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 53 reported.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM ACT, 1961-1962

House in committee on Bill 144, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-1962.

On section 1:

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on section 1 of the bill, I would like to ask the Minister whether he has not given consideration to some more flexible method of fixing the interest rate on the debentures which will provide the funds for the retirement fund? It seems to me, with fluctuating interest rates over a period of time, when we embody them in a statute it becomes, in fact, unrelated to the general level of interest rates over a month-to-month, six-month-to-six-month, or year-to-year basis. Already in the note to the bill, that is indicated, because the debentures had been earning only 5 per cent, and obvously the fund has been penalized by the rate not being appropriate to the general level of interest rates.

We are now asked to raise it to 6.5 per cent. I do not argue whether that is appropriate or not. I suppose one could argue that this is an average going rate for debentures of this type at the present time. But surely, there is some method by which the interest rate on these debentures could be tied to some standard interest rate; either a slight point above them, or a slight point below them, or at the same level as the province of Ontario is borrowing funds throughout the financial markets, rather than to fix it so specifically in this statute.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are getting into a very tricky area, that of setting rates. Neither 6.5 per cent nor 5 per cent, to me, in some ways seems a very appropriate rate today, when even the province of Ontario is paying 7 per cent or better. However, you realize that this is for a 40-year term in the original OMERS bill, the money was for 5 per cent for 40 to 45 years which was considered, at that time, to be very good, and I do not think really it is fair to say that there was a penalty on the scheme because it was not changed sooner. I think had it not been changed now, there undoubtedly would have been.

Now, as to being more flexible about it, I can say that this matter was thoroughly threshed out between the OMERS board and between The Treasury Department and they went back and forth. Quite frankly, I have to say to you, that much of the argument was technical enough that it was away over my head. But I have the sum and substance of it, although I had wondered why this could not, for example, be done by regulation so that it could follow the interest rates.

I think the real reason is that at this early stage of the development of the scheme—even though OMERS has something in the order of $50 million now invested, or $70 million, I have forgotten the figure, it is still in its early stages and it becomes important, or more important, for the actuary to know exactly what is happening to the dollars which are going in today.

I think probably five years from now, undoubtedly the Act, pending on what happens to interest rates, may probably be amended again. I think at that time, it would be under

consideration that it should be a floating rate, following the provincial rate, perhaps following the Treasury bill rate at Ottawa in some way or another.

I think it is not inconceivable that one fund has been in operation long enough, that it may be thought advisable to put part of the moneys into some other investment; mortgages, I do not know—preferred or common stocks.

But at this point, I think the actuary and the board feel, and certainly Treasury feels, that it should be at a fixed amount and stated value.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, coming back to the same point. Are the funds treated as if they are all on deposit, not different term issues bought as funds accumulate? Is it treated as one single issue? Or is it broken down as the money accumulates? Do they keep on buying, in effect, from the province, securities at the new rate of 6.5 per cent; or 5 per cent that it was before? Is it treated as a deposit account, in other words, or is it treated as buying bonds?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: When I was first appointed Minister, Mr. Chairman, I think one of the delights I had was—and this was before there was a proper rubber stamp made for my signature for these purposes, and before the board was appointed, which was on January 1 and I was still on the board of OMERS. I was signing cheques for several hundred thousand dollars about every second day, on the OMERS account, payable to the Provincial Treasurer.

Unfortunately I do not have that pleasure any more. In answer to your question, the money goes over, I would think within two or three days of it coming in OMERS, it immediately goes over to the Provincial Treasurer and it starts earning that amount of money from that day. It does not go into a bank account and earn short term interest. It presently earns 5 per cent immediately the Provincial Treasurer receives it, and, at the end of the year as I understand it, or at a certain fixed time, then a debenture is issued for the total amount received up to that time and I think that is done about once a year.

Mr. Deacon: Well, I have not quite made myself clear, Mr. Chairman. I would like to know if the whole $50 million now moves up to the 6.5 per cent rate? If not, I would suggest that this definitely is where the province is not being fair to this fund at all. They should be treating this fund on the same basis as people would be able to benefit were they to go to an insurance company today, which would be able to take their money on a current basis and take advantage of the higher interest rates that are available. It seems to be wrong that we should be approving a change here that does not, as the hon. member for Riverdale said, take into account the floating levels of interest rate. Particularly, when we are not moving up the overall rate paid on the fund totally on deposit as when we pass this legislation today.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if I may just comment briefly on what the Minister has said. What this bill is doing is providing for the issue of very short term debentures up until 1973, and then there is this refunding operation from 1973 until the year 2013—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think it would be clear whatever money comes in between now and 1973, will be invested in these debentures for 40 years. It is not a short term debenture. The money will be invested in a very long term debenture.

Mr. J. Renwick: Perhaps I need clarification then, because the bill does say that in each year the Treasurer of Ontario shall issue province of Ontario debentures to become due and payable on December 31, 1973 and so on, and then provides that later, on December 31, 1973, the Treasurer of Ontario shall issue debentures to become due and payable in the year 2013.

It seems to me, rather strange that we should be sitting here taking a view of the interest rates under which these debentures are to be refunded in 1973, let alone for the period up to 2103, because I do not think that either of us will be here to make the necessary changes during the period of time. I would like again—and I realize that it is a technical question, and not wishing to prolong it at all—but it does seem to me that there must be some more flexible method for this period between now and 1973, so that the debentures, which are short term debentures, even though there is an obligation for funding them for a longer period, will have an interest rate which is appropriate to the market at the time. I do not think we can take the view that the interest rates are going to be up or down, because there is no way of knowing.

I think that there should be, for this short period of time a much more flexible method by which the Minister, by regulation, can

fix the interest rate, and then when the time comes in 1973 to fund those debentures, it can be done in terms of the experience with the interest rates over the previous years from 1973 back to the inception of the OMERS fund.

It would seem to me, to be a much more appropriate and equitable method, if that was followed, rather than for us to be passing this kind of bill, particularly the part about the refunding in 1973. This seems to me to be totally inappropriate, other than for the purpose of indicating that the government does, in fact, intend to refund, and that we should not be passing a bill to fix interest rates which will be in effect after 1973.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would say to my friend that I will be glad to. I do not have the papers here, but there were a series of papers which went back and forth from the OMERS board to Treasury, outlining both arguments; a fixed rate, and the floating rate. I would be glad to send him those papers, and will do so, and if he understands them, fine. I think that I was ultimately convinced by the arguments, but I cannot recall them all now. But I will send them to him.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, in view of the Minister's last statements, I would think it very important we defer further consideration of this bill until he does understand what he is putting before us. I think that it is ridiculous for us to be considering this without knowing the background of this clause and the reason for not being able to operate this fund to the same advantage of the people covered by the fund as they would be able to receive outside if they were under another private pension plan. I do not think that we are being fair to these employees in going ahead with this under this system.

Section 1 agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill 144 reported.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

The House in committee on Bill 140, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 140 reported.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

The House in committee on Bill 141, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 141 reported.

THE ART GALLERY OF ONTARIO ACT, 1966

The House in committee on Bill 151, An Act to amend the Art Gallery of Ontario Act, 1966.

On section 1:

Mr. J. Renwick: Perhaps the Minister would just comment briefly why the semantic change from "directors" to "trustees" is more appropriate?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Chairman, it is to a degree a semantic change. You will notice that this is in keeping with the Act relating to the ROM. This is a term used, I think, generally with respect to art galleries and museums: "trustee", rather than "director". Also, in the terminology with respect to administration of the art gallery and the ROM, the term "director" is used for, shall we say, the professional administrative people. So we have made this change to the term "trustee".

Sections 1 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 151 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

RESOLVED

That, the Royal Ontario museum and its real and personal property business and income are exempt from all assessment and taxation made, imposed, or levied by or under the authority of any Act of the Legislature,

as provided in Bill 152, An Act respecting the Royal Ontario museum.

Resolution concurred in.

THE ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM

House in committee on Bill 152, An Act respecting the Royal Ontario museum.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on section 2, I notice that the Minister has fixed the fiscal year definitely in this Act to end on June 30, without any provision for any change being made. Yet, in the preceding Act on the art gallery, there was an enabling provision for it to end on June 30, but with provision for the board of trustees to make a change if they felt it necessary. I would not know whether there is any necessary connection, or whether it deserves comment, but I did note the change.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this Act, of course, has to relate to the existing University of Toronto Act, where the fiscal year is set as of the period June 30 and because of the existing financial arrangements it was set in this Act in the same way.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister give us the reasoning of the government that believes that only three of the members of the board of trustees should be elected by members of the museum, and the remaining 15 should be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council? Perhaps at the same time, he might comment on the classification of membership in the museum, if he has knowledge of them at the present time, so that we will have some idea of the group of people from among whom the three members will be elected.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, at this time, I cannot give the hon. member the number of people who are or will be members of the new museum. I shall endeavour to get this information for him. If one were to look at the total numbers in the province, of course, and recognize that we all have an interest in the museum, I think that three out of 18 would be very appropriate, although one might hope that they might have a large number of members of the museum. But I think at the present moment this is a very equitable distribution of the trustees as far as the governing of the museum is concerned. I cannot at this point give you the total membership or what their plans are for an increase in membership but I shall endeavour to get this information for the member.

Mr. J. Renwick: Does the Minister have any idea at the present time who, in fact, will be the 15 who will be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not, at this point, Mr. Chairman.

Section 4 to 19, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill 152 reported.

THE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, 1967

House in committee on Bill 160, An Act to amend The Air Pollution Control Act, 1967.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 160 reported.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

House in committee on Bill 161, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 161 reported.

UPHOLSTERED AND STUFFED ARTICLES

House in committee on Bill 157, An Act to control the content and identification of stuffing in upholstered and stuffed articles upon their manufacture, sale and renovation.

Sections 1 to 30, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 157 reported.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report one resolution and certain bills without amendments and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one resolution and certain bills without amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 18th order, House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS
(Concluded)

On vote 1107:

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Chairman, on vote 1107, I mentioned earlier in the estimates that there was no reference made in the opening remarks of the Minister (Mr. Brunelle) with regard to the Brodie report that has been under consideration since 1964 and was made public in the House here on April 1 this year. It brings up many questions with regard to the recommendations of the report that have already been adopted, those that are under active study, and those that are still in question.

I have before me a resolution passed by the lumber and sawmill workers' union with regard to the Brodie report, and I would like to read into the record their observations with regard to the Brodie report itself. They say:

> We must state that this is not the first study or commission report that has been made to the government of Ontario, and all others have failed to be implemented even though there were sound recommendations contained therein after complete study of the problems affecting the forests. Without changes, we predict that the recommendations contained in the Brodie report will fail for the same reason that other reports and recommendations have failed. There is no proper recommendation for enforcement of the new forest policy, simply a sanctimonious statement by the Minister of Lands and Forests that it will require co-operation on the part of the various interests concerned to make his proposals work out successfully.

And another such statement, both in the main report and the condensed report from recommendation number 5.

> We know from past experiences that these huge corporations, who have raped our forests for decades and who are responsible for the mess our forests are in at present, will not co-operate and will have to be forced into a sane forest policy. Basically, in the report the problems are fully outlined and, if all of the recommendations were implemented and rigidly enforced, they would:
>
> 1. Eliminate waste in harvesting products by implementing a clean-cut method as recommended by recommendations 1, 9, 40, 42, 43, 44 and 46.
>
> 2. Distribute different species and sizes to properly designated processing plants as recommended by numbers 8, 9, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45 and 46.
>
> 3. Reforest to not only supply existing mills but to supply expanding forest products industries on a perpetual basis—recommendations in sections 14 and 15 of the report itself. However, the shortcoming of the report, as we have stated, is lack of machinery for enforcement, and we urge the Ontario federation that they press for the implementation of the recommendations of the report with the following additions and deletions:
>
> A system of board of referees to settle disputes between the harvesting companies and the company which utilizes the forest product, and in the end, an arbitrator if these disputes cannot be settled by the referees amicably.
>
> We can foresee many disputes arising as to prices to be paid, delivery dates, etc., and if no such procedure is established the large companies will have a stranglehold on the utilizing companies more so than they have at present.
>
> An addition to section 16, "The Private Lands Forestry," for the fullest enforcement of The Settlers Pulpwood Protection Act and the establishment of marketing boards for the private land owner. The Settlers Pulpwood Protection Act was made law under the UFO government in the early 1930s. It gives the Minister of Lands and Forests the right to establish the amount of wood to be purchased by a company in any area and the price the purchasing company will pay.
>
> At the present time, private land owners are delivering wood to the mills at a much lower rate per cord than the same company can produce wood from their licensed areas, and furthermore, many of the private land owners are cutting immature timber under conditions which are not in the best interests of a sound forest policy.
>
> The only manner in which these abuses can be eliminated is through proper policing and proper marketing procedures.
>
> We are completely opposed to recommendation No. 13 dealing with licences to settlers or settlers' co-ops. It takes pages in the main report for Mr. Brodie to explain why small operators and third party operators have no place in a sane forest policy. The meat of the explanation is that these operators cannot afford the necessary

machinery which is being used in the woods industry of today or will be used in the future. They cannot afford the cost of a road system and cannot afford to properly plan their operation on a sound basis as regards sustained yield. And then, because of political pressure, we believe that the Minister himself and pressure by Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company (he makes a completely insane recommendation that) where these poor settlers (whom he states) cannot afford to operate form themselves into co-operatives, licences will be issued.

He further states:

This is straight nonsense. We say that the Crown is holding unlicenced land which requires harvesting. For good forest management the Crown must engage a contractor or contractors who can be party to a union agreement, and his employees will have the same wages and conditions we have established with the harvesting companies throughout northern Ontario and who will be as responsible as the other companies for the forest management.

Now Mr. Chairman, with regard to the timber branch itself I have several questions that I would like to ask the Minister of Lands and Forests. Mr. Chairman, but before doing that I would like to draw the House's attention to an agreement that was entered into between The Department of Lands and Forests and the E. B. Eddy Company under licence No. D2256, dated October 10, 1963; and it was approved by order in council No. 2946. This particular licence or contract gives the E. B. Eddy Company the right to cut and monopolize the forest potential on 1,640 square miles in the Timiskaming area. I would like to know from the Minister how much has been cut on this licence since 1963 by the E. B. Eddy Company; how much has been cut by third party agreements; what revenue accrued to the Crown as a result of any cutting activity since the issue of this licence, and how many third party agreements have been entered into?

I understand that this is a continuation of a licence that was granted quite some time in advance of this date, October 10, 1963; as a matter of fact I think it is just an extension of a previous licence that was issued. They are allowed to cut spruce pulpwood for 35 cents a cord, balsam for—I think it is 5 cents a cord, jack pine 10 cents, poplar 10 cents and other hardwood pulpwood for 10 cents a cord.

As I said before, I would like to know under what conditions you are going to allow them to continue to monopolize this huge tract of land. I think it says in the agreement that they have some 10 years to make up their mind as to whether or not they are going to establish a pulp mill. They have put up a $25,000 bond and the licence is renewable at the discretion of the Minister, I believe it is, after the expiry date of this one. And it says "provided that the licensee does not, on or before the expiry date of this licence, build and have in operation a pulp mill capable of utilizing a minimum of 100,000 cords of wood per annum at a location to be approved by the Minister, the Minister may refuse any extension of this licence and the bond referred to in clause 3 hereunder, shall be forfeited to Her Majesty and retained by her as liquidated damages and not as a penalty."

Now, when you consider towns in that area like Elk Lake, Latchford, and Matachewan, which have been losing the small industries they have, because of the lack of wood within reasonable distance of the mill, I think that maybe the Minister should give us some answers as to why a company of this size can monopolize such a huge tract of land. I understand that as far as as the pulp and paper industry is concerned they are in overproduction now, operating at about 75 per cent of capacity, and world markets certainly contribute to the problem that the mills find themselves in at the present time. But certainly, I am told by some of my colleagues, that in that area there are small sawmill operators who have had to shut down because of inadequate supplies of wood. I was just wondering if the Minister would not like to comment on that particular licence and give the House some assurance that it will not, in the future, deter the proper harvesting of not only the pulpwood in the area but the different species that would be suitable for sawmill operation and plywood and presswood operations.

Turning to another matter, I would like to ask the Minister to what extent, if any, the present prime licence-holders contribute toward the cost of reforestation. I think there are something like 10 or 13 prime licence-holders in the northern part of the province that have a virtual monopoly on all the productive forest lands within reasonable distance of mills, and I have had considerable correspondence with the Minister with regard to supplying the proper wood supply essential for plywood mills and sawmills in the

area. And I think that if many of the recommendations of the Brodie report, which have not been been implemented to date, were implemented forthwith, it would take care of that situation with regard to the small operators—particularly the one about which we have had considerable discussion in this House, Norply at Nipigon.

I really believe that it is incumbent upon the Minister, in addition to making the different species available to these small operators, either to insist that the prime licence-holders build a network of access roads on all parts of the limit, so that they will not just exploit those particular areas that are adjacent to the mill and which can be harvested most profitably to the detriment of the industry in northwestern Ontario.

There are all kinds of marketable timber on these limits that are not accessible, simply because they have not taken the trouble to build a proper network of access roads where they can cut all areas simultaneously and in so doing, assure that a particular mill can operate in perpetuity. They will not just cut with a 10- or 15-mile radius of the mill and then get out, and then leave it for somebody else to come along and establish a new town in a new location, which is happening so often in the north where they cut out and get out.

I need not remind this House and the Minister that we have far too many towns in the northern part of our province that are reliant upon one industry such as a plywood mill, or a pulp mill, or a sawmilling operation. We cannot allow these towns to die for want of a proper forest management policy. I think that the only realistic way we can solve this problem is to assist—or to co-operate with the licence holders to build a proper network of access roads to make all the merchantable timber accessible and make them harvest it in a realistic manner to perpetuate the operation in that area with the co-operation of this department.

With regard to silviculture, I notice in the report for the year ending 1967 that there has been a marked improvement in the number of trees planted, and the different species that have been planted. I was wondering at page 65 of the report that I just mentioned—the number of Scotch pine planted for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967, planted on private lands, 1,465,000, and on public lands there were only 16,430. For Norway spruce, on private lands there were 309,000 planted as opposed to only 33,000 on public lands. For white cedar there there were 458,000 as opposed to 45,000 on public lands. For European larch 99,000 on private lands, and only a little over 2,000 on public lands. For white ash, there were 91,000 on private lands as opposed to 26,000. Silver maple, 162,000 as opposed to 30,000. Red oak 83,000 as opposed to 572. Carolina poplar 234,000 as opposed to 34,000. Black locust 64,000 as opposed to a little over 2,000.

Now some of these I think are for decorative purposes, and I suppose maybe the Scotch pine would be for Christmas trees. Now I was just wondering if the Minister would care to comment as to why so many of them were planted on private lands, and yet a very small proportion of them were planted on public lands. I do not know whether the Minister can get the information for me now, but I would appreciate it if he could.

With regard to his silviculture programme I was just wondering how many cords of each species were cut during the past year, and I am talking, not about the decorative species, but the merchandisable timber. Not only the spruce, the jack pine, but also the hard woods, such as birch and poplar. How many trees would this represent? How many of each species were planted? Are we developing species or better methods for quicker maturity? What is the backlog for the regeneration programme? When will we catch up? Will we be able to keep pace with the demands over the next 20 years?

Now I notice for the year 1968-1969, you plan on planting some 62 million trees. How many acres would this represent? Will it take care of the backlog, and a little more, or are we just keeping pace? What is being cut at the present time? How long do you expect it is going to take you to not only take care of what is being cut at the present time, but the backlog of some 200,000 to 300,000 acres that we failed to keep up to date with in years gone by? I just wonder if the Minister would care to comment on those few things that I have asked about?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, with reference to the E. B. Eddy Company, the hon. member knows, and mentioned they were given a licence in 1963 for a 10-year period, and it is provided that the licence may not be renewed if a pulp mill has not been erected and in operation at the expiry of this date. It further provides that if any other company makes a firm commitment to construct

a mill, the E. B. Eddy Company must make up its mind to proceed with a comparable project within 60 days, and commence construction of a mill within the next 12 month period, or give up the licence.

Now we have prepared the report entitled "Pulp Mill Feasibility in the Timiskaming Area", and this report has been widely distributed throughout Canada as well as in Europe. We have at the present time five major areas that we feel could support a pulp and paper mill, and the Timiskaming area is one. Of course, the well-known area that the hon. member knows of the Blind River area, and there is an area stretching in the Georgian Bay to Bancroft. The fourth area is the Michipicoten area. The fifth one is in the Red Lake district.

I believe the hon. member appreciates that at the present time, there is a depressed market for newsprint and pulp, and therefore it is very difficult to interest a company or companies to try and establish themselves when today a newsprint mill costs in the millions of dollars. I would estimate that at today's prices it would cost in the neighbourhood of maybe $50 million, if not more.

Also I would like to say to the hon. member that in that very area of which he is speaking, in Timiskaming, we have a very prosperous new mill, the Grant and Wilson. A very new, modern mill which has recently opened. It is producing lumber and chips. I was just given a copy, this morning, of their latest report, and it is doing exceedingly well. If the hon. member knows of any sawmill that is going out of business, due to the lack of the raw material, we would be pleased to look into it. But I do need to say, that in the province of Ontario at the present time, there are about 900 sawmills, and it is only those who are becoming more efficient, who are putting in new machinery that survive. They must have the very modern machinery in order to compete, and this is what is happening in many of these small inefficient sawmills who are falling by the wayside. But I would be pleased, if he knows of any sawmill that is curtailed or closed their operation due to the lack of raw material, to look into it.

With reference to the figures that he has asked regarding the amount of volume that is being cut, and the other matters, we will have this information for you, if possible this afternoon, if not, we will have it for you tomorrow.

With reference to access roads, I agree with the member that we need more forest access roads, and we will be building more forest access roads. As the hon. member knows, we have established a committee this year, called the northern Ontario roads to resources committee. This is an enlargement of the existing mining access roads committee, and we will be building more and more roads to develop our resources and of course, the forest resources are a very important part of our natural resources.

He was mentioning also the Scotch pine, according to our report. As the hon. member knows, the Scotch pine is primarily used for Christmas trees and actually private growers are very interested in growing Christmas trees in view of the short term. But in the department our primary object is to grow trees where they make the greatest contribution, and that is why most of our programme is in, for instance, black spruce, which is used for newsprint. I would like to tell the hon. member—I do not need to tell him that the contribution that the pulp and paper industry makes to Ontario is substantial—I believe we cut about 525 million cubic feet a year and I believe it is something like, for every 100 cubic feet, about $120 of gross provincial product. So if you multiply 525 million cubic feet I think it gives you a figure of about $620 million—the contribution of the pulp and paper industry to the gross provincial product of Ontario.

So our whole programme is aimed at this, and I can tell you, as the hon. member knows in my opening statement, we have expanded considerably our regeneration programme and next year we will be doing more of this, and we should be doing substantially more because all projections are that the demand for newsprint and other wood products is increasing substantially.

With reference to the regeneration agreement, as the hon. member knows, we have regeneration agreements with all the large pulp and paper industries and also with most of the large sawmill industries. They supply the equipment and the men, and the government pays for these regeneration agreements. For instance, in figures, we receive in stumpage dues, $16 million revenue. These were our last figures, and we spend about $5 million in regeneration.

Now, I would like to mention to the hon. member and also to other members, and I do not need to say we are in an age of competition and we must not increase the cost too much, because, as you know, many companies are looking at other areas: British

Columbia, in the southern United States, so that is why we must try and keep the cost of production down, and I think as a government we should do everything possible to try and make it as attractive as possible to have existing mills expand as well as to invite companies to build new mills. That is why we feel in the department that we should try and keep the cost of production down, doing more reforestation, building more access roads and doing more of the things which will be of some help in keeping the cost of production down.

The hon. member made reference to the Kennedy report, and most of the recommendations of the Kennedy report have been implemented. One notable exception is the formation of forest operating companies. Our policy is that we prefer to encourage industry to integrate its operations rather than impose such a system on the industry, and that is why in this report one of the major recommendations is on this question of integration.

This is not an easy one, and I can tell you that in our department we have been giving considerable thought to these recommendations. The hon. member knows we have implemented more than half, and of course the major ones are the ones that are very difficult. But we are making progress, and the hon. member knows that the Smith committee report also made recommendations and these are under review. Our policy is the full utilization of wood on a sustained yield basis, and I feel very optimistic that we are making substantial progress.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Timiskaming.

Mr. D. Jackson (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment and perhaps ask a couple of questions of the Minister.

First of all, in Latchford there have been two mills close down because of lack of timber—Murphy's and Gordon's mills. They have been closed down for some time, and the prime reason was the unavailability of timber to keep them going. At the moment, they are sitting right on the edge of E. B. Eddy limits and right on the edge of the Johns-Manville limits in Nipissing. I would like the Minister perhaps to comment on the available cut in the Johns-Manville limits and how much of it is being used, and whether it would be made available to a mill under the same terms as in the licence of the E. B. Eddy Company.

I would also like to comment, Mr. Chairman, on the clause in the E. B. Eddy licence that says that it is to commence construction of a pulp mill "as herein provided within 12 months of the date." The company is to make this commitment within 60 days of another company or group of companies saying that they will build a sawmill. I would just like to point out to the Minister that he has already stated they would have to raise in the neighbourhood of $50 million to establish a sawmill, but I cannot even visualize a company or a group of people trying to raise $50 million when they know that within 60 days of the raising of this money and committing themselves to build a sawmill, the E. B. Eddy Company can come along and say, "We are going to build a sawmill," and all their labour would be lost.

Plus the fact if they raise $50 million, even for a period of 60 days while they wait for the E. B. Eddy Company to make up its mind, they are going to have to pay a phenomenal rate of interest on that money, which would be a dead loss. I believe that the Minister has made a very big step in putting this clause in because it is at least a step forward. However, I do think that due to the fact that the E. B. Eddy Company has held this property for so many years without properly developing it, he would be further ahead to cancel this licence and to put it on the open market and give the competing companies an even chance to establish a sawmill.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: First, I will deal with the last item. Their licence, as you know, was given in 1963. They are doing what we have asked them to do. I will admit that all new licences that we issue today have not the same clauses as those which were issued five or seven years ago. We have clauses in them saying that the licences come up for periodic review and at the end of three years or four years, if the licensee is not using the allowable cut, the surplus can revert back to the Crown.

We have other areas in the province that are, I would say, just as attractive if not much more attractive than the Timiskaming area. I would say the one in Blind River, which is located on the Great Lakes, is very close to the tremendous market of the northern states, Michigan and Ohio. There are very few new pulp mills being established in Canada, and those which are being established are being established in British Columbia mainly by Japanese interests, because they are closer to Japan and they have a 12-month shipping season. Also there are

other various factors in British Columbia; the cost per unit is smaller than it is in Ontario.

With reference to the reasons why the white and red pine mills are not being built, as the hon. member knows the red and white pine are just about depleted in that area. E. B. Eddy and the Johns-Manville have jack pine and spruce primarily, and the volumes available for sawmilling are substantially used. So the availability of red and white pine has greatly decreased because most of it has been cut, and it takes I would guess somewhere between 50 to 75 years to grow the pine to sufficient maturity to be used.

Mr. Jackson: The Minister said that the licence was issued in 1963. That is quite correct—the most recent licence—but E. B. Eddy Company has held this property for many years under different licences. He also says that certain areas are more attractive to a pulp mill and this is quite true. But, because of this clause in this contract, this is one of the reasons that Timiskaming is not quite as attractive, and I think it should be removed. The Minister has that discretion under The Crown Timber Act, and when this licence comes up for renewal I certainly recommend that he use his discretion in that situation.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I can assure the hon. member that when the licence does come up for renewal in 1973, we certainly will give it a very close look, and the same clauses will not apply.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has not answered my specific question with regard to this. He made a brief reference to the fact that the E. B. Eddy Company had lived up to its commitments and its obligations under the licence. I asked how much wood had been cut under this licence since 1963 in terms of the allowable cut; and what revenues have accrued to the province as a result of it? Did they issue any third-party agreements, that is did they allow anybody else to come in and utilize the other species? It makes specific reference in here to the fact that the pulpwood would be left for the licensee as much as possible. But there are many other species that could be used for sawlogs, for sawlog operation, or for veneer bolts and things of that nature. Now, how much has been cut on this licence since 1963 either by the licensee or a third party, and what revenues have accrued to the province as a result of it?

Now, I think what the Minister has said, and the provisions of the licence fly in the face of recommendation No. 57 of the Brodie report; this has already been implemented. I am pretty sure it has. But where there is a surplus allowable cut, proposals for its use should be requested and the allocation made on the basis of the merit of the various proposals. If an industry ceases to require or use its allocated allowable cut, the allocation should revert to the Crown; it should not be considered a saleable asset. Thus the province could maintain full control of the disposal of Crown timber for the best attainment of its provincial economic goals; a change in the allocation would require a revision of the management plan and the approval of the regional director and the chief of the timber branch.

Now, am I not correct in saying that this has been implemented—recommendation No. 57? This would be directly in conflict with the agreement you have signed with E. B. Eddy Company in 1963, and I presume even the predecessor agreement that was signed before this. But, specifically, I would like to know how much has been cut by the licensee on this area since 1963? How much have they farmed out, say, to third-party agreements? And, what revenue has accrued to the Crown as a result of any cut?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned to the hon. member at the opening of my remarks, this information is being gathered and will be available to him shortly.

Mr. Stokes: What about recommendation No. 57? Would you not say it is in disagreement with the provisions of the agreement?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: With reference to recommendation 57, we are in agreement that the surplus allowable cut be made available on the merits or proposals made and this, in effect, is being done now. It is possible also to increase our efforts to increase proposals. Any surplus area of timber is much easier to deal with than a surplus volume on an area already under licence. The department has a marketing unit which is working towards the full utilization of the allowable cut and keeps informed on the production statistics and trends in North America and even farther afield. So, we are doing this now and we are also meeting—I would like to mention that in the past three or four months we have met with the major pulp and paper companies; have written to all the presidents; and we met here at the Westbury hotel. We are going to meet

again, probably within the next month, and we are making substantial progress. We have made it known that there are many demands for wood uses and therefore those who are not utilizing their full allowable cut and who do not anticipate expansion—now we do not want to jeopardize existing industries who have plans for expansion—but those companies are being made aware that we are taking steps to try to get the surplus wood back to the Crown. Also, I would like to mention, regarding third-party agreements, that most pulp and paper companies have third-party agreements, and this is the way to utilize certain species of wood which are not of any use to the original licensee. That is why once you see the figures of the Timiskaming area—then you will find that we have several third-party agreements in that area. This mill that I mentioned—Grant and Wilson, this new modern mill that just came into production in the last year, it is using a substantial amount of the allowable cut under the E. B. Eddy Company.

Mr. L. Bernier (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, I think it is very appropriate at this time to mention that about one year ago the town of Sioux Lookout was seriously threatened with a very devastating forest fire. Of course, we were quite pleased with the efforts of the department at that time, and it is interesting to note that some 90,000 acres were burnt over during that particular fire. I am pleased to report to the House today that in this area we have slightly over 50 per cent of the plantable area now reforested. I think this is a tremendous credit to the Minister and his department, and I would also like to commend your department in this particular project because in this project you utilized the services of over 110 Indians from northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Jackson: I would just like to ask the Minister a question, Mr. Chairman, through you. The Minister stated that some of our strongest competition is from the southern states in pulpwood and in newsprint manufacture. Would the Minister just comment on the quality of the newsprint that comes out of the southern states as compared with Canadian newsprint; and will he also comment on the lowering of the quality because of the fact that the trees are growing at such a fast rate that the quality is actually going down year by year?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to hear that their quality is going down because the information that I have been given is that due to technology their quality is being improved and that they have in the past few years—I am just going by memory—I think about no more than five or six years ago, they were cutting about 6 million cords and this year they are cutting, I believe, about 35 million cords. By 1970 they will be cutting over 40 million cords. We have also sent one of our forest economists, who has spent more than one month in the 11 southern states; we have another of our forest economists who went to Yale recently and met with these various companies from the southern states. And they are real competition to Canada. And in order to have first-hand information about the numerous forest developments in the United States, a department economist was recently sent to the southern states.

Briefly, it is apparent that the forest industries in southern United States have many advantages which, when lumped together, make them extremely important competitors. For instance, technological developments have made it possible for newsprint of high quality to be manufactured from southern pine; and with the short distance to many of the major United States cities, and the advantage of cheap water transportation to some destinations, there is very little doubt that this area will continue to increase its share of the total market for newsprint and other forest products. The total volume of plupwood harvested in the southern states has increased from about 6 million cords in 1946 to 33 million cords in 1967. The forecast, as I just mentioned, is 40 million cords in 1970. Also, they are becoming very nationalistic. This may sound strange but they are becoming very nationalistic, and instead of buying paper from Canada, the publishers are buying paper from southern states.

They have, as you know, a much longer growing season, being closer to the equator, and many areas are capable of growing two cords of wood per acre per year, or more. Here is this province it takes between 60 and 100 years to grow spruce, while the southern pines take an average of 20 to 30 years. The mills are usually completed and surrounded by forest area as compared to Ontario where the majority are located on large bodies of water. This means that the distance that the wood must be transferred is lower than here, and good road access to the forest access was established in the agricultural areas in the south at public expense. That is why we in the department feel that we must be building more of our roads ourselves. There are

also numerous attractive financial assistance schemes for new industry development.

The foremost among these is the issuance of revenue bonds by municipalities. During the period 1963 to 1967, the amount raised by this means with this industry increased development from $100 million to $1.3 billion. This form of investment is very attractive, because it provides a shelter against tax. That is why we in the government are studying ways and means to make a much more favourable economic climate in Ontario. To have the existing industries expand and to get pulp paper mills at the five major areas I mentioned, is hampered by very great competition in the southern states.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1107?

Mr. Stokes: I would like the Minister to explain briefly the way in which timber is sold. On page 112, table 27, spruce saw logs, bid $2, bonus $6, dues $4, total $12 per 1,000 board feet. Would the Minister care to say how he arrives at the figures? What is the bid price, the bonus, plus the dues? Who gets this money, and what is the reason for breaking it down in this way?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Generally speaking, as the hon. member knows, we have studied the recommendations of the Brodie report very closely, this whole question of stumpage and bonus and dues is under review, and we have made and will be making changes. This is in keeping with the recommendations of this report.

One of the recommendations of the report, and I am sure that the hon. member will agree, is that in order to develop those resources in remote areas, there must be a reduction of stumpage used in the remote areas. The dues are statutory, and the bonus given is our estimate of value. As I said, this question of bonus is under review, and we will be making changes. As far as the bid is concerned, this is what the bidder bids above the normal rate. We are putting up for tender fewer and fewer bids, because we feel we should be trying to supply those industries that were established, the sawmills that are in operation and need more wood, with the raw material that they need. Often the person who bids is not necessarily the person who needs it the most, and on some occasions it is the person with the most money. For this reason, we are giving this question of bidding, as well as the system of bonus and dues, a thorough review, in accordance with the Brodie report.

Votes 1107 and 1108 agreed to.

On vote 1109:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, once again I would like to congratulate the Minister on the junior forest ranger programme. I think that it is an excellent programme. However, I would like him to consider the feasibility of experimenting with a programme for young girls in that same age category, to see if such a programme could actually be operated successfully. We find today that a lot of our young ladies have not the opportunity to get summer employment, and this not only would provide employment, but give them the opportunity to learn some of the basics of outdoor living and the general economics.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I wish to thank the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville for his suggestion. I think it is an excellent one. As you may know, we do employ a very limited number of girls in our provincial parks. A week ago Saturday I assisted at the graduation of the first corps of forest technicians at Lindsay, at Sir Sandford Fleming community college, and was very pleased to see among the graduates, one girl. I do believe that today, with the emphasis on outdoor recreation, we should do everything possible to try and have more girls enter into this field of work. Also, we will certainly try to employ more girls. As far as the junior rangers are concerned, we certainly will look into this suggestion.

Mr. B. Newman: My thought is a pilot project for one year to see if the idea will work, and why not take—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: You are thinking of a junior ranger camp for girls only?

Mr. B. Newman: That is right. May I also suggest to you that once you have compiled the list of the individuals who are going to attend the camps, you could provide the members of the area with the locations to which these rangers are going so that the member may be able to get several of them together to share expenses, especially if they are travelling by automobile.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: A very good suggestion.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): How many have you included in your junior ranger programme this year? How many junior rangers were there this year?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, we take in 1,800, the maximum that we can accommodate. This year we had over 2,500 applications. I hope that next year we can expand the programme, and I am sure that this will meet the approval of all the members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I too would like to commend the Minister for the excellent junior ranger programme that he has going on in the province. The very last statistic that he mentioned—2,500 applicants to fill 1,800 positions—is living proof that there is a demand for it. It is unfortunate that the programme is limited to 17-year-olds, particularly in northern Ontario now, where it is almost essential that we provide summer employment for high school students and people attending university, and jobs are not too easy to come by with the lack of industry. I was wondering if the Minister would undertake to expand the programme and make it available to boys from 16 to 19?

There is a lot of work with regard to reforestation that could be done in the north. We have a lot of younger people coming from the south vying for the job opportunities that we do have for young people in the northern part of the province, and I think that if the Minister would undertake to expand this programme, to include young people from 16 to 19, I am sure that it would be money well spent. It would give them a chance to earn a little bit of money if you could utilize their skills and their industriousness toward a proper programme of reforestation. I think there are many ways in which you could use their skills in your silviculture programme and I was just wondering if the Minister would take that into consideration.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I certainly think it is an excellent recommendation.

I would like to mention to the hon. member that this year, in addition to the 1,800 junior rangers, we have hired 1,186 university and high school students and also 69 from the forestry technical school. This makes a total of summer students hired by the department of 3,055, and they are doing excellent work. I certainly think that next year we will see if we cannot enlarge this programme, because not only is it good for the students in that they make gainful employment, but as far as the department is concerned and the province of Ontario is concerned, they do very worthwhile work in planting trees and as park assistants and in garbage collection and other various types of work in connection with the resources.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): I too, Mr. Chairman, would like to encourage the Minister in the continuing development of this form of educational employment which the department has so successfully spearheaded to date. Both The Department of Lands and Forests and that of Tourism and Information, I think, have well developed their programmes, not only in making historical sites live with the employment of students as in the Fort Henry guard and such like, but also I believe that The Department of Lands and Forests has a tremendous educational possibility here to have students from all of Ontario serve in the areas of northern Ontario which they might not otherwise see.

The growing university population and the encouragement of the provincial government for students to remain in areas of higher education, I think that there goes, hand-in-hand with this encouragement, a certain responsibility. The responsibility is to ensure that those who are involved in higher education have forms of gainful employment.

The Minister and his department are certainly to be complimented on the work that they have done and I would hope that the Minister will encourage Treasury board and his colleagues in the Cabinet to further be allowed to develop this kind of a programme which can give so much long-term benefit to the entire province.

Vote 1109 agreed to.

On vote 1110:

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, there is just one little point I want to raise with my friend, the Minister.

In relation to the long hunting season for moose in Ontario, I have no idea what the population of moose in Ontario would be at any given point but it seems to me that a season extending from October 1 until January 8—I believe it is—annually, is a fairly long season. I wonder if the Minister has given any consideration to shortening the season? If not, what is the population of moose in Ontario? The population of moose must justify the long season. I suppose that would be an inference.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, with reference to moose, our biologists estimate there is, in the province of Ontario, approxi-

mately 150,000 moose. These figures are arrived at by aerial surveys. During the winter months they conduct aerial surveys and according to our biologists they claim that we should harvest about 25 per cent—somewhere between 20 and 30 per cent. Our last figures are somewhere in the neighbourhood, I believe, between 12,000 or 15,000 moose that were killed last season.

So therefore, we are not cropping the amount of moose that we could crop according to our biologists. But the problem, in moose hunting, is access and it is very difficult. What we are trying to do, is to encourage hunters by building more roads and other means to get deeper into the forest and there are certain areas, it is quite true, where the moose are being over-harvested. Those areas that are more popular is where there is probably more density of population. Our problem is trying to direct the hunters in those areas where there is a good moose population and fewer hunters. This is rather difficult to do. But generally speaking, our moose population is sustaining very well.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): There are two points that I want to raise with the Minister. Quite frankly, I do not know whether the first one is in this estimate. Perhaps my first question should be where, if at all, is there, in the Lands and Forests estimates, an appropriation specifically for work with the Indians? Is there one?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, I believe, under the first vote, this comes under item 6 or 7 with reference to the treaty number 3. I mentioned that we spend, in the department, approximately $200,000 on resource agreement and this is shared by the federal government. The actual vote, as the hon. member for York South knows, for Indians, comes under my colleague the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko). But we spend in the department, approximately $200,000, shared by the federal government, and we employed the Indians mainly as forest firefighters and, of course, in the tourist aspect. For instance, all goose camps in the James Bay area—I should not say all—with the exception of one or two, they are mainly operated by the Indians, and we encourage this. We are opening new areas, strictly restricted to the Indian population.

So we feel, in the department, that we are doing considerable work in providing employment to our Indian population.

Now as far as the forestry is concerned, we are employing them in certain areas, and we are doing more of this.

Mr. MacDonald: But there is no appropriation as such for Indians? It is in The Department of Social and Family Services?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well—

Mr. MacDonald: I am interested in the figure of $200,000 that the Minister gave me. From persons who are associated with the Ontario union of Indians, they were of the impression that there was more than that, something like $250,000 being spent in northern Ontario and $18,000 in southern Ontario, perhaps that includes something more than the programme that the Minister has just referred to. Are the figures accurate —$250,000 in northern Ontario and $18,000 in southern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, where—

Mr. MacDonald: They are not here at all. These are figures that were given to me and I am a bit curious. The Minister has clarified to some degree—that the appropriation is a matching appropriation. It is passed in The Department of Social and Family Services estimates, under the interdepartmental committee. But the total figure was in the range of $250,000. The Minister mentioned a figure of $200,000. Is that the total amount that is made available for Indians through the interdepartmental committee—$200,000 a year?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The money that I referred to, Mr. Chairman, the $200,000 is on resource projects and this is under a federal-provincial agreement. There are 33 projects and they are mainly as I mentioned, in forestry, fisheries, fur and wildlife.

Also, we employ—these are permanent employees—in the department, in the summertime, I would say maybe 2,000 or 3,000 Indians, mainly as firefighters, and for tree planting. Also, we have as permanent employees—and I am just guessing now—between 50 and 100 on permanent staff—about 50.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the $200,000 figure the total, including the federal matching grant? Namely, $100,000 from each level of government, or is it $200,000 from Ontario and another $200,000 from the federal?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: My understanding is that the $200,000 is the total on this resource agreement and $100,000 is paid by the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1110?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry—the Ministers are conferring there.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Excuse me if I repeat this once more, Mr. Chairman. This $200,000 is on the resource agreement project only. Now the hon. member knows that under The Department of Social and Family Services they spent $1,428,000, in the estimates under that department, for the Indian development branch.

Mr. MacDonald: On the resource development, which partly comes under this Minister, and partly under other Ministers. One point that has been made to me—and I want to raise it with some care, because quite frankly I can see both sides of this issue—is the argument from Indians in southern Ontario, that a disproportionate amount of money is being spent in northern Ontario. Now I repeat; I see both sides of this issue, because in northern Ontario I think conditions are much worse, and the need for assisting these Indians is greater. It certainly would be in fish and wildlife and in forest resource that would be related to this Minister. But there are—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The $200,000, Mr. Chairman, is mainly, I would say, in northern Ontario. My guess , it would be probably 75 per cent if not higher.

Mr. MacDonald: In northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In northern Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, this was the point that was being made. Let me try to put it fairly and factually before the Minister, for a moment. Some 75, or 80 per cent of this amount was being spent in northern Ontario, but that in southern Ontario, where our Indians have been somewhat better off, and therefore, perhaps, in a position to react more effectively to self-help, if they are given a bit of financial assistance.

In other words, in many of the northern Indian areas, I think you have really got populations that have to be lifted up by the bootstraps in a very serious and basic way. Our southern Indians are somewhat more independent if they had the means to get on a self-supporting basis. Therefore, the argument is advanced by some Indians from southern Ontario, that while they are not jealous of what is going to northern Ontario —because they recognize the desperate need there—that in southern Ontario, the expenditure of money might be even more effective if more money was available in assisting in the kind of economic development that is needed, for example, in the Cape Croker group and Indian bands all across the province.

I wonder if I could solicit some comment from the Minister on this, and see if we can allay some of the criticisms that are coming from southern Ontario Indians?

Mr. Chairman: I do not want to restrict this debate, but frankly I do not believe it comes under vote 1110. The member for York South has made his point, but I think he must agree with me it is not under this vote. However, if the Minister can give him some reply—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the $200,000, I am advised, is strictly for northern Ontario. But I think the hon. member has made a good point that maybe there should be some assistance under the resources programme for Indians in southern Ontario, and we certainly will take it into consideration.

Mr. MacDonald: I appreciate what the Minister has said, that my point is accepted. We will let it rest there. But the point becomes even more valid if the Minister now informs us that all of the $200,000 was in northern Ontario.

The second area that I wanted to explore would certainly be in relationship to access roads, or roads in general. It has always been my feeling that if the Minister wants to achieve effective forest management, he cannot achieve it for harvesting of the tree crop over the whole of the limit if there is not a basic roads system. The Minister may be aware of the fact that I have raised the matter in earlier sessions as to why, in Ontario, we do not do something comparable to the kind of policy that exists in British Columbia, where if a timber limit is given, the first thing that the licensee must do is to build his basic road structure.

He cannot start to cut timber until he has built his basic road structure, and therefore he has got the basic means for harvesting of a crop throughout the whole area. Compare our approach—where they may build a $50 million mill and put in $500,000 in starting a road structure, and gradually build it into the limits. Twenty-five years from now, they may be getting into the hinterlands of their limit, which meanwhile is not being cut on a modern forest management basis. Is the gov-

ernment contemplating some adaptation, if not application, of the policy that exists in British Columbia, and if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, it is a very good point. We are contemplating building roads, giving assistance. For instance, as the hon. member knows, this year we have no money in the northern Ontario roads-to-resources programme, but next year we will have money. This is an enlargement of the mining and access committee's responsibilities, and this committee's prime purpose will be to build roads for forestry, mining and tourism as well as other resources.

Also, in Bill 115, which was introduced and passed in this Legislature, money will be made available for the maintenance and construction of certain roads, mainly on pulp and paper company limits. As I mentioned earlier, with the tremendous competition of the southern states—where there are roads, which were built, of course, mainly for agricultural purposes—as well as, you mention, British Columbia, we as the government must make it as attractive as possible to try and further the growth of our forest industries, so that we will be getting into road construction.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the government itself assuming responsibility for building the roads in an area that has been licensed to, say, a pulp and paper company? Are you assuming responsibility and, in effect, making it available on a rental basis? How do you cope with the cost? To what extent does the licensee share in the cost of building the road structure which he is going to use?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Up until now, Mr. Chairman, we of the government to my knowledge have not spent any money in building roads, except for our own Crown management units. Pulp and paper and other companies have been building their own roads at their own expense. Under Bill 115, the main purpose is on the concept of multiple use, of providing access to hunters and anglers and other people who are interested in recreation. But I feel the northern Ontario roads-to-resources committee is a vehicle whereby we will be building more roads into our resources—

Mr. MacDonald: Will the paper companies, or the licensees, be sharing in the cost, if any?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: With reference to Bill 115, we will be entering into agreements for certain roads for certain companies, and at the present time we are negotiating with certain companies for certain roads.

Mr. MacDonald: On a shared-cost basis?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: On a shared-cost basis.

Mr. Spence: I would like to ask the Minister about the $6,039,000 for fish and wildlife. With regards to Lake Erie, as the Minister is well aware, the federal government has a 10-cent floor on perch, and of course at the present time there is a surplus of perch, fillets and rounds. I understand there is about two million pounds in storage in this province. I would like to know if your department is doing anything about finding, or helping to find, a market, on account that I believe in the early part of the summer or fall, there was some discussion that the federal government was going to lower that floor price.

Another question I would like to ask of the Minister is: How many new licences were given out or sold in 1967 in Lake Erie, or are there any?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, with reference to Lake Erie, there is quite a surplus of perch. We are working very closely with the federal government. The McIvor Royal commission on fisheries has made its report to the federal government and I believe one of the main recommendations is a marketing board. I feel very optimistic that this will greatly help the marketing, and give the commercial fishermen a fair price for their product. With reference to new licences, I am advised that no new licences have been issued on Lake Erie this year.

Mr. Spence: Is that in 1967?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. R. H. Knight (Port Arthur): Once before in this House, Mr. Chairman, I proposed to this hon. Minister that something more be done about a proper guiding system for non-resident hunters in this province. I am not aware of just how much the department is doing at this point on guiding. I am given to understand that not as much is being done as in the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia, where I understand a compulsory guiding system for non-resident hunters is in effect. I would not propose that tomorrow we establish a system of compulsory guiding for non-resident hunters in this province, but I would like to propose that we step up our programme of guide training.

I think that it is the only solution. It is the only way that we are really going to get proper safety in the bush in Ontario. I think there are hunters who come into this province who are not fully cognizant of our rules, who get up into the great northwest and figure they will make themselves pretty well at home without realizing what dangers there are. As a reporter up in that part of the country, how many times have I reported visiting hunters killing horses and cows, and shooting up barns? How many thousands has it cost the Ontario Hydro Electric Commission in this province to bring about repairs caused by insulators that were shot off poles? I think that when a non-resident hunter comes into this province, he should have a guide with him, and that we should be on a very intensive programme right now to train sufficient guides, to attract sufficient men into this field and make it worthwhile to them.

I understand there was some kind of a guiding system at the Quetico training centre and I thought that was good, but it did not seem to be the solution to our problem. I cannot see any real hard campaign underway in the province right now within the department to develop or to train a sufficient number of guides. I think probably the best guides or possible guides in this province—and you will agree with me—would be our Indian people. I know an Indian, drunk, with his hands tied behind his back, could get across Lac des Mille Lacs at midnight. Some of these people know that bush so well and it is a shame that they have to come into the city and work on some construction job or do some kind of a job that they are not interested in, when they could maintain a living right out there in the wilds where they would be happy and where, after all, we need them.

I think a good guide will see to it that a hunter hunts away from the highway, away from the city; he will get him into the bush and out of the bush in safety. Most often, if the hunter cannot shoot his game or get his game, then the guide will do it for him. I think our American hunters have been waiting a long time to see Ontario set up a proper guiding system. I think they would appreciate it, I think they would welcome it; certainly most of them can afford it and I think it is high time that this department went into this business of a proper guiding system very seriously with an ultimate objective of making it compulsory for non-resident hunters. I think a lot of our would-be hunters down here in southern Ontario would be far more game to head into the wilds of the north and hunt if they thought they could hire a guide who would make sure that they got in and out safely and got their game, and so forth. So much for that but I would like to reimpress this on the mind of the Minister.

The other thing I would like to bring up is the business of a period of hunting for Ontario hunters only. I have mentioned it before and I would like to bring it up again. I think the first two weeks of the hunting season should go to our own resident hunters here in Ontario. And I think we should do this especially for the poor fellow who works all week and does not get a chance to pick up his gun and go out into the bush except on the weekend. In most cases now he gets to his favourite haunt and some visiting hunter is there ahead of him. I think we should give him a break. We are putting up the hunting fees, but we are not putting them up, I understand, for the non-resident hunter, for the Americans; we are putting them up for the resident. The resident hunter looks and he says, "What am I getting? My fees are increased, the American hunter's fees are not increased. He starts the same time I start, I do not get any head start at all, what is the advantage of living in Ontario?"

It is this old business of pride and resentment once again. If we want them to have pride in the province of Ontario, then we have to give them reason to feel this is their province and they have a little bit of an advantage. I do not think there is a visiting hunter from the United States or any other province in Canada who would resent this government doing that for the resident hunters. I think the Minister should very seriously consider once again the possibility of giving them two weeks or even a few days. I have two documents I would like to read into the record. The 1,500-member Thunder Bay district fish and game association—at least it was 1,500 the last time I heard—has sent a letter into the department, which they have also sent to me. I would like to read it:

> This is to advise that the following resolutions were passed at a regular meeting of this association held April 3 last.
>
> That we oppose any implementation of a fish licence.
>
> That we oppose any increase of hunting licences.
>
> That we suggest increase of non-resident alien hunting and fishing licences.
>
> That we oppose the increased park fee.

That we again request a two-weeks advance season for the resident over the non-resident alien hunter of moose and deer.

It seems to our members that the resident sportsman is already paying more than his share of taxes in the pursuit of his hobby. The three levels of government, federal, provincial and municipal, are taking too great a share of the worker's hard-earned cash. The time has come when these three must re-assess the situation and decide the pie must be cut in such a manner to give each a share and leave some for John Q. Public as well. There has been and still is far too much overlapping of taxes at the three levels mentioned.

That is from the Thunder Bay fish and game association.

The other one is a letter I received recently from the—well I will read it:

We read in the *News Chronicle* that you were interested in keeping the first two weeks of the hunting season open for Canadian residents only. I enclose a petition from the Thunder Bay mill employees (Abitibi division)—this is 300 or 400 men.

We hope you will be successful in this endeavour—

And so forth. It is signed by the president of that local. I think the local hunters of Ontario know what they want and what they need. I do not think their request is too selfish. I think they might even be inclined to go along with some of these increases that the department is moving ahead on this year, if the department were to turn around and say, "Well, we will do something special for you, we will grant you one of these requests". At this point I do not see where the department is granting any of their requests. It is going ahead with all of its proposals, all its increases, the new fishing licence and so forth, but there does not seem to be anything left for the local hunter and he is turning very bitter about it. I said all these things not too long ago and so I would like to bring it to the Minister's attention again.

Another question I would like to ask the hon. Minister while I am on my feet is whether we have any law in the province right now that states that a hunter, be he resident or non-resident, has to wear a certain type of garb that is going to make him immediately discernible from the animals that move about in the bush. I think a hat or something, even a jacket, so that is readily recognized which is man and which is beast—and it might not be a bad idea for the farmers to put some of these things on their cows and horses; because we have a situation up north where some of these hunters—I do not know whether they are shooting out of the bottom of a bottle or out of a gun, but some of the incidents that happen strike us as humorous but, believe me, they are not; the potential danger is very, very disturbing, and I think the time has come to include a law for some kind of a compulsory type of dress for the hunter to protect himself and protect the others who are in the bush.

So just reiterating very quickly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister again to consider a very intensive guiding programme in the interest of Indians and hunters, in the interest of residents, in the interest of people who drive along the highway up in the north and never know when they are going to get a bullet through their windshield. I would again like to propose that the department favour resident hunters in some way, more particularly in a way which they request themselves, that they get a little headstart on the season. And I would like to request some kind of dress, special dress, hat or coat or something, that will make the hunter immediately distinguishable in the bush.

Thank you.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I have one request along the same line which the Minister would probably answer at the same time. It is my understanding that one of the considerations in the increase of the small gun licence from $1 to $5 would include liability insurance for the person purchasing the gun licence. Also that it would be very desirable to have accident insurance coverage linked with the purchase of a gun licence. I understand this was under consideration. Could the Minister inform the House whether anything final or definite has been arrived at with the including of liability and accident insurance with the purchasing of a gun licence?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, if I may deal with the last item I would say that this matter of gun licensing is still under review. We have not come to it yet—but we soon will; I would say that within the next week or two we will have something definite, but it is still under very active review.

With reference to the hon. member for Port Arthur, I believe there is a lot of merit in his recommendation that there be guide training. As far as making it compulsory,

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that this would be advisable, because, as the hon. member knows, years ago it used to be compulsory and the problem is that once it is compulsory and there are no guides available it gets very embarrassing. I come from a region, the Kapuskasing area, where offhand I would say there may be 200 or 300 non-resident licences sold, and there are very few guides. In fact, they can be counted on one hand. There are no Indians in that area. We sell today, I am advised, about 40,000 non-resident licences, and it would be very difficult to try to find 40,000 guides.

There is a lot of merit in the suggestion that we should be giving more training to our Indians. They are excellent guides. The hon. member referred to Quetico centre and probably knows that Moosonee has a new school under construction. One of the subjects to be taught to the Indians at this school will be tourism. Of course, this will include guiding services as well as other services that are provided to tourists. With reference to the suggestion of the advanced season for hunters only, I am advised that biologically there is no problem. There is a lot of merit in the suggestion, and we will look into this as to whether it is advisable to have an early season in certain areas.

I would like at the same time to remind the hon. member that there will be considerable opposition to this by people in the tourist industry who feel that the contribution made by non-resident anglers and hunters to the province is substantial. However, we are prepared to take a look at your suggestion as to having pre-seasons for residents.

With reference to wearing a certain colour to make hunting safer, may I remind the hon. member that we are, of course, giving a lot of attention to hunter safety programmes that we have established in the province. As far as having a law to make it compulsory to wear a certain colour is concerned, we would be very reluctant to do this. We are introducing a back patch. I think that it is just a matter of time, until we will have a central registry in Toronto, like a car licensing bureau, and every hunter will be licensed. There are certain areas in southern Ontario, where back patches are issued, and this is something to give us more information. At the same time there could be a safety feature, rather than having a back patch, to have some sort of system that would make hunters more conspicious.

Mr. Stokes: I would just like to make one comment on the fish and wildlife section of the vote, with regard to restocking. I mentioned earlier in the estimates where the American authorities had done a considerable job of restocking in connection with the lamprey problem in the Great Lakes. Particularly Lake Superior, where, over the past ten years, they have stocked some 26 million fingerlings and yearlings, whereas this department in the province restricted its programme to something like 5 million over the last 15 years. It has been generally agreed that the lamprey are on the run, and there is every likelihood that the environment is conducive to the rehabilitation of the Lake Superior trout. There is ample evidence of this. If you look at the cohoe salmon programme that is going on so well on the south shore of Lake Superior, and in Lake Michigan, I was wondering if the department plans any more hatcheries that will make many more fish available for lakes like Nipigon, which I understand has been stocked once in the last 20 years?

Now, lakes that were once considered inaccessible in the northern parts of the province, are becoming accessible because of the flying tourist trade and the planes that we have today. I was wondering if the Minister would not consider stepping up the restocking of the lakes? Because if the Minister is quite adamant in imposing the fishing licence fee, he is going to have to assure the people that they are getting something for their money. Of course, if a man is interested in only one aspect of outdoor life, say fishing, he wants to know that there is every likelihood that he might catch fish.

As you know, in many of the lakes that were once productive, along the main highways, it is almost impossible to catch fish, and these people are going—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): This has all been covered.

Mr. Stokes: What has all been covered?

Mr. White: All this.

Mr. Chairman: May I remind the member for Thunder Bay that the aspect of fishing licences has been covered. But I believe the member was referring to another part other than fishing licences?

Mr. Stokes: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like some assurance that the hon. Minister will undertake a thorough restocking programme of many of the lakes along

the highways, and also the inaccessible ones, so that he can assure these people that are going to have to pay for their fishing, that they will be getting something for their money—and there will be every likelihood that they stand a good chance of catching fish. Particularly in Lake Nipigon, Lake Superior, and a lot of the more remote areas where people tend to go to fish.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I agree with the hon. member and we are intensifying our fisheries programme. For instance, he referred to Lake Huron, which we are restocking with lake trout at the rate of .5 million per year. This number, we feel, will produce the number desired. As the hon. member knows, we have introduced kokanee salmon and are very satisfied with the success in this, the fourth year. We are doing this in other lakes.

As to our future programme: We are establishing a large hatchery in southeastern Ontario, since I know that he will be interested in the whole province, not just the north. We are establishing, at Sault Ste. Marie, an experimental station, and this is very helpful to train personnel in fish management. There is also the new station, north of North Bay, a $.5-million investment, that will be open in the next few months. Generally speaking, we have, with the introduction of an angling licence, to do more. In lake surveys, we are doing presently within 500 to 700 lake surveys a year. We should, and will, be doing twice this number in the future years. We are very optimistic that we will increase the fish population.

I am sorry, .5 million lake trout were put into Lake Superior, not Lake Huron.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1110? The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): With respect to the issuing of gun licences, I understand that from some reports in our area, that it is going to be a rather cumbersome method. And where are they going to be issued? In Essex-Kent I understand that they are going to have to go to the local agriculture office and be interviewed and so forth, and then they go back to Aylmer for processing; and then they have to come back again at some other time to the agriculture office to receive their permit. I am just wondering, in a five-day week, how are some of the people going to be able to obtain the licences. Could you explain anything with regard to this, or is this set up yet?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, we are setting these up and we are trying to provide the services to the people; we are trying to provide these services so that a person will not have to travel on the average, more than, say, fifteen or twenty miles. Now, I cannot tell specifically for the hon. member's area, but I certainly will look into it and I will drop him a line as to just where we intend establishing them.

Mr. Ruston: With regards to a park that has been in operation for a couple of years: I understand that facilities for boat docking, or runways, or for getting the boats in the water in the Wheatley park are not adequate. What have you got? Do you not generally have proper boat ramps in these parks so that people can get the boats in, or what is the general procedure?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I will have that information, Mr. Chairman, in a minute.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wellington South.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Sir, I would like to urge what the hon. member for Waterloo North has suggested in regard to insurance for hunters. I recall in the past year, in fact quite recently, I have had a farmer who has been left crippled by a stray bullet, and while the police caught what they thought was the culprit there was no way of proof because the lead was damaged and they could not tell which rifle it came from. I would like to urge the Minister to give serious consideration to this possibility of putting insurance on the hunter's licence so that the individual who is injured can be protected.

The other item that I would like to ask about, Mr. Minister, is this: You had a letter from a constituent of mine concerning an imported fish that was evidently dangerous to Canadian waters. Is it a piranha? I have forgotten the name of the fish. Did you ever follow that advertisement up as to what was the outcome of the advertising?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It was bait was it?

Mr. Worton: No, this was an advertisement concerning a tropical fish, I believe, that is very dangerous to our waters and was advertised in a Toronto paper. You replied to the constituent but I did not hear further as to what action had been taken in regard to satisfying the request as to whether they were going to allow it into the country or not.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, first, in reply to the hon. member for Essex-Kent, with regard to boat ramps in Wheatley park: Two boat ramps have been established in Wheatley park and there are also facilities for parking cars. With reference to the hon. member for Wellington South: It is illegal to release—the name of this fish is piranha; the import is restricted.

Mr. Worton: As I understand it, this American firm had put an advertisement in the paper that these fish were available and from what I gather if they were ever let loose in our waters they would really cause havoc to the fish and to humans too. And I was wondering if they ever followed it up to see what had happened to it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, it is illegal, and also I am advised that they do not survive our winters, that they would die out in a few months; as soon as the water gets colder, then they would die.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister—and this is a question a lot of hunters in our area would like to have answered—why the department has seen fit to increase the resident hunter's licence without increasing that of the non-resident? What is the motivation here, to do it for one and not for the other? It was obviously going to cause a lot of resentment with the resident hunter, which it has done. And the other question would be: If not now, when does the department propose to follow through with an increase in the non-resident hunter's hunting licence?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, the non-resident licence for moose hunters is $101. A few years ago a committee was established, I believe under The Department of Economics and Development, to study the tourist industry in Ontario. And I believe one of their recommendations was that the fee of $101 is very high and that a moose hunter makes a contribution on the average of somewhere between $200 and $300 per hunter, in addition to the $101 fee. This contribution is made for lodging, food, gasoline and liquor, and other expenses. And we feel, in the province of Ontario that if we were to raise this any higher, we would drive hunters to other jurisdictions; that they would go to Manitoba or the province of Quebec or elsewhere. Our moose licence—the resident moose licence—has been $10 for quite a number of years; I would say for at least ten years. Also, in view of the fact that the value of the dollar has decreased substantially in the last ten years, we felt that it was in keeping with the higher costs. Also we are providing, or will provide, more access to hunters.

The main value of Bill 115, in my opinion, will be to hunters to provide access on company roads, and this will cost a substantial amount of money. So we feel again that the increase will pay for the increased benefits. The deer licence in Ontario has also been raised $5 and there again we are trying to increase the deer population. Last year we spent, I believe, somewhere between $200,000 and $300,000 in deer yard improvements. This has proved very successful, especially in the Parry Sound district. We have figures to show that this has really helped to increase the deer population and we will be doing more of this, so we are spending this money to intensify our fishery and wildlife management programmes.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister tell the House how much the non-resident deer hunting licence is? It is $10 for the resident. What is it for the non-resident?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The non-resident deer licence is $26.

Mr. Knight: Do I understand correctly, Mr. Chairman, from the hon. Minister that there is no intention in the near future to increase that licence fee?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would not say, Mr. Chairman, there is no intention. It is not the intention to increase it this year but these things are always under review. This year we do not intend to increase the non-resident hunters' licence because we feel that they are fairly substantial.

Mr. Knight: Very good. One other matter, Mr. Chairman. I would like to belabour the guiding system to some extent. I wonder if the Minister could tell the House approximately how many available guides we have now? How many guides would the department have at its disposal to call out? Is it relatively easy for a hunter, a visiting hunter, to find a guide in Ontario? What system does he follow? Whom does he call? Whom does a hunter call—I mean a hunter who is not used to obtaining or securing a guide? Does he go through the department or does he go through the tourist operator? Just how much is our guiding system at the present time organized?

At the Lakehead, for example, if someone wants a guide, whom do they call, the chamber of commerce, The Department of Lands and Forests—you know: Wieben, Superior Airways? What are they doing right now in order to get a guide, and does the Minister not see how there could be perhaps greater organization in the guiding system, like a pool, an information centre in each of your major hunting centres of northern Ontario where a person would always know where there would be a guide, or where he could reserve a guide?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to correct the figure for licence fees for non-resident deer hunters. I said $26, it should be $36; $36 is the fee.

With reference to guides, if a non-resident hunter wants to obtain the services of a guide, normally he contacts tourist outfitters or the local district office of The Department of Lands and Forests. I believe there is a lot of merit in his suggestion that our department, in conjunction with The Department of Tourism and Information, should be giving more attention to providing more information. I think it is a very good suggestion and this could be done maybe through literature that we issue to hunters. We will certainly look into it.

Mr. Knight: Just one more question. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Your present guide training programme—does it pay the trainee? Is he paid to learn? I mean, is it economically possible for an Indian person—an Indian gentleman from the north to stop his work, stop what he is doing and go and train for a certain period of time? Is it economically feasible the way it is now? In other words, is it in the reach of the people who should be taking this training? Is it really—do they have any incentive to go and take that programme and become involved?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am a strong believer in the Moosonee area, for instance, with which I am quite familiar, where we have a population of approximately, at least, 5,000 Indians. This new school—this new education complex will provide courses geared to the needs of the people who are predominantly Indian. A lot of these courses are given under the federal programme—I think it is called programme 5—whereby they go to school, they are paid while they are taking instruction, and at the same time they learn a trade. I would think that this is what we intend doing in the James Bay area and I would think that we should be doing more of this in other areas.

Mr. Knight: Will the course at Quetico in guide training be run again this year, do you know? Does the department have any plans to move ahead with that again this year?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The Quetico training school is not under The Department of Lands and Forests. To my knowledge, it is a private organization which is operated through private funds and the Ontario government does not make any contribution to this centre.

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I just have two brief questions for the Minister.

First of all, would he comment on black fly control and the progress we are making? Second, I have hunted in Ontario most of my life, in fact the first season I missed was last year during the election—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Name that place again?

Mr. Jackson: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Would you mind repeating—

Mr. Jackson: I say, would you comment on black fly control and the progress that is being made by the department? Second, I have hunted most of my life and very seldom miss a hunting season, and for the first time this year, I ran into two conservation officers who were carrying side arms. Is this something new in the department or is it the department policy to arm the conservation officers, since the increase in the licence fees?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: With reference to the black fly control, the only areas where we provide control are in our provincial parks. We do spray and provide fly control.

With reference to conservation officers, I am not aware of any change in regulations and I do not believe—they have been doing this—they do carry a revolver—

Mr. Jackson: Might I ask you, the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, if he would explain why they need to be armed. I just cannot see why they should have to carry side arms. I believe, in fact, it puts them in a very dangerous position to go armed in the bush.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): You figure the bears will shoot back?

Mr. Jackson: Some hunters might.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am not too qualified, Mr. Chairman, to speak on the merits or demerits of conservation officers carrying firearms but they are law enforcement officers. I believe that this applies, to my knowledge, in other jurisdictions in Canada; conservation officers do carry firearms. We have a very good record in the province and I do not, at this moment, plan to change our policy.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Nobody missed anybody yet.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: At this moment, I would be reluctant to make any changes.

Mr. Jackson: I would just like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that I personally have hunted for 20 years in Ontario and this is the first time I have ever seen one of the conservation officers carrying sidearms. If we have gone for 20 years and not found the necessity for carrying them, I cannot see why it has become necessary this season.

Mr. Stokes: The member for York South has mentioned the Indian problem, and I would like to find out from the Minister if there are any mechanics in your department, in your basic organization, whereby you set up agreements with Indian bands to go in and harvest timber on land held by prime licence holders. If you do set up this kind of an agreement, is there any assurance that the Indian end of the bargain will be met? I have some indication of an Indian band somewhere down around Wawa that agreed to work for a contractor on this particular cutting operation and the contractor supposedly went broke. Of course, the Indians worked all winter for nothing.

I was just wondering, do you enter into agreements like that? Is there some branch in your department that looks after the interests of the Indian people when they enter into agreements? Is there any money held back, or how could the interests of the Indian people themselves be looked after? Is there any provision in your department for this?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, we have employed Indians, we find that they are very skilful in the forest industries, and we do everything to encourage them. We have entered, with bands, into licensing agreements. The forest resources come under the timber branch and we have no specific personnel that deals with the Indians. We do certainly want to encourage the Indians as much as possible in this type of work which they are so proficient at, and we are encouraging them in those areas where it is suitable to provide licences to Indian bands.

Mr. Stokes: But specifically where it would appear that some contractor is trying to exploit the Indian people, would there be any way of you recovering this from the contractor or would the Indian band or group of Indians, which has nothing to start with, have to go through court proceedings to get it back?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I would say that if the hon. member has a specific reference that Indians have been deprived of their salaries, I would be pleased to look into it and we certainly will do all we can in the department to see that they are paid their full allotment.

Vote 1110 agreed to.

On vote 1111:

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, I presume this is for contingency and the possible use and requirement for these funds. I am wondering what the funds spent in the previous year were and what the Minister's expectation for this expenditure is for the current year?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The funds, Mr. Chairman, for last year for extra firefighting were $1.8 million and of course, this year they are $750,000. There is a decrease, sir, of $1,050,000.

Vote 1111 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: The capital disbursements on page 85, vote 1112?

On vote 1112:

Mr. Jackson: Mr. Chairman, if I might on 1112, I would like to ask a question. On the construction of access roads for development of summer resort subdivisions, is this money recovered in the cost of the lots?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, Mr. Chairman, $300,000 will be spent this year for roads for summer resorts and this mony is recovered. The cost of the road is added to the cost of the cottages. In other words, it is a self-sustaining operation.

Votes 1112 and 1113 agreed to.

On vote 1114:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1114 agreed to?

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on 1114 I would like to ask—

Mr. Chairman: The member was a little slow. However, I will spare him because maybe the Chairman was a little fast.

Mr. B. Newman: It was a little bit of both, Mr. Chairman, I really was not slow at all. May I here put in my annual plea to the Minister for the consideration of park sites along Lake St. Clair and the Detroit River, as there are still some undeveloped properties that should be taken up immediately, or they will never be available. The proposition was first raised by the city of Windsor in 1958. I will read the assessed values of the properties. When I asked the government back in 1960 to acquire the properties it refused. Today the properties have probably increased tenfold in value.

There had been the Gignac property with 6,380-foot frontage, west of the Ruscomb River, assessed at $8,000 in 1958; there had been little or no development at that time. The next was the Surf club property, east of the Ruscomb River, assessed at $43,000, including club house, motels, several other buildings, and 36 privately owned lots. There was a 5,600-foot lake frontage, over a mile, combining both properties, giving a distance of 2.2 miles, a total assessment of $51,000. The department refused at the time to consider the purchase yet they could have been bought for a song, and could have provided a needed recreation area. The government could have developed a park similar to the park across Lake St. Clair on the American side, the metropolitan Huron park authority, an outstanding park development, and we still should duplicate that on the Canadian side, not for our American friends, but for Canadians.

If you follow the Doxiades report, which mentions that the area of Minneapolis-St. Paul right through to Montreal, and on to New York City, will be one large megalopolis, you can see that we should be acquiring all available park land and lakeshore land immediately. Now, the Minister may say that the land does not have enough depth. In some cases it might be within 100 feet of the waterline, true enough, but if you send your officials to study the development across the lake, the Detroit metropolitan park authority there, or Clinton metropolitan park authority, you can see that we could very easily do the same thing on this side. And I cannot strongly enough urge the Minister to acquire properties there today. They are not going to be available in the not-too-distant future. The land is probably now ten times as valuable as it was in 1958. We do have the Holiday beach, and you are expanding it and we thank you; we appreciate that. But the area keeps growing and developing, and you are going to have to provide facilities on the north shore of the Essex county area.

There are still properties available at the mouth of the Canard River, and I think you would want to extend all the effort possible to acquire this property now, even if you do not develop it today. Acquire it today and develop it in the future, but let us get hold of it before the Americans, who have all kinds of money available and practically own Essex county. Please get your officials on the ball and buy the property on the north shore of Essex county and the south shore of the Detroit River. Have your officials come there. You promised us that you were going to visit the area prior to the election, Mr. Minister, and it looks kind of phoney; but if you come after, you sort of look askance at us. The election is over. I will be glad to take you around the county, and show you the land available. For heaven's sake, let us buy up some of this land.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I agree with the hon. member that we need more park land areas in that beautiful Windsor area, and I certainly was very sincere in my intentions to visit the area last summer, but for various reasons which he knows, time did not permit. But I can promise you that I will be going there this summer. My officials are very familiar with the area, and we have at the present time, under negotiation, another acquisition of more than 380,000 acres. Also, the Surf club property was well used by members, but it is now less used, and a meeting is planned with this group in the not-too-distant future. The parks integration board has approved negotiations for the acquisition of the Brissette property at the Ruscomb River. The Gignac has been looked at very closely and our people feel that the Gignac property is not the most suitable. However, again, as I said, we are giving the area our attention, and this summer I will get in touch with the hon. member when I am in the area.

Mr. B. Newman: The Gignac property may not be the most suitable because of its lacking depth, but if you will get across the river

and see what they have done with a similar amount and see how they have brought in the sand from the shallow depths of Lake St. Clair, and have extended the park well out—we could do the same thing. We could build a tremendous park in the area for the future citizenry, so if you cannot find something else, we will take the Gignac, or the Gignac property rather. But do have your officials take the thing seriously. Let us not have this come up as an election promise in 1971.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring this up at this time also. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville has done this very capably over the last few years. I think that time is catching up on us as far as available property is concerned and I do not think that we can keep looking around. We are going to have to take action. The population of the city of Windsor is now 190,000, and of course we have accesses from the United States for about 2 million people from the Detroit area, and a large group of them do come across into Essex county. The population of Essex county is about 90,000 and it is in an area that is increasing greatly year by year. The land is getting scarcer year by year. Now, on the north shore of Essex county, there are a number of townships that go along there, and Maidstone township, where I have the honour of living myself, has practically no shore line left now. There is one private beach that is operated during the summer months, and I think it has about 500 feet of frontage. There is one other private one, that has about 1,000 feet of frontage, and looks like it may be closed up and sold for building lots. And I do not think this should happen. I think this land should be bought by the province. Our own township bought a park only last year, but we stayed off the lake because of the cost for a small municipailty.

Lake frontage, of course, we know, is rather high-priced now, but with people using it from all over the area, it is really the responsibility of the province, and not of the local municipality to furnish these lakeside parks. Now I hear people say that they are too small, but I think that these parks, as small as they may be, can no doubt do, someone can handle the one I am thinking of, that may close up. It has handled as high as 1,000 people in a day without any trouble. The swimming is good, and this could be developed into a nice day park. It seems rather a shame to see these things just let go back into private hands where the people will never have access to the lake.

We have about 40 miles of frontage there along Lake St. Clair, and it is really a shame to see this going so that the public does not have some use of it. Farther down there are some areas in Rochester township, Tilbury North township; and I am sure that there could very easily be at least a half-mile of beach picked up there at a reasonable price to make this area into a beautiful day park. I do not believe there is room as I have heard mentioned from the department for facilities like camp sites and trailer parks and so forth. I do not think we need that so much in that area probably as we do need some day parks, and I think the most important part is for the province to buy the property and have it, because the trend of the property in that area—they are buying it up something fierce, all the land in there and people are moving out from Windsor areas. The lake frontage is choice property, and it just is a shame that we sit back and let this beautiful land go into private hands.

I think we should maintain this for our future generations, and I think the government should take immediate steps to do so, even if they have to expropriate this property, at a reasonable price. But whatever method they will have to negotiate to buy it, I am sure that it would be better to buy it now, than five years from now. It is not going to get any cheaper. We could have bought it, of course, in the 1930s for $1 a lot, but however, that was a time that no-one had $1 to spend. This is a time that we should be buying it, and with the population of say, 280,000 in Essex county in the city of Windsor and then with visitors from the United States, it is solely the responsibility of the province to furnish more of this park site and not just local municipalities.

I just want to stress very strongly, that this is very important, that the province buy this land now, and have it available for future use.

Mr. Chairman: The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): During the Minister's discussion on the operation of parks he mentioned different classifications of parks in the interest of people using them. One of the questions I would like to ask the Minister, in this connection, is what plans there are for acquisition of more sites which would be suitable for use by water skiers.

This is not nature trails, or swimming, but there are people who would like to have more public access points for power boats in areas that are not interfering with normal swimming and other similar recreational uses. Maybe in lakes where there are a lot of power boats already, but it is nearly all privately held property. Is there boat provision made for additional access points into lakes suitable for water skiing—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle. It is quite true that there is an increasing demand for facilities for water skiers. We have, for instance, approximately 381 access points located on various lakes, and we are spending $300,000 to develop these access points. I would think these would be areas that could be used for water skiers.

As the hon. member mentioned with reference to our park classification, each provincial park is in the process of having a master plan, and in this master plan, of course, we are giving recreational areas as one of the main aspects that we are looking into. I can assure the hon. member that we will certainly do all we can to provide water skiing for this increase in numbers.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister be able to tell us if he does have lists of such access points? Is there any place where people interested in this type of recreation can find out where they can most conveniently use their power boats and do water skiing?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would be pleased, Mr. Chairman, to send the hon. member a list of access points where water skiing could be carried out. Again, if I may refer to a master plan for each provincial park, once we have this information then we will have considerably more information to give to park users in each park, as they arrive, or as they write to the department. Those who are mainly interested in, say, water skiing can go to certain areas, and those who are mainly interested in nature trails or other forms of recreation can go to others.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1114; the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, the amount of money that is already spent in land acquisition for the Bruce peninsula park development?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, we will get this information for the hon. member. The amount of money spent in just parkland acquisition in Bruce peninsula?

Mr. Sargent: Well, the thing is, that there are a number of headaches for people involved up there. You pay fabulous amounts of money to outside interests for acquiring parkland and the people who are involved there do not get a fair shake. The farmers do not get a fair shake when they sell their land. A case in point was an individual who had 119 acres listed for $21,000 with a realtor, and he is walking around the peninsula showing off a cheque from you people for $500. You expropriated the land. You gave him $500 for it and he will not cash the cheque. Here is a man who has land worth $21,000 and you walk in and take the land. You give him $500 and it is worth $21,000. He has your cheque, and will never cash the cheque. What kind of an operation are you carrying on? It is a despicable operation because of the way they treat people from there on up. It is hard to believe what goes on.

A contractor up in that same development had the contract for gravel and hauling and they went out and spent a large amount of money in acquiring heavy truck equipment on finance. All of a sudden you call off the project, and because you allegedly ran out of money. The man had previously a good operation and had to lose all his equipment and lose his business, because of the way you operate up there. I would like to know what you are paying for land. How much money do you plan to spend, and—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order. It is pretty hard to take coming from the member for Kenora—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: I think that you should have this information available, Mr. Minister. We are not a bit happy at the way you are handling things up there. Your public relations is very bad. You have been up there a lot yourself, and I think should. You probably tried to bolster the PR. Your presence there has been good for the operation, but I think you are playing dirty pool on a lot of occasions up there in a lot of cases. So let us have some information on what you are paying for the land and how much money you have spent.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member knows, the acquisition of land is carried out with The Department of Public Works, and we are in the process of getting the information he wanted.

Mr. Sargent: Well, what recourse has a citizen when you walk in and take his land? It was listed for $21,000 and you give him a cheque for $500. What kind of an operation is this? You can dodge this and say it is Public Works, but you are the motivator, it is your project that is going on, why do you not play square with people?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, generally speaking I think the government has been paying, I would say, very good prices for land acquisition, and I am surprised to hear—

Mr. Bullbrook: Good from whose point of view?

Mr. Sargent: That is good—from whose point of view is it good?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As I said earlier, we are getting this specific information and as I also said, land acquisition comes under The Department of Public Works. They are the ones who negotiate.

Mr. Sargent: What are your plans for future development in the peninsula?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well, the peninsula is certainly one of the very attractive parts of this great province of Ontario and the Niagara escarpment committee is carrying out a major proposal. As I mentioned a day or so ago Professor Gaetler's report will be available some time within the next two months.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I have one or two questions in relation to Holiday beach provincial park and their land acquisition programme in that area.

First I might like to underline the comments of my two Liberal colleagues in relation to acquisition of land in the north part of Essex county. Some seven or eight years ago when I was president of the county tourist association and regional tourist association, we did have very intensive tours by the previous Minister of this department in this area looking at sites. I would hope that this Minister, when he does come down into our part of the province, will take a close look at this area for two or three reasons. Most of these have been already mentioned, but I would point out the proximity of rail service in that area might lend itself to a GO transit operation out of the city of Windsor for a day park use. This has potential. Further, in my own part of the county, in the south, our highways are quite clogged with vehicles at the present time and a park established at the north might help relieve some of this congestion, while we are proceeding to construct a major highway in the area.

Turning to the southern part of the county, I wonder what further plans the parks integration board has in acquiring more lands or possibly islands out in Lake Erie as provincial park sites or holding areas? Specifically I realize that you have acquired the Dr. King property adjacent to Holiday beach provincial park, but there has been an expropriation going on for approximately two years by Public Works on property owned by one Mr. Hlavac. I wonder if anything can be expedited by this department to bring this to a successful conclusion? The only other point on this particular park is that I recall vividly the previous Minister, when visiting that park some three years ago, indicated that they may put a hard surface on the gravel roadways in that area because of the dust problems. I wonder if the Minister could comment at this point?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, it is quite true, when the hon. member mentions that this is an area where more beach land is necessary. We are taking steps to acquire more beach land. For instance, the Dr. King property, of several hundred acres, has been acquired, and presently we are negotiating for the Hlavac property.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, some years ago a committee of the Welland county council came to Queen's Park and made representations with regard to a beach park that would be established involving that controversial Sherkston beach. They were informed at the time, by people who purported to be speaking with knowledge if not on behalf of the parks integration board, that a recommendation had been made by the parks integration board for purchase of the necessary land and the establishment of a beach park there. But the whole project seems to have died, disappeared, drifted off into limbo; nothing more has happened. My question to the Minister is: Is there any active contemplation of that request from the Welland county council for a beach park in the Lake Erie area in the southern part of Welland county?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with this proposal. I am fairly familiar with the Sherkston beach and there are people who feel that we should acquire this. Our figures indicate that 90 per cent of the users are Americans. We feel that to acquire this would cost several millions of dollars—more than $2 million, I believe—that if we did acquire this, it would not add to the beach land area. All it would do really would be to subsidize the Americans, because, as I said, 90 per cent of the users are Americans. What we are doing is acquiring beach land on adjacent areas, adjoining areas, and we have under negotiation several areas, but the cost, as you can imagine, is very high.

Mr. MacDonald: As was indicated in one of the studies that was done, they pointed out that most of the other areas along the Great Lakes had beach parks, not just involving the beach but including some hinterland, so that there would be an opportunity for cottage development and things of that nature.

At the moment, I am interested in the Minister's figure that 90 per cent of the people using the Sherkston beach are Americans. It is alleged that the take by the private operators is in the range of $40,000 to $50,000 a week, by charges of $1 per person coming in in the cars there, so that the feeling around is that it is a real gold mine by a private operator who has been given this concession. But it is not just the beach, it is getting back into a park area as well as the beach. So you would have some native development, if I may describe it as such, of cottages and concessions and things of that nature back off the beach itself.

I judge from what the Minister says that there is nothing contemplated there. But there are neighbouring beaches and I presume he wants to play it close to the vest until he has acquired the land. Am I correct, or can you give us specific information as to where other developments and purchases are contemplated?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am advised that near the west side of Bertie township there is an excellent American-owned half mile of beach that the province is presently in the process of acquiring. This will be developed as a provincial park for public use.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister how much has been spent on access points along the shore of Lake Superior, and at what locations was the money spent, and if he has not spent any, does he intend spending any?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to have this information sent over to the hon. member.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he is acquainted with Ouimet canyon, about 40 miles east of Port Arthur?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am not, but I will be going to Port Arthur within the next month.

Mr. Knight: I would like to call it to the hon. Minister's attention, Mr. Chairman, because while I admit not having been there myself in years, I have heard so much about this natural attraction. Scenically, they say it is the Grand canyon of Canada, that it is just a fabulous sight that has sat there for many years.

One of the things that was brought to my attention, Mr. Chairman—and perhaps the Minister will have a chance to look into this or examine it from this aspect—is that apparently the approach to the canyon is on the wrong side of the canyon. An oldtimer who has lived around that area for quite a few years tells me if there would be some way of getting the tourist into the other side of the canyon, it would be something that the people really would talk about, because it is a fabulous sight, a fabulous area.

I am not necessarily suggesting the department should make a provincial park out of it, but I think there should be some attempt made to conserve it in its present state and to attract more attention to it, possibly some co-operative effort with The Department of Tourism and Information. It is one of our really big attractions up there, and if it is promoted in the proper way, it will become something like the sleeping giant that we have in Sibley park, the land mass that lies out in Thunder Bay there. I wanted to call that to the Minister's attention.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that it is a wilderness area and we will look into the hon. member's suggestion.

Mr. B. Newman: I would like to speak on the development of a park and I am going to refer to the Holiday beach in the Essex county area. I would like, if it were possible, Mr. Chairman, and I think it is, for you to have that park developed so that it could have winter use; you have an excellent facility there and the use in the winter is

very limited. As you know, the Essex county is all flat—the city of Windsor, in an attempt to provide recreation for its residents, is building a ski hill. And I would suggest to the Minister that maybe, over a period of time, we would develop a hill in that park so that the residents of the county would likewise have an area which they could use in the winter time and possibly even use for skiing. You know you look upon Essex county area as being the sunshine parlour; you figure there is no winter skiing whatsoever; yet you go 30 miles north of Windsor into the state of Michigan just outside the city of Detroit and there are large ski resort areas developed, and most of them using artificial snow. I think the Holiday beach area could be developed into some type of a ski area after a fashion so that you could get year-round use out of the facility there rather than simply summer and springtime use. I would like to ask the Minister if the department is acquiring any water fowl areas in the county, in the adjacent area? The federal authorities, I understand, have purchased or leased 12,000 acres. We happen to be the only county, or one of the few counties that does not have a conservation authority. And because we do not have a conservation authority in Essex county there is no way of acquiring the land by the municipalities, whereas the provincial authorities, maybe, in co-operation with the federal authorities, could acquire water fowl areas and in that way have an area that could be put to use by the hunters.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the hon. member's suggestion about year-round recreation, it is quite true we are giving a lot of thought to opening some of our parks on a year-round basis, especially today with the emphasis on snowmobiles. This is an area where we are doing something; in fact, we are spending this year about $300,000 or $400,000 to provide snowmobile trails in some of our parks. As far as developing a ski hill is concerned, I think we would have to take a close look at this, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. B. Newman: All you need is a hill, sir, you need nothing else. Look in the city of Windsor and see what they have done with a pile of garbage by building a hill there. I think once you see that you will be more than pleased to copy the idea.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): And Toronto will supply the garbage—we have lots of it sitting around right now.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: With reference to water fowl acquisitions, it appears that we do not have any water fowl acquisition in that area.

Mr. B. Newman: I did not hear that; there were no water fowl areas being acquired whatsoever?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, that is right but there is some excellent water fowl hunting not too far away from Windsor at Long Point, near Rondeau Park and other areas nearby.

Mr. B. Newman: There are other areas in the county, but they are privately owned; they are owned by our friends north of us and as a result our own residents cannot do any hunting in these areas. Has the Minister ever considered a different level of fees for park use? You see we have Point Pelee national park. The admission to that park is 25 cents. Your park is $1.50. Where would you go, Mr. Chairman? You would go to Point Pelee would you not?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The hon. member will agree the federal government is spending—I believe their budget for parks is about $23 million, and therefore they can afford to provide these services at a much lesser revenue.

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, but you see, the $1.50 fee has put the park out of the reach of many.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, $1.

Mr. B. Newman: Even a dollar—the attendance dropped in the park last year, whereas Point Pelee national park attendance increased. If it was not last year, it was the year before. And why did it increase at Point Pelee and decrease in your area? Because a dollar is a lot of money for a family when they can drive a little distance farther and pay only 25 cents.

Vote 1114 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates for The Department of Lands and Forests.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, before these estimates commence, I want to rise on a point of privilege. Since it is so

close to 6 o'clock, I would prefer to raise this point at 8 o'clock when I will have some additional information. Call it 6 o'clock?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): It is only 5 to 6.

Mr. Singer: No, it is two minutes to 6 according to the clock. So I would suggest to you sir, that you can call it 6 o'clock or not, because my point will take several minutes to expand upon.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I think that would be desirable—I have had no notice of this. If you would just outline what the nature of the point is, then we can continue.

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman, I want to present it as a whole. I think there is no point in commencing on a matter that affects the privileges of all members of the House, at a time when you are going to adjourn the House, in one or two minutes from now.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I might say to the member that the point of personal privilege should not be raised in the committee of supply. If it is a point of order dealing with the estimates before us, then, of course, we may consider the point of order, but a point of privilege concerning the privileges of any individual members or the members collectively cannot be raised in committee of supply, and we are here, in committee of supply, dealing only with the estimates before us.

Mr. Singer: Well, I draw your attention, sir, on a point of order, to rule No. 50 of the rules of this House which says: "Whenever any matter of privilege arises, it shall be taken into consideration immediately." Now "immediately" is now.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, that is the point I was trying to get at. "Immediately" is now.

Mr. Singer: All right; there is no point doing something that is going to take ten minutes to deliver when there is only one minute available.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: You said that now is two hours and some time from now.

Mr. Chairman: Of course, it is the Chairman's opinion that the committee is dealing only with the estimates and any point of order pertaining to the estimates may be raised by any member. A point of personal privilege, which is clearly defined, has nothing to do with the estimates and therefore the Chairman has no alternative but to rule the introduction of the point of privilege out of order.

Mr. Singer: Well, with great respect, sir, then I would ask that we appeal your ruling, and that we call in the Speaker to rule on this and I again refer to rule No. 50.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): We are in committee.

Mr. Singer: The rules of the House apply to committee and I would like you to quote some authority that indicates otherwise.

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman has indicated that the particular rule to which the member refers does not refer to the committee of supply and we have no authority to deal with any matters pertaining to anything other than the estimates.

Mr. Singer: Then I challenge your ruling.

Mr. Chairman: It being 6 o'clock, I do now leave the chair and we shall resume at 8 o'clock.

No. 130



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968

Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 27, 1968

Estimates, Department of the Attorney General, Mr. Wishart, continued 4887

Point of privilege, Mr. Singer 4887

Estimates, Department of the Attorney General, Mr. Wishart, continued 4892

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 4917

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
(Continued)

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, at the opening of this evening's session we are in the estimates of the Attorney General; and I wish to move that the committee of supply rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege, and I charge, sir, that the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) has breached the privileges of this House in two ways.

First of all, sir, you will recall that yesterday I posed a question with written notice, the question was not in fact asked, it was question number 12 in my list of some 14 questions and after some discussion we agreed that the question would not be put yesterday.

The question read this way: "Will the Attorney General advise whether those investigating the series of events which led to this action"—that was the action concerning the two magistrates we have been discussing—"indulged in wire tapping and listened in on telephone conversations of any of the persons involved in these incidents?"

That was (a) part; and (b) part: "If so, who amongst those who will be charged with criminal offences or will be subject to public inquiries had their telephone calls listened into, on how many occasions, when; if so, on whose authority did the wire tapping take place?"

As I say, sir, as a result of those discussions and relying on some of the things you said in the discussions that we had, I agreed with you that in view of the fact that the Attorney General had announced details of certain orders in council passed, that the putting of that question in that form would be in breach of the *sub judice* rule and, therefore, I withdrew it.

However, I did today pose a different question and that question was asked. You and I discussed that this morning and that question was asked in this form: "Will the Attorney General advise on how many occasions in the last three months, in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, has wire tapping been used in the course of police investigations. (b) Give the details of each of these occasions. (c) On whose authority was wire tapping used on each of these occasions?"

That question, I think, and I think you agree with me, was within the rules and was not in breach of the *sub judice* rule. The Attorney General answered that question in in this way and I have copied from the *Hansard* proof, his exact words:

> I have knowledge of only one instance. This is relating to the question of wire tapping, the circumstances of which I do not propose to reveal at this time.

And that was his complete answer to that question.

Subsequently, the Attorney General went out into the corridors, spoke to members of the news media and appeared on television. I watched him on television tonight and he conveyed to the news media and to television information that he was not prepared to disclose to this House.

I will not just rely on what I saw on television at 6:45 this evening. I have here the final edition of the Toronto *Daily Star* and in the upper right hand corner headed, "Test Case for Commission—Police Say They Tapped Telephones in Magistrates' Case". Under the by-line of Gwynn Thomas, *Daily Star* writer, these words appear:

> Outside the Legislature, the Attorney General, Arthur Wishart, said wire tapping was used in the magistrates case although their telephones were not tapped. He said police [this is in quotation marks] used

> electronic devices to pick up certain messages on the phones of certain criminals during the investigation.

The story goes on and the implication is that the commission is going to have to rule on the admissibility or not.

Now I say that the privileges of this House have been abused in two ways.

The first way is that the Attorney General chose to convey to the news media information that he was not prepared to give to this House, in fact, that he denied to this House.

I refer to the 17th edition of May at page 377, headed, "Raising Matters of Privilege in the Commons", these words appear:

> Proceedings have been interrupted to allow the raising of a communication to the newspaper of a memorandum explanatory of the bill which will be introduced the next day, after the memorandum has been presented, but before it was available to the members.

Now, that is the exact parallel, but surely, sir, the principle is there. What happened in the House of Commons on that occasion, I am advised, is that Lloyd George, who was the Prime Minister of the day, had conveyed to the news media certain information relating to a bill at a time when he thought that the members would have it prior to it being released to the press. In fact what happend on that day was that the news media got it at four o'clock, and the members were not given it until ten.

The end result of that case was that the Speaker in the House of Commons in England ruled that the action was wrong, and the Prime Minister of the day apologized to the House for that breach. Now, this is much more serious, sir. This is not just conveying to the news media information in advance of the time that it was going to be conveyed to the members of the House. This incident is the conveyance to the news media of information that was specifically denied the members of this House, and, as I say, in doing that the Attorney General seriously breached the privilege of all the members of this House.

The second point that I want to make is this. We know about the *sub judice* rule, and I was prepared to accept your ruling, sir, as I did, and the Attorney General's answer to my question today, while he did not say so, I concluded from his answer that the reason he used the words "Which I do not propose to reveal at this time" was because it related to a matter which was the subject of a public inquiry, and an investigation under section three of The Magistrates Act. I was prepared to accept that because of the *sub judice* rule.

Now, as I say, what the Attorney General has done is to breach the *sub judice* rule. He has gone out and told the news media about evidence that will be presented at the Royal commission, and he has perhaps prejudiced the hearings of that sitting.

May I draw a parallel? If this sort of thing appeared in a criminal trial, where a judge and jury were listening to the evidence, I feel quite certain that any competent judge would have called before him the people responsible for this, given them his views of the sort of discussion that can take place while the trial was going on and probably dismissed the jury. It probably would have been ample cause for mistrial.

Now, of all people in the province, the Attorney General, least of all, should be one that either will destroy the privileges of the members of this House, or secondly, breach an important rule of this House. I say the privileges have been breached, and that the Attorney General should be brought before the Bar of this House, and dealt with accordingly.

Mr. Speaker: The matter which has been raised by the member for Downsview is one which normally and ordinarily I would wish to take under consideration. But in view of the fact that the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General are presently, or were recently and will shortly be, before the committee of the whole House, it would appear to me that this matter should be dealt with forthwith.

Not knowing, of course, the reason for the member stating, before the committee rose at 6 o'clock, he had a point of personal privilege, I nevertheless had the opportunity of consulting with the authorities. I am pleased to see that the procedures outlined in our rules and expounded in May, and about which I have been advised by the preceding Speaker, who is very good with these matters, and the clerk, I am pleased to see that we have followed the proper procedure.

I think, therefore, that it is only right at this time that as the member of this House—that is, the member for Downsview—has stated that the Attorney General should be given the opportunity to speak on the point that has been raised by the member for

Downsview; therefore I would give the floor to the Attorney General.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, before the Attorney General speaks, and on a point of order, I would believe that it would be correct to designate it thus. I think that the member for Downsview, quite properly, referred to sections from May dealing with the procedure by which the matter would be brought before the House when the House was sitting in committee. I do not think that it had anything to do with the substance of the question and I question very clearly, whether the hon. member for Downsview has in fact, established a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege. It would appear to me that, in the light of his remarks, the first step that Mr. Speaker should take would be to decide whether he has a *prima facie* case of breach of any of the privileges of the member of the House.

I listened to what the member for Downsview had to say very carefully, and I must confess that the sense of the breach of my privilege escaped me entirely. I would therefore ask if you would decide, in the light of what the member for Downsview has said, and before the Attorney General is required to reply, whether in fact there is a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege made out by the member for Downsview.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale has taken his point well.

With respect to the (b) part of the member for Downsview's submission, I do not think that there has been a *prima facie* case made out, in my opinion. With respect to the part (a) of his submission, it is my opinion that there is sufficient—if not a *prima facie* case, because there is quite an area between a *prima facie* case and a proven case—if not a *prima facie* case, enough has been said on the subject by the member for Downsview to make it seem reasonable to me that the member about whose actions he has complained to Mr. Speaker in this House should be given the opportunity to speak to the matter. I would so again yield him the floor, particularly with respect to point (a) raised by the member for Downsview.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would submit first that there is no real point of privilege here at all, but I welcome the opportunity to deal with the question raised by the hon. member for Downsview, which he calls a point of privilege.

He is quite correct when he says that the question that he had designed yesterday with regard to wire tapping was not asked. Today, in this House, he did submit the question, which was his number 4, I believe: "Would the Attorney General advise on how many occasions in the last three months in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto has wire tapping been used in the course of police investigation?" He is quite correct in stating the answer I gave, which was: "I have knowledge of only one instance, the circumstances of which I will not reveal at this time." And that one instance, Mr. Speaker, was this instance, the subject of this public inquiry, the whole matter, and that is the only instance. That is the only situation of which I have knowledge.

At the time I answered that question, Mr. Speaker, I did not know that any publicity had been given from any other source on the matter of wire tapping. Shortly after I had answered that question, perhaps an hour later, I was outside the House, and I saw this paper, the Toronto *Daily Star* of today, the four star edition, which had this headline: "Test Case for Commission—Police Say They Tapped Phones in Magistrates Case." The press approached me and asked me if this was so, and I then confirmed it. It was then public knowledge, but I restrained and restricted myself to saying that the only case, to my knowledge, was this instance, as I had answered in the House.

I went this much further, Mr. Speaker, because there seemed to be some speculation that the magistrates' phones had been tapped. I took the occasion to say that so far as my knowledge runs, there was no tapping of the phones of the two magistrates in question. I felt that was fair, proper, and advisable to say. Had I known that this information was public at the time I was answering the question in the House, if it was then public, I would have perhaps been free to give detail to the extent that I gave it outside the House. I said the phone of a criminal person with a criminal record had been tapped, or at least had been tapped by electronic means.

That I said, Mr. Speaker. This edition which I saw does not carry any comment of an interview with me, as to what the Attorney General said outside the House. In the edition from which the hon. member quotes; "the Attorney General said outside the House," that must be a later edition, and I did say what I have said now outside the House. I answered the question of the hon.

member in the House to the extent I felt proper at the time. I confirmed the matter, since it had become public knowledge to the press outside. This was really a confirmation of what I said in the House. I have knowledge of this instance. At that time I did not wish to give details. The only detail I gave was that the magistrate's phone had not been tapped but that the phone of some person with a criminal record had been tapped.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the question of the second part of the hon. member's complaint, the question of privilege, as to the matter of the inquiry being *sub judice*, I agree with him entirely that it is entirely *sub judice*. To make any comment on evidence, to say anything about the content of what was obtained by the tapping, would have been completely out of order, would have been a breach, which I did not make.

To merely say that the phone had been tapped, I think was what I had said in the House. I have no intention of denying members in the House knowledge of anything which was said outside, I made no comment on the type of evidence, or the nature of the evidence, except to say when I was asked, what the evidence is. I said this type of evidence will be for the commisison to weigh and decide its weight. I did not say what it was or make any comment upon it.

So I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I have broken no rule of this House or treated these members with any prejudice; certainly I had no intention of doing so. If your honour should rule that I have, I would be the first, sir, to say if I did, it was not intentional. I do not think I did breach any rule of the House or any rule of privilege. I think I have made no comment in the House or outside the House which would be prejudicial to this inquiry. No comment of mine will be found to express any opinion as to weight, value or nature of evidence except the way it was taken, which I admitted to the House in answer to the question of the hon. members there was an instance of wire tapping. That is all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I would say only this: I do not suggest the Attorney General did this with evil intent. I suggest that he talks too much.

I suggest, sir, that he had no right—and I suggest this in all seriousness and it emanates from everything he has said—he had no right to go outside the confines of this House, no matter what appeared in the newspapers, and to tell the press or to tell the news media something that he was not prepared to tell the members of this House. That, sir, is a serious breach of privilege.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): That comes from the member with ill grace.

Mr. Speaker: It is quite apparent to me, and I presume to the members of the House, that with respect to the second part of the submission of the member for Downsview there would not appear to be any basis in fact for the same and I would reject it.

With respect to the first part, I think the Attorney General has been most unwise. I think he would have been much better advised, having found in the interests of appearing to have justice done in the province and having made the statement which he felt was necessary under those circumstances to the press, that he should have made the occasion to report to this House similar things to those which he had told the press, which he could have done at the beginning of the estimates of that department.

However, it is also quite apparent that, so far as the Attorney General is concerned, there was no premeditation and it was one of those things which can happen to any member, or even a Minister of the Crown. It has not caused any serious harm to the privileges of the members of this House. I agree somewhat with the member for Riverdale, that except technically, there has been no breach of the privileges of the members of this House.

Therefore, I do not feel that this is a case where I should find that the Minister has breached the privileges of this House and I would hope that, with the explanations and discussions which we have had up to now, that the House will be able to resume its work in committee and deal with the important business of the House and of the province.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, before the order is called—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, before the order is called, I wonder if the Speaker would take under consideration and advise us, at his convenience, of whether or not the so-called *sub judice* rule applies to this kind of an inquiry. I am not an expert on the rules, but I have looked a little bit at May and it would appear to me to be restricted solely to matters before a court of law—criminal matters from

the time they are instituted and civil matters from the time at which the particular action is set down for trial.

It has been customary here, I think, to use the term *sub judice* loosely and inaccurately, perhaps by all sides of the House. And I question, under the reading as I have it in May, whether the reference by the government under The Public Inquiries Act or under The Magistrates Act in the appointment of a judge to hold that wide-ranging investigation is, in fact, a matter which is *sub judice*.

I note that, apart from criminal cases in courts of law and civil cases, May, 17th edition, on page 454, refers only to one other type of matter which could be considered *sub judice*. I quote very briefly: "The ban also applies in the case of any judicial body". I assume that the judge in this case would be considered a judicial body. But that is limited in the following way, and I continue the quotation—

Mr. Singer: May I ask the hon. member what page?

Mr. J. Renwick: Page 454.

Mr. Singer: The 17th edition?

Mr. J. Renwick: I think so. Yes, 17th edition. If I may just continue to quote:

> To which the House has expressly referred a specific matter for decision and report from the time when the resolution of the House is passed but ceases to have effect as soon as the report is laid before the House.

It would appear to me that if this matter were referred after debate in this House by resolution of this House for a judicial inquiry the rule would apply. But the government has, in this instance and in past instances, chosen not to bring the matter forward as a resolution to be debated in this House as to the terms of reference, both in the inquiry relating to the then chief coroner in Metropolitan Toronto—the present member for High Park (Mr. Shulman)—and in this instance. I would respectfully submit and request your ruling, at your convenience, that this matter, having been referred to a Supreme Court judge under The Magistrates Act, and in the case of Magistrate Bannon under The Public Inquiries Act, is not a matter which is *sub judice*.

I would make this other comment that I think it would be quite in order for discussion in the House to be ruled out of order, but not because it is *sub judice*, simply because it is being better and more expeditiously handled elsewhere, which is a different point from being *sub judice*. We tend to use *sub judice* as a cloak rather than as a mechanism for furthering the intelligent discussion of political affairs.

As I say, I can see the matter being ruled out of order on a different ground if it made sense to do so in a specific instance. It may not be a blanket rule but, generally speaking, not a matter properly to be debated. But I am very reluctant, particularly so long as we sit in opposition, to see the term *sub judice* used loosely as a method of cloaking what, to my mind, are matters which may well in various of their implications be matters which should be debated in the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: May I first of all say I am pleased that the member for Riverdale is in good voice again and able to use his voice, because there are many times when he does bring to the House interesting comments. I enjoyed the one just now where he qualified his statement by the words "so long as we are on this side of the House". I thought that was a gem and I wish to commend him on the manner in which he placed his point of order.

I must say, that I was prepared earlier today to deal with this particular point because it is a matter which was in discussion earlier. I had then a ruling, I think by Mr. Speaker Morrow, with respect to it which is not at the moment available to me but I would be most pleased to deal with that matter, I hope, by tomorrow morning. My recollection of the ruling in somewhat similar cases was that the *sub judice* rule has been extended, by this House, to cover such commissions and authorities appointed under the two Acts, or similar Acts referred to by the member. But this is one point that I will take under consideration and endeavour to deal with tomorrow.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Speaker, in so doing, would you please give the House your opinion on distinction between a judge and a *persona designata*?

Mr. Speaker: I would be pleased to bear that submission in mind.

Clerk of the House: The 18th order; House in committee of supply, Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

(Continued)

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, it is again my privilege and responsibility to present to this Legislature the estimates for The Department of the Attorney General for the year 1968-69.

It is not my intention, Mr. Chairman, to review in detail the financial operations of my department for the previous year since, I believe, all of this has become apparent to the Legislature through the public accounts committee which devoted considerable time to a review of my department at approximately ten meetings which were devoted to this subject over the past months. These recent meetings with the standing committee on public accounts were perhaps the most exhaustive that have been held in recent years, certainly as far as my own department is concerned and I should advise this House, Mr. Chairman, that we considered it a privilege and a very worthwhile experience to be able to spend that amount of time with the members of the Legislature who sat on that committee. The civil servants who had the opportunity of explaining the operations in which they are involved and of answering the pertinent questions of the members of the committee found the comments and constructive criticisms not only helpful but encouraging. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the exhaustive review which we had in this other forum will, in some way, shorten the proceedings at this time since, no doubt, many of the members have already received information which will obviate the necessity for pursuing some of the matters that have already been discussed.

I feel that it might be helpful to the hon. members if I did pursue for just a moment the various principles inherent in the office of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General since these principles, in my own view, provide the context within which I attempt to discharge my responsibilities. I am sure that if the hon. members understand these principles they will be able to consider in a more constructive sense the estimates which I will shortly place before them for their consideration.

The office which I have the privilege to hold has always been singular in its difficulties because of the variety of responsibilities which the unfortunate or fortunate incumbent must discharge to the government, the Legislature, the people of the province and the administration of justice. It was only three hundred years ago, a relatively short time in our constitutional history, that the attitude of the members of the House of Commons in the United Kingdom evolved to an extent that would permit the Attorney General to take a seat in the House of Commons because up until that time he had always been considered an adviser to the House of Lords and the Crown rather than to the Commons. We all recall that at the opening of every session of this Legislature the justices of the Supreme Court assemble with us to receive the Speech from the Throne. At one time the law officers of the Crown were summoned to attend at Parliament in the same capacity as the judges of the Supreme Court, for all of these legally trained people were summoned to attend, not as council members but rather as advisers.

This brief excursion into history demonstrates two of the major capacities which the present law officers of the Crown must discharge in our own province. This dualism in his participation in the affairs of the state has been recognized for hundreds of years and is still recognized frequently both in Canada and in the United Kingdom. The law officer today must, on matters of law, adopt an attitude of independence so that he may speak as a lawyer advising the Legislature and not as a politician supporting the government's position. The Rt. Hon. Harold Wilson, when he was leader of the Opposition at Westminster, put it very well in 1963 when he said, and I quote,

> The Attorney General, whoever he may be, is not only the legal adviser to the Crown and to the government. He is also the servant of the House. It is, from time to time, his duty to advise the House on legal matters—a duty going beyond his responsibility to the government and to the Crown—

At the same time, however, the Attorney General as a member of the government has a political responsibility and must share in the collective responsibility of the government. Sir Hartly Shawcross, after his experience as the chief law officer of the Crown in the United Kingdom stated,

> But whilst participation in party politics, and, of course, a share in the collective responsibility of the government for action that is taken, are normally incidental to the office of the Attorney General, it remains the clearest rule that in the dis-

> charge of his legal and discretionary duties the Attorney General is completely divorced from party political considerations and from any kind of political control.

I mention these principles, Mr. Chairman, because I have conscientiously attempted over my period of service to provide independent and accurate legal advice wherever possible and have attempted, to the best of my abilities, to maintain an independence in the operation of my office as a servant of this Legislature in order that all of the hon. members may have such assistance as I may offer, inadequate though it may be.

However, Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is singular within the provinces of Canada that the responsibilities of the Attorney General extend beyond the duality that exists in the United Kingdom, for in Ontario the Minister of Justice and Attorney General also assumes the responsibilities of the Secretary of State for Home Affairs which office exists in the government at Westminster upon which our parliamentary system is established.

Thus we find that in addition to the responsibilities as chief law officer, our Attorney General also has the responsibility for the administration of the courts, the administration of a large police force and the additional administrative responsibilities for the operation of so many offices such as the registry and land titles offices and the coroners' offices, and many other agencies associated with the courts, the public safety and the public protection.

The responsibility inherent in the duties I have just outlined is perhaps one of the highest responsibilities which a member of this Legislature may discharge, for these matters represent the administration of justice which is the basis for our whole social structure. My responsibility in this arena must be more political, in the higher sense of that word, and it is here that every member of this Legislature will share in expressing those comments that are needed in order that our system for the administration of justice may reflect the needs of our growing society.

A further responsibility which, in my own view, is different from those to which I have already referred, is that which the chief law officer has, to ensure the independent prosecution of offenders under the criminal law. Here again the responsibility must be completely divorced from any political or governmental considerations and the discretion which the chief law officer has must be exercised without any executive interference. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, governments have been defeated where a question has arisen as to the possibility of executive interference in the exercise of the discretion of the chief law officer of the Crown. The Labour government of Great Britain in 1924 was defeated largely as a result of a question that arose at that time about the Campbell case, when it was alleged that there had been an interference by the government with the approach which Sir Patrick Hastings took to a case when he was serving as Attorney General. This question arose in the prosecution of Thomas Paine in 1793 when Sir John Scott, the then Attorney General, was conducting that particular prosecution for sedition. In the classical language of the English bar Sir John Scott stated the proposition then, but I repeat it since it is valid in this Legislature today.

> The Attorney General must discharge his duty in criminal prosecutions by a conscientious pursuance of his own judgment, which may well be guided by the opinions and advice of many persons in all stations of life, but he must ultimately be guided by his own conscience for he alone is ultimately responsible.

That is the end of the quotation.

Within the context of these principles, Mr. Chairman, and as a member of the government, as an independent legal adviser to this Legislature, as an independent prosecutor for the Crown and as the supervisor of the administration of justice I would now proceed to review with this Legislature my proposed estimates for the ensuing year.

I am sure that the hon. members will recognize that there is an increase in the estimates of $20,712,500, exclusive of the Ontario provincial police force. Of this very substantial increase, approximately $14 million is represented by the costs we will incur with the assumption of the responsibility for the financing of the administration of justice throughout this province. This, of course, is a most significant step forward and the hon. members are all familiar with the principles relative to this programme since these have been discussed in substantial detail during the passage of the various bills which have been introduced to accomplish this ultimate objective. I should note, Mr. Chairman, that this substantial increase does not include the anticipated cost relative to the buildings that house the administration of

justice throughout Ontario and that particular cost will be reflected in the estimates of The Department of Public Works which has the responsibility for that portion of this programme.

The legal aid fund represents the second largest area of increase in these estimates and the hon. members will note that we are seeking the sum of $6 million this year to sustain the legal aid plan as compared with the $2 million which was provided last year.

I do wish to make just a few comments respecting the legal aid plan, Mr. Chairman, but before leaving the matter of the increase in our estimates may I point out that the additional increase of $2 million is almost completely represented by the rising costs with which we are all faced and does not represent any expansion of any significant size in any of the other programmes of the department. While our total complement is now approximately 3,700 persons as compared with approximately 2,300 persons as of the end of 1967 I would point out that we are only seeking 40 additional positions for the department despite tremendously increased responsibility demonstrated by the additional work that is entailed in the assumption of all of the outside offices related to the administration of justice.

If I might, Mr. Chairman, just for a moment revert to the legal aid plan may I say that in the opinion of those who have worked with it the plan has been a substantial and significant contribution to the administration of justice in this province. While it has entailed the expenditure of public moneys, I would hope that all of the hon. members would recognize with me that the plan has made available to all persons in this province that legal assistance which is so desirable in our present society.

I believe that a few brief statistics might be interesting to the hon. members at this time.

During the year ending March 31, 1968 54,760 applications were received for legal aid in Ontario, and of this number 51,424 were referred to the welfare officers for consideration. Provisional certificates, which are those certificates issued prior to the welfare investigation, were issued in 9,550 cases primarily to those in need of advice in criminal matters of a highly emergent nature. Certificates of eligibility which permits the individual to proceed with his legal matter were issued in 38,860 cases approximately 45 per cent of which were criminal in nature. The balance of the applications for which certificates have not yet been issued are still being considered as at any given time there must always be a number of applications which have not yet been completely dealt with by the legal aid plan.

Of the total number of cases in which certificates have been issued approximately 5,281 are cases in which the applicant is contributing to some extent towards his own legal assistance so that in 14 per cent of the cases we do have this participation by the applicant.

One other area which I feel is exceedingly important in our system of legal aid is that relating to the duty counsel who appears in every criminal court in the province as well as in most of the civil courts and who is available to persons who are appearing for the first time and have not yet had the opportunity of retaining counsel. Over the last year these duty counsel have represented 67,204 individuals of whom 52,668 were appearing in our criminal courts.

While statistics are often misleading, I do feel, Mr. Chairman, that these figures represent how effective the legal aid plan has been in bringing legal assistance to those people in this province who might not otherwise have had it available to them. The cost has not been as substantial as some people have anticipated although I must acknowledge that the cost is increasing and will perhaps continue to increase as the plan develops. However, the benefits received by our citizens from the plan, I feel, far outweigh the expenses which have accrued and with the continuing co-operaiton and contribution of the legal profession I am sure this plan will continue to be the outstanding system of legal aid, both on this continent and abroad.

May I now present to this Legislature, Mr. Chairman, the estimates for The Department of the Attorney General for the year 1968-1969.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Chairman, might I first take this opportunity of commending the Attorney General in connection with his comments and prepared statement that he furnished us, his colleagues, with this evening. I was most taken with his historical approach. I had the opportunity of reading *Hansard* for the last three or four years and I think this is somewhat of a novel approach towards the presentation of his estimates.

I want to make some comment also during the course of perhaps my opening remarks, but certainly when we come to digest the expenditure of $6.7 million in connection with the legal aid system. I believe the government is generally to be complimented in connection with this somewhat unique and, I would say, far-sighted approach towards the necessary application of the principle of a just society, at least in this province, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to attempt to assure my colleagues that I will not be too long. I believe there have been some arrangements, Mr. Chairman, between our leaders in connection with the length of the opening statements.

I must say that I feel, having digested somewhat those remarks that have been made by my predecessors in this present responsibility, that there is somewhat of a burden on me tonight that I do not entirely accept with joy, and that is I feel that to criticize The Department of the Attorney General and mainly The Department of the Minister of Justice of this province is a delicate task in itself.

Every member of this Legislature, Mr. Chairman, I am sure feels a responsibility at all times in no way showing any disposition towards disrespect either to the administration of justice or to the bench of this province, no matter what level. And I would hope my colleagues in the profession here in the House would agree with me—that when you have a background in the legal profession you recognize this responsibility even more so.

Over and above that, I must confess that the responsibility to criticize this department, aside from those matters that I just mentioned, is a difficult one because we are dealing here with a fine gentleman who occupies this position of responsibility.

However, be that as it may, I have taken issue with him in the past, and I am sure I will continue to take issue with him. I sat here tonight listening to his explanation in connection with those unfortunate circumstances that transpired between the hours of two o'clock this afternoon and eight o'clock, and I must say—and I say it most respectfully—that his rationalization of his position in this connection was in my opinion quite thin.

However, what has happened since my predecessor rose in this House in 1967 to the present time has, in my opinion, been somewhat of an evolutionary and revolutionary year in the administration of justice.

Here in the province of Ontario we have seen many things happen, but more importantly I suggest to my colleagues here, that in the Parliament of Canada we have seen things happen. Finally, Mr. Chairman, Hamurabbi has been laid to rest and the concept of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth is leaving the thought of the law and the legislators of this great Dominion of ours, and very nearly time, I put it, very nearly time.

And I say this to you, sir, also, that I can well nigh not contain my enthusiasm for what is happening in our great country and in our province. The concept of new approaches to the problems of abortion, the fact that finally we are tearing ourselves away from the ridiculous skirts of undue philosophical and theological rationalization of positions.

I should leave this type of comment to my great colleague, the Montesquieu from Lakeshore, but I do have to say this: I think, Mr. Chairman, this shows a vitalization in our approach to life. Thank God that shortly a man in this great country can say yes, I want the wife of my five children to live, and thank God that finally we are getting to a situation where he can say that and it is not against the law.

And I say thank God finally the legislators of this country and this House, we ourselves, are looking at a new approach to divorce; thank God, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Attorney General, thank God he and I do not have to look at the charade of adultery before the justices of the Supreme Court of Ontario. Thank God—and I do not mean this to be unduly political—that we are finally looking at a situation of social justice in the Dominion of Canada.

This is really what we have been looking at in the last year. It has taken a great deal of courage, but the people of this country, I think, are reciprocating to this attitude. And I wanted to make this comment because I feel quite sincerely, vigorously about it, it is very nearly time, sir, that we have had leadership of this nature.

We, too, in this House here, although I will say that our role primarily is a technical role—we do not have the opportunities I think because of the constitutional aspect of things, to look at the very foundation of criminal matters—I think our role is more one of administration and supervision.

I think we can take pride in this government and we in our position, because as you look at *Hansard*, the majority of things that have happened have been initiated right here

on this side of the House. I think we can take pride in the attitude that has flown from our four reports that have been tabled thus far by the Ontario law reform commission. I do not think there is any doubt on that question.

As I said before, *Hansard* discloses that some three years ago this whole concept came from this side of the House; this need to look at these measures. Absolutely.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): And they came from this party 10 years ago.

Mr. Bullbrook: I had practically the authority from High Park once to say something. What was that?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The hon. member for High Park figures you could not have thought of it before he got here.

Mr. Bullbrook: Right!

In any event we can take pride in the legislation that is coming to finality now in connection with the elevation of our provincial courts. This has been a thing that was sadly needed. I am going to make mention afterwards of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that of course, the elevation of names, the changing of the name from a magistrate to a judge and the elevation of his compensation does not always assure justice. I recognize, sir, as we all do, that you cannot always legislate compassion, and we cannot always assure the milk of human kindness on the bench, although this is a responsibility that I feel the Attorney General at times rationalizes himself out of.

I am going to discuss one situation that I think is absolutely flagrant and shocking that was before this House in the month of April. I recognize that this is a sincere attempt that, together with the administration of the justice bill, itself a sincere attempt to upgrade the facility, upgrade the type of talent that is available to us. We do need, there is no doubt about it.

If I might be permitted for one moment, Mr. Chairman, to comment on something that bothers me, as a new member of this House, relatively new, but in connection with the administration of justice I would like *Hansard* to record this. I think the time has come to the province of Ontario that in connection with our supreme court justices, we have got to stop calling them "lordships." There are no lords in Ontario. This is anglicizing this thing too much.

In my short experience before the bench, the thing that we need more than anything else is to bring to the attention of the public that those people who sit on that bench are human beings, and that there is no fear to be judged, because they are going to be judged with equity, and with compassion.

Some of the trappings that surround the bench, especially on the supreme court level, bother me. This business of "our lord." I know what is meant by it. We want to convey the degree of respect that is due to the bench. I know that is what we want, but I must say, Mr. Chairman, I think we go a little too far. We took the wigs off them, and I think we should get down to some common denominator, such as "your honour," and perhaps a little less of the refinements that they are clothed with now.

Some of them—this is the delicate point that I was talking about, this is very difficult for me to say—but some of them really think they are clothed with the mantle of the deity when they go on the bench. They really do. It is just awful. Some of them when they go up there, and sit on that bench, from then on it is complete omniscience. They never make a mistake. They know everything, and they never make a mistake. Infallible as corrected—however, I digress.

The most significent thing that happened during the course of the last year, of course, was the publication of the report by Mr. McRuer on civil rights. That is a monumental cornerstone as far as the operation of justice in this province is concerned.

Chapters 61 to 64 dwell entirely on the function, responsibility and the office of Attorney General. A person could spend at least two hours digesting the attitude and the approach of Mr. McRuer to the office of Attorney General. I commend it to everyone in this House. I know the Attorney General has read it because it exemplifies itself in the statement that he made here previously. But the main thing that I want to bring to the attention of this House, and I think the most important feature of that which Mr. McRuer said is the question of the responsibility of the Attorney General in connection with advising on legislation.

I must say this—that I have been somewhat shocked at times at the draftsmanship of some of the laws presented to us and frankly at the attempt at conveying the substance of the law in the bills that are presented to us. On five occasions I have risen in this House—and I have counted them in *Hansard*—on five occasions I have risen in

this House, and taken technical issue with various interpretations of statutes that have been put before us. I hate to say that on not one occasion have I been right, because every one of those bills went through without any amendment as I suggested. Not once in this House have I been right. But every time out in the corridor I have been right, every time.

This gets us to the point that the Attorney General mentioned, and I suggest this to you—the responsibility to be above party politics in connection with legislative interpretation. I must say that I find you fall short there; with respect, you do fall short. There are times when I feel that it stretches even your capabilities to rationalize that side of the House out of problems that they find themselves in—legal problems that they find themselves in. You do a good job at attempting it, but you have not been able to convince me on too many occasions.

However, Mr. McRuer, the basic position taken by him, Mr. Chairman, is that there has to be a consolidation of legal talent and legal effort. There is just too much diffusion. He says, on page 955 of his report, under summary of recommendation on the role of the Attorney General in government —I am not going to deal with the first three of them, they are really minor in nature, they deal with the operation of Crown attorneys throughout the province—but he says, 4: "There should be a legislative branch of the Attorney General's department."

Prior to this he had gone into a breakdown of the number of law offices of the Crown that we have here, operating in the various departments of this government—5, he says: "Strict procedure should be adopted for the preparation of legislative bills." Well, the departmental Minister should be responsible for the social policy of all bills. "It should be clearly recognized that the Attorney General is constitutionally responsible for the legal policy of all the bills." You have accepted that, but it has not been done adequately in my submission, Mr. Chairman:

> 6. When a department proposes new legislation a memorandum embodying the principles of legislation should be submitted for approval to the Cabinet so that the government's policy may be determined before the drafting begins.

I am skipping 7—

> 8. The legal services of the government should be reorganized so that all legal services come under the direction of the Attorney General's department.

This is absolutely essential, Mr. Chairman. It is very nearly time now.

This government has been prepared to accept from McRuer some of the recommendations that seem politically expedient to accept at that time. But this one is not going to cause expenditure of a great amount of money. But the central responsibility for legislative opinion rests with the Attorney General. And I think in fairness to him, he must be given this concentricity of approach that Mr. McRuer recommends.

As I said before, much time can be spent in discussing Mr. McRuer and his approach to The Department of the Attorney General. This will be elaborated upon by my friends and by myself during the course of the individual votes in the estimates of the department, but I feel frankly that I want to dwell at some length on one matter that came up before this House. And to me, I suggest it is a typical example of the fact that the Attorney General goes to great lengths at times to act as an apologist, not only for the ineptitude of government policy, but at times for the bench, when the bench does not deserve any apologia.

I refer to what I call the Bigelow incident. I sat here in this back bench, and I listened to the repartee that went on between the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) and the Attorney General in connection with the attitudes and actions of Magistrate Bigelow and his treatment of drunks. Perhaps you think, Mr. Chairman, that I waste the time of the House in bringing this up. But I put it to you this way, and I say it most respectfully, it has been said before that that which you do to one of these, the least of my brethren, you do to me.

This is the way the Liberal Party feels about justice. This is why we want to get into this tonight, because I want to show you, I want to read into the record, what happened between the drunks and Magistrate Bigelow. Then I want to read again, the criminal code and I want to read again the apologia as I call it, of the hon. Attorney General.

If I might read from the *Globe and Mail* of Monday, May 20, headed, "A Day In the Court of Magistrate S. T. Bigelow, Q.C.:

> Excerpts from court proceedings held at Toronto on May 17 before His Worship

S. T. Bigelow, Q.C. D. Johnson appeared for the Crown; S. Linden was duty counsel.

Mr. Johnson: Number 8 on Your Worship's list is Donald Morrison. Is Donald Morrison here?

The accused: Here.

Mr. Johnson: How do you intend to plead?

The accused: Guilty, Your Honour.

Mr. Johnson: Arraign the accused, please.

And then, the clerk of the court reads the charge.

The accused: Guilty, sir.

Clerk of the Court: No record.

Mr. Johnson: I have nothing unusual in the circumstances, Your Worship.

The Court: The accused will be fined $10 or two days.

Mr. Linden: Your Worship, on behalf of the accused may I ask that he have time to pay his fine?

The Court: No time to pay.

Mr. Linden: Your Worship, the accused man is 40 years of age, he resides at ——, has been there for about three months your Worship, he works for —— as dock loader and he's been employed with that company for approximately a year, Your Worship.

The Court: Thank you. Next case please.

Mr. Johnson: Number 11 on Your Worship's list is David Campbell.

And we go on and in fairness, I wish to shorten the reading of this and go down to the third accused—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): It will not make any impression if you do not read it all.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well I hesitate not to read it all because one must read the whole thing. I think the member for Riverdale is right. But we continue and keep this in mind, the duty counsel for whom we are going to vote $6.7 million — legal aid right — he is there representing the accused intoxicates. We finally get down, for example:

The accused: Guilty, Your Honour.

Clerk of the Court: No record, Your Worship.

Mr. Johnson: Nothing unusual in the circumstances, Your Worship.

The Court: The accused will be fined $10 or two days.

Mr. Linden: Your Worship, on behalf of the accused may I ask that he have time to pay?

This is the third time now.

The Court: May I save you a little time? I don't give time to pay on any offence under The Liquor Control Act.

Mr. Linden: Your Worship, I prefer to make my submissions. The accused man, Mr. Campbell, is 56 years of age. He resides at ——. He's been there for seven years, Your Worship. He's employed by —— as a maintenance mechanic for 2.5 years.

Now here come—in the vernacular—the beautiful remarks of that compassionate man on the bench. Here they come now:

Why do you make submissions when I say I don't grant time to pay under The Liquor Control Act?

Mr. Linden: Your Worship, I feel I have an obligation to the person whom I am appearing on behalf.

The Court: You are just wasting your time.

Mr. Linden: Well with respect—

The Court: And the court's time and everybody concerned with the court.

Now five more times that happened and let *Hansard* also record the respect of the member for Sarnia for one Mr. S. Linden, because what he did that day was take care of the very responsibility that our profession and the legal aid system of Ontario gave him. Mr. Chairman, that is what he did.

He would not let that man wear him down. He would not let that magistrate wear him down, Mr. Chairman. Every time he got up and spoke on behalf of those accused; each time attempting to elicit from the bench, one—an exercise of discretion, which he did not get and, two—a little bot of compassion, which he did not get. Instead, he got abuse —that is what he got. He was told in effect: "Do not waste my time, I have not got time to listen. These men are really only drunks and they have been here many, many times before." Then we are involved, on May 22, 1968, in questions put forward by my colleague from Sudbury and previously by the hon. member for High Park in connection with this report. Frankly I again wish I could read it all, but you will find it gentlemen on pages 3196 to 3198 of *Hansard*.

But what has happened there is that the Attorney General went over the provisions of

section 694 of the code. I want to read this to you because my friend from Sudbury could have put this forward much better on that occasion and this occasion, than I can tonight, as is his talent and wont. But he did not have the opportunity because this was during the question period. But the section 694 says:

> Where a summary conviction court directs that an accused pay a fine, the court shall not at the time the sentence is imposed, direct that the fine be paid forthwith unless—

Now that is the onus right there placed upon the court. The court is told not to have the fine paid forthwith unless one of three things happen:

> (a) The court is satisfied that the convicted person is possessed of sufficient means to enable him to pay the fine forthwith.
>
> (b) Upon being asked by the court whether he desires time for payment, the convicted person does not request such time or,
>
> (c) For any other special reason, the court deems it expedient that no time should be allowed.

Now these words were read and a complete rationalization taken by the hon. Attorney General because, in my respectful opinion, on this occasion the magistrate did not fall within the purview of (a), (b) or (c) or never attempted to put himself within that purview. But what was not read that day was subsection 5 which reads:

> The court, in considering whether time should be allowed for payment, and if so, for what period shall consider any representations made by the accused.

"Shall consider" any representations made by the accused, not "may consider," not "prejudge" the man because he has been convicted 68 times before, because, strangely enough, our system of justice says we do not care if they have been convicted 68 times before. The criminal code says we do not care if they have been convicted 68 times before and the book says we do not care if they are a shell of humanity.

As my friend from Sudbury said, of any people coming before the court who need some understanding and compassion, it is these poor drunks. But what did he get—he got nothing and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, what the Attorney General said—his statement is in the record, but he ended up with these words, and this is why I made up my mind that I was going to discuss this again at length. He said:

> So far, Mr. Speaker, as I am concerned the magistrate in these cases acted completely within his jurisdiction and in accordance with proper principles which he applied with proper reason and understanding.

Those are the great words, with proper reason and understanding.

I like to think, Mr. Chairman, that the Attorney General did not write that. I like to think that somebody within his staff wrote that and because of the exigencies of the moment or the burden of his office, he was not able to fully digest the significance of what he said there before he said it in this House.

Because those words do not exemplify, to me, the individual personality and attitude of the Attorney General here. What they do exemplify to me, and I say it most respectfully, is stupidity.

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to say it, but this is stupidity. The criminal code speaks—and it does not speak equivocally at all; it tells the magistrate what he has to do. It gives him no alternative. He must listen to representations. Not only did this man not act with proper reason and understanding, he acted outside the law.

I say this: perhaps I would not act otherwise, Mr. Chairman. It is a most difficult task. I went down and sat down there. We are fortunate in the city of Sarnia. We have wonderful accommodation both in our police and in our court. I sat down there, in these holes they call magistrate courts here, and how these magistrates can contain themselves in many circumstances I do not know. The very stench of the court is enough, so I can understand that at times there would perhaps be lack of compassion, but I must say this: The magistrate did not act with reason and understanding; he acted entirely wrong.

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): He preferred horses.

Mr. Bullbrook: And in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, this is why we must have the Attorney General at all times diligent for the rights of the individual. I do not really think that he meant what he said there. But if he did, he is entirely wrong. During the course of the estimates I invite him to debate the application of 694-4 a, b, and c, and subsection 5 to the circumstances that are now on the record here.

We invite that type of debate. Our main concern is this—and this is why we wanted

to put these thoughts on the record here tonight. The main concern of this party is that the very essence of justice is the law, and if there is no application of the law, you do not have justice. We feel frankly that the very soul of government has to be justice, and that is why our great concern lies in the proper application of principles and precepts of both the law and justice.

Thank you.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, speaking on behalf of this group, on these estimates, I wish to join with my friend from Sarnia in basically commending the Attorney General. I am sure that we will have some very incisive things to say about his role and his failure in many regards to live up to the demands of that high office. I have four matters which I wish to discuss with you tonight, Mr. Chairman. One has to do with the law as a whole, and its effect on the man in the street, how he regards it, and his reaction to it.

Second, I would like to deal with what makes a law sick or healthy or what makes a system of law, as say, operative in this province, healthy or the converse.

Third, I would like to discuss, not to any great extent or depth but it is central to McRuer, it is the thing that is the springboard out of which his report comes, a theory of separation of powers and how it operates to make a system healthy or sick.

Fourth, on the role of the Attorney General, I began to mention in the beginning what is said by Mr. Justice McRuer in this regard, to bring this fully before the House. Because really, despite an effort at an earlier time in the sittings to discuss the principles and various propositions put forward here in the three great volumes of McRuer, we have never really had an opportunity to do so. Nor will we, in the course of these estimates, be in any position to really do it at length and depth. It will take some years to do, but may we say that all your actions, at least for the foreseeable future, will unquestionably be judged against these criteria, these tough criteria. The man pulls no punches and he means what he says.

We are very fortunate in the province, against all the jurisdictions that I can think of, to have a report on civil liberties. We think that it might very well become some sort of a magnum opus for the civilized world, giving them an index as to what civil liberties mean in actual practice. In a sense, the volume, perforce, is too parochial; it is concerned with the special wording of The Condominium Act and therefore would lose some of its universality. Nevertheless, I know of no other such thorough-going investigation than this into English and common law.

To open my first point as to the role of law in society, I would like to read from the first page of the new book by the foremost, in my opinion, legalist in North America at this time, Professor Lon Fuller from Harvard. In his new book entitled "The Anatomy of the Law," he says as follows:

> To the thoughtful and sensitive citizen, the law can present itself in a bewildering array of moods. It can appear as the highest achievement of civilization, liberating for creative use human resources otherwise dedicated to destruction. It can be seen as the foundation of human dignity and freedom, and our best hope for a peaceful world. In man's capacity to perceive and legislate against his own defects, we can discern his chief claim to stand clearly above the animal level. Philosophers of former ages have not, indeed, hesitated to see some kinship with the divine in man's ability to reorder his own faulty nature and in effect to recreate himself by the use of reason.
>
> A shift in mood, and all this bright glitter surrounding the law can collapse into dust. Law can become man's badge of infamy, his confession of ineradicable perfidy. To say that man can reshape himself by rules is to confess that he is a creature who has to put a halter on himself before he can live safely with his fellows. It is something that no other animal can do, it is something that no other animal needs to do, for mankind is the only species that chooses its own kind as its preferred prey. Viewing the law in this gloomy light, we can gladly share the dreams of Tolstoy and of Marx, that a future may come in which men can live simply and affectionately with one another, and without the crutch of rules.

The law as seen by a layman—we get the complaint from the member for Grey-Bruce from time to time that it is too laboured and prolix. I would just remind the members of the House that in any area of human endeavour, however or whenever man sets his mind or hand to a task, he generates a special vocabulary and a very definite mode of speech in approaching it. I think of knitting, and of the words "purl" and "slip," and I

think of golf where they have "bogies" and birdies," and such things. This is all very lofty and if you are not inside the game, you do not know what it is all about.

It is the same thing with the law. I see no unique position for the law in this way of things; but nevertheless, the paragraphs of the law seem to a layman to be too laboured. There are too many "as ifs" in the thing, and I agree with him. It can be simplified, as Mr. McRuer simplifies it in the course of his great statement.

The witness gets into a witness box and he cannot and is not allowed and is stopped in mid-sentence in trying to speak the language of everyday life. He tries to give evidence in the only language in which he knows how to tell the truth, and what happens? He is told he is not able to do so. The law stops him from giving his evidence in this particular way. To the man on the street, the law appears as a sort of brute fact, where it is often more persuasive to argue that a precedent or rule has been applied for centuries than that it is either sensible or just.

Oliver Wendell Holmes once said and I quote:

> It is revolting to have no better reason for a rule than that it was laid down in the time of Henry IV.

The law, I suppose for many laymen and members in this chamber, and some of the lawyers in this chamber, may be to all of us at some time or other, is very much like the weather. You try to get in between the rain drops, or under cover before the lightning strikes. In this peculiar case the lightning has an uncommon quality of striking more than once. One is very vulnerable. It seems pervasive and unavoidable. It is terrifying in its effect, and many men feel helplessness on the one side or indifference on the other before its fatal power.

But it is the work of human minds and hands; it is as good as the people, as the people who promulgate it, for the intents and purposes for which they promulgate it. It is readily amendable; it is a flexible and ought to be a flexible interest. The business of a Kantian worshipping of law as a respect for something in itself seems to me a simple reaffirmation of the status quo and a giving in to a host of things that ought to be removed.

We must look at the law in a healthy way and in a moment I think we should take a look at some of the things that would or would not make a law healthy. Fuller says at page 4:

> In an opposing light, law can seem as the emptiest of sciences; it is all means and no end; a science frightening in its adaptability, holding its rough engine ready to serve all comers who can show the proper papers. The law has indeed been said to be the only human study having no distinctive ends of its own. Where its ends can be regarded as grounded in reason, and not brute expressions of political power, those ends must be derived not from the law itself but from ethics and sociology and economics. If it is empty of ends, the law can hardly be said to be attractive in the means it employs. At their best, these means represent measures designed to restore a condition of social health, itself not a direct product of law. At their worst, they involve the deliberate infliction of pain. Economics has been described as "the dismal science" but economics at least deals with the allocations of scarce goods, while the law deliberately apportions evils in a world already over-supplied with suffering.

The indices, I suppose, would be along the lines that if laws, when they are on the books are put on the books and ignored, or put on the books and unenforced; or are put on the books and are unenforceable. And, nevertheless, they manage to get themselves passed and we have many, as you go through McRuer, in all three categories. Some laws were passed for straight political reasons and they were never meant to be studiously and actually enforced; they were thrown as a sop to certain interest and pressure groups in the community.

I suggest to you that up to a point a considerable amount of our liquor legislation is precisely of that kind. We all smile behind our hands at the liquor laws and evade them; we know this to our intimate knowledge in this House. And yet, at the same time, we will hypocritically hold it out to the public that these things have abiding and overall effect. Some rather innocent fellow coming home with a few friends some evening feels the full impact of that foolish law fall upon his shoulders and he is convicted and receives a criminal record. The principal of selectivity is all awry.

And that is the next point I make—that laws are posed on a selective enforcement basis, to be only enforced in selected cases, and this, of course, is applied particularly to

the laws respecting commercialized gambling and the difficulty of segregating out the bingo games and the church socials and the little parties where a few dollars are exchanged at some card game, over against the big-time operators.

The law from that point of view is selectively enforced, and it means that people in authority and in power can ferret out or single out, for their own uses, individuals who would otherwise be disregarded. In other words, it opens itself to abuse. The whole purpose of law in a democratic society and the purpose of legislature is to foreclose those abuses by making the terminology definite and preventing selective enforcements of laws.

There are cases of laws which mean sickness in a society where the penalties are disproportionately severe over against the offence. This happens in a good deal of our legislation, and I mean we are not particularly struck by it. But again in McRuer we have a couple of instances which I probably will come to in the course of the estimates.

The reason for having severe penalties, of course, is to use the law as a club, to beat out confessions from individuals charged saying: "Well now, you could suffer this particular sanction, but we will let you off easy if you tell who your buddies are, or you will locate your collaborators"—that is an abuse of the process.

There are many laws not brought before this Legislature at all. These are made through the processes of the regulations and the orders in-council; many commissions and boards in effect are passing their own laws; and there is a further defect in all this—and this is a deep-seated one—a good many of these laws, with which commissions and boards are operating, are unavailable to the legal profession in this province; they are never published; they are kept in the secret chambers of Judge Robb's heart.

Nobody knows what is the basis of making discriminations, of handing down or refusing people licences. In many cases in the boards of this province, including—you name them, you know them as well as I do—the workmen's compensation board is of the same ilk, you cannot get reasoned and forthright decisions which have any consistency from a great number of the boards in this province.

Again, the good judge has pointed this up in no uncertain language.

I would think that in due course, over the next few years, we shall see all that altered, when you get the model code of procedure.

Some types of enforcement in our law does not so much affect the Attorney General in a way—I am thinking of the criminal code particularly—but which necessarily involve sordid methods of detection and so on. Those are particularly the case in those so-called "crimes without victims," where the crimes of prostitution or trafficking in narcotics, or the homosexuality between consenting adults; and it is part of the reason for the change.

These crimes without victims very seldom have any prosecuting witnesses available; they just do not want to testify. And with that, the police have to use invidious methods—wire tapping up to a point, and spying on people, and using various underhand ways of ferreting out these offences and bringing them to light. To the extent that this happens, the system is sick.

In other words, it involves the police mechanism in the same sort of underhand machinations as what they are trying to root out. Surely this is the sticking of the molasses where it hurts.

There are cases, and this would be the seventh index of what would make a law unhealthy, where the Legislature confers arbitrary and far-reaching powers on a Minister and provides for no review. Now, my friend from Sarnia has mentioned a number of cases, but I remember very well when The Planning Act was before us a few weeks ago, precisely that situation occurred. There was no bending back, nor did the chief law officer of the Crown, here floating a little above the whole political partisan arena, intervene.

Did he step forward and say either in closet so far as I could see, or openly in this House, that this was a traducing of our liberties, that the Minister had arrogated to himself powers and functions which he had no right to, under any doctrine of common sense?

The very thing that was done was the thing that I say that the three volumes were designed to overcome.

Now, this is fairly common. If there is any validity or virtue, or if this report is going to be carried out, then the Attorney General is going to have to alter his whole mentality towards his office. He has to no longer regard himself in the same position as his Cabinet colleagues. He is above them.

He is above them under British justice. He is above them in our traditions coming through, in many provinces of this country. There is an Act which gives them that authority and it is a unique position, a difficult position.

He is walking a tightrope every day of his life. He is the critique, the critic of his own people, and, therefore, he is allied in a singular sense with us on the other side of the House, at least when we are reasonable and when we are making the points well, and safeguarding the interests of the whole province, because our interests at that point meet, coincide, are identical.

I would ask in the future—and if he does not carry it out in my opinion it should be brought to your attention very much in the future—about this particular role that you must play. I do not think it has ever been spelled out for the purposes of this House or the provinces previously. It is now done in five chapters and there is no reason we should not start living it.

It may be a bit of an ideal thing, at the same time that is the whole job, to try to make it a living reality.

McRuer said in a speech which he gave to the Empire club some weeks ago that all this leads to these various failures to observe certain standards, certain general principles that must run through our law, that it breeds disrespect.

> Law and authority are not synonymous, laws that are not based on modern concepts of justice may have to be obeyed, but they will not be respected. Authority that is not based on just laws may be obeyed rather than submit to sanctions, but it will not be respected, and is not likely to be obeyed if a way of evasion can be found. Laws that invite disobedience are not only bad laws, but promote disrespect for all law. They infect and corrupt the whole machinery of law enforcement.

We have—and we will come to this—numerous laws in effect in the province of Ontario which breed precisely this mentality of disrespect and rejection and, therefore, infect the whole system in this province and society against the laws which would be inherently just and would demand on that basis respect of other such laws.

There was an interesting comment made both by McRuer, and I notice it coming out in Fuller also. I would just like to mention it because there is a nostalgic flavour to the thing, and that has to do with procedure.

You know, there is very little substantive of law in McRuer's volumes.

The way, he says himself, is the thing; which is also borne out in what Fuller says —which I will read in a moment—is that men as they get older and look more deeply into the intricacies of the bar, the law which they love and wish to have; that people come to and understand and respect along with them. As you get older the procedure becomes terribly important, just how things are done, not so much what is done.

We will assume we are living in a democratic country, we share a great many things in common, and we would not expect anybody to go off on some crazy bender with the law—you just would not get away with it anyway. But the fact is that the procedures, the machinery by which things are achieved, may be inherently unjust. And the newspapers and others do not look with that type of microscope at the operations of the law. That is precisely our job. And it is McRuer's job and the whole thing is procedure. One more contention, as to how the thing ought to operate in terms of review, towers largely over any other:

> The first question anyone experienced in dealing with legal problems would ask is one that would not likely occur to most laymen at all; it is the question of procedure. Men who participate in affairs —whether in politics, law, business or education—characteristically become, as their experience accumulates, increasingly concerned with how things should be done and not just with what should be done. One can cite eminent men, including Senator Paul Douglas and Wilhelm von Humboldt, who have described a deepening concern for procedure as the principal change they underwent between youth and mature age.

And I say I am sure Mr. Justice McRuer has never read that, but there is a similar statement to that contained both in the report itself and on page 15 of the recent speech to the Empire club. I think the point bears mentioning.

The third thing that I have been concerned to speak about was a separation of powers as the focal point in the bringing about of a healthy legal system. Just to be philosophical a moment there was mention by Aristotle of this in his "Politics," but the great book of Montesquieu on the "Spirit of

the Laws" contains the foundation for the modern world.

Now, as McRuer points out—and a number of others—Montesquieu was all wrong, he did not understand the British system. He thought he had borrowed it from the British but the Lord Chancellor and the House of Lords thought they had completely distinct judicial legislative and executory powers. The Lord Chancellor was judicial officer with high executory powers. No one pretends that you can really segregate these things; we have a "mixed system" here in legal affairs, just as we have a mixed economy; in a complex society perforce things are mixed. It is a question of just what is the right mixture to that particular pudding. It comes down then to the internal system of checks and balances which would give the role of the judiciary against this Legislature its proper scope and direction. And it is out of this core, out of trying to segregate them off legitimately—they ought not to overlap—that McRuer's whole approach and theory is based. Out of that particular situation he then generates the rules and the role of the functions of the Attorney General's office. He says that the Attorney General is not as other men, at least, in his office within our constitutional structure; his role is not that, his role is above that and in assessment of that of other Cabinet Ministers.

As the Attorney General's report tonight indicates, historically he was not, nor could he be a member of the House of Commons, much less a Cabinet Minister. Why? Because he had several roles, two of which elevate him or should elevate him above the day-to-day partisan in-fighting of the political arena. These two roles stem from the fact that he is the chief law officer of the Crown and in this regard I would like to mention page 932 of "the bible" where—well, let us just see what McRuer does say. I think at this stage in the proceedings—this is again the first opportunity—it should be read into the record of this House:

> The Attorney General is the chief law officer of the Crown and in that sense is an officer of the public. It is to him that the individual must look for the protection of his civil rights, whether it be through the enforcement of the criminal law—to provide adequate protection of the innocent and ensure as far as possible the just punishment of the guilty—or whether it be as guardian of the interests of the public against legislation that may confer excessive or oppressive powers on tribunals, bodies or individuals.
>
> As the chief law officer of the Crown, the Attorney General performs two main functions. He is the Queen's attorney and as such is responsible for the public, as distinct from the private, prosecution of offenders, and he is the responsible adviser of the government with respect to legislation. Historically and traditionally, in the exercise of these functions, the holder of the office must exercise a degree of independence quite different from that required of any other member of the Cabinet.

And so in this double sense he occupies a unique position immediately next to that of the Premier. He goes on to say that in Britain and in Canada the sounder view has evolved and that it is legitimate, good and proper that he be both a Cabinet Minister and a member of the House where he is answerable for the consequences and the administration of justice or its effects on human rights.

I am more concerned within the limited time available here at the moment with respect to his second function, that is, the function as prosecutor and defending the innocent and prosecuting the guilty with results. In this regard McRuer's chapters 62, 63 and 64 are completely concerned and at page 934, he says:

> The duty of the Attorney General to give legal advice on legislation and to advise departments of government requires a lesser degree of independence than his decision to prosecute or to discontinue a prosecution. In that capacity he is not, in the same sense, the adviser of the Queen. Nevertheless, this function requires a substantial degree of independence. The members of the public must be dependent on the vigilance of the Attorney General for their protection against legislative invasion of their civil rights. Departments of government must realize that in advising on legislation and advising departments, the Attorney General has a duty that transcends government policy, in the performance of which he is responsible only to the Legislature. This we shall discuss in greater detail later.

There are then set forth four functions which the Attorney General will perform; the first is that he has supervision of the machinery of justice, which includes the supervision of the Ontario provincial police, which I can

discuss when we come to those particular estimates.

The recent series of bills becomes more onerous on him—a most onerous responsibility now in his department with respect to assuming the costs all the way along the line, with respect to the operation of the courts.

The second duty that is mentioned is with respect to law enforcement. We could spend an awful long time on that because it is divided up into three headings. 1, policing; 2, investigation; and 3, the prosecutioners themselves.

Under policing, I will say at this stage only one thing, that—well, I think it is the most sensible thing to read some McRuer again. At 727 he says that one of the outstanding Crown attorneys in Ontario stated to the commission:

> Apparently officers only rarely exercise any discretion as to whether it is necessary to arrest a person rather than summons him. Some simply are not aware that the discretion exists. Others view arrests as a sort of pre-trial. Others still view it as more convenient. Plainly there are too many unnecessary arrests without a warrant.

He makes the case that the power of arrest under policing is deeply abused in this province. Of course, once they are arrested the ability to get out on their own recognizance is a thing that I find to be deeply abused in the province, too.

We shall come to that in due course. Turning to investigations—a large part of the volume from page 383 to 497—over 100 pages—is concerned with investigating the investigatory powers of this department, and Mr. McRuer cites instance after instance of arbitrary and discretionary powers vested in bodies or persons other than the Legislature, either directly or indirectly; either by the Act itself, or it is conferred by regulations. These are sometimes drawn up by the subordinate body for their own purposes; and either by regulations having objective limitations, or by those with merely subjective ones. He goes through a whole host of them for over 300 pages, and gives instance after instance of deep abuses of authority and power in this province.

The Attorney General for the next few years has his job cut out for him.

In this regard, at page 386, he sets forth the areas in which the investigatory powers take place, and where the abuses lie, and without going again very deeply into them, it has to do with the issuing of summons and subpoenas and the right to search and seize people, and to compel people to testify against themselves in court proceedings, and they are very wide ranging, impressive powers right there.

In kind of summary of that situation at 946 he says:

> Powers of investigation have been conferred on boards with reckless abandon without any statutory safeguards as to non-disclosure of the information obtained to unauthorized persons. There are at least 80 statutes which confer such powers, and in very few is there any restriction on the use of the information gained.
>
> There has been a growing indifference to the delegation of legislative authority to the Lieutenant-Governor in council and other bodies. Repeatedly, power is given to the Lieutenant-Governor to make regulations respecting any matter necessary or advisably to carry out effectively the intent and purpose of this Act or any part thereof. It is a power that is rarely necessary, but it appears with great frequency in The Conservation Authorities Act.

Then he goes through a whole host of Acts and so on in which this power is exercised. Could anything be more incisive, could anything be more categorical as to the almost flippant disregard of the rights of the citizens of this province in passing such legislation?

It is a fact that has struck me forcibly without McRuer, but enforced multiple times by the text of this document, in making a judgment upon the workings of this department as it stands at the present time.

Now, I shall try to bring my remarks to a close, there are two other matters which he goes into at some length. I shall just mention them.

His third function of your department, sir, has to do with the supervision of government litigation. He says, and I cannot see how we can really argue against it, that all lawyers in the government ought to be brought under your umbrella, supervised by you, taught those overriding general principles to safeguard citizens rights in the province, over against their very special interest in serving their own minister with limited goals, and without having the foresight to see what the detrimental effects upon others outside that area be in other parts of the province and its laws.

Fourthly, and this is complementary to bringing the whole of justice and the legal steps together under your department, and really is the *raison d'être* of this bringing together, he argues that to safeguard civil liberties, the chief law officer of the Crown in order to be such, must in the last analysis supervise all legislation.

> We are concerned with something much more than ordinary drafting; we are concerned with legislative supervision. In the broad sense, the duty of the Attorney General to supervise legislation imposes on him a responsibility to the public that transcends his responsibility to his colleagues in the Cabinet. It requires him to exercise constant vigilance to sustain and defend the rule of law against departmental attempts to grasp unhampered arbitrary powers.

Just as the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) acts by the yearning—you know—to grasp unhampered arbitrary powers —which may be done in many ways.

> Sometimes clear language is used, but more often subtle devices are resorted to by incorporating in legislation such phrases as "if the Minister is satisfied" and "if the Minister believes", or the inspector. These devices may be just as effective to limit the authority of the courts to control the exercise of that power conferred as would clear direct language.

It goes on to considerable extent on that same theme. To develop this is the whole intent and purpose of the report. It is an elixir of good for us. It breaks through into a new life and its problems. We applaud, we have a solid foundation, an authoritative text to point to; something that you accept and I accept; both of us in a perfectly objective way we can find in common, so that if you disregard it, you are disregarding yourself.

If you bring yourself into contradiction then you become the laughing stock of the province, and if this is the case we shall help to do the laughing.

The Empire day speech if only in closing, makes reference to Pollack who in one of his statements in 1882 spoke of "the capricious orders of a crazy despot." He felt that perhaps some of these capricious orders were floating around Ontario, and in the misuse of the law to serve special interest. This is me not McRuer. And to private ends, laws, as McRuer says, are not weapons, but shields serving to protect and regulate the respective rights and freedoms and liberties of the individuals from whom the authority and power of the state is derived.

One could say, with some emotion, in reviewing the thing, that your department and its role could be improved in very many ways. One could talk about the operation of justice and its relation to compassion which we hear a good deal of these days. There is a lot of law without any compassion, and there is an awful lot of compassion with any law, and I think they are both equally at fault.

There are mentalities abroad who in their hardness and callousness with respect to the role of others will nevertheless as a gracious act, as a piece of grace, thinking that the law is obdurate and unable to bend and cruel —and it ought not to be cruel—thinking that the laws are necessarily cruel, will out of the air and out of grace sometimes on a completely unpredictable basis grant some clemency. Such are the magistrates' courts of this province, on more occasions than not.

I may as well end with the great man as I began, and he says at page 10 of his little talk on the State of The Individual:

> The theory underlining democratic government is that when Legislators make the law, the rights of the individual will be safeguarded through public debate and public vote in the Legislature.

My friend from Sarnia and I feel, I think I can say this for him, that they are not always safeguarded in this Legislature in public debate. They are ignored and there is no reason for it. There is no reason we cannot be bigger than that and be bigger, if we want, than ourselves. That partisan political advantage should take on small jealousies and a narrowness of purpose simply to protect. I do not know what!

The Minister ought to be able to bend with reason. His task is a bigger one than he has given himself, and he could grow into it and he can confer the greatest benefits because he has, behind him, all kinds of support.

Where did we have such a plenitude of new law making—we will come to the reform commission as to what work it is doing. The whole course on family law. The business that we have with this civil liberties report before us. The Smith committee report which we are presently studying. We are blessed with a plentitude of good work to do, let us

not do it necessarily in any partisan spirit, at least, where it can be avoided. Really our purposes are in common.

So he says it is the Legislature, or nowhere else, that this thing is really done and

> when the judges administer justice, the civil rights of the individual, must be safeguarded by the independence and wisdom of the judges.

I think that in summary, the various points that have been brought to the attention of the Attorney General, particularly the police and investigatory powers, should be recapitulated and driven home.

There are great abuses presently, at the heart of our society, too complacently accepted. You seem to think over there that somehow you have come into the promised land, or you are standing there overlooking it and maybe never entering, but at least, you have led the way. I suspect that our children will judge us on that and that we are very far from many such things and to pretend that we should, in all humanity beat our breasts and say: "That's where the fault lies." The strength of a man is in acknowledging his fault and not in pluming yourself on his virtues.

Mr. Chairman: The Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think, Mr. Chairman, I shall make such comments as might be required on these remarks as we approach the individual vote in my estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Very good, sir.

On vote 201:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on vote 201: for a number of years now my colleague from Sudbury and I have put forward the view that the Attorney General could be all of the law to all of the government in Ontario. We have made this point and we have made it philosophically, we have made it in a practical way. I think that we have had some acceptance, at least in principle, of the fault from this Attorney General, but very little action is taking place in this regard.

Our approach to this point, which we think is a very important one, certainly has been very substantially fortified by the opinions given by Mr. McRuer in his report. And certainly sir, our approach must be obviously fortified by several incidents that have happened in this session of this Legislature.

The first one is The Provincial Auctioneers Act. The others come from The Department of Agriculture and Food and these are just points that are particularly outstanding, there have been others.

You will recall, sir, that the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) some time ago introduced An Act to amend The Provincial Auctioneers Act. We put forward the argument that it was bad in principle. It was a badly drafted Act and gave arbitrary power to a commissioner. It gave power which the Legislature had no possibility of reviewing. There were no appeal procedures and so on. To the government's credit, the Act was not proceeded with and it still stands on the order paper as the first item under order number seven.

I would hope, sir, that that Act in the form in which it was presented will never come before this House again.

The second item is The Beef Marketing Act. I can well recall the hoots and hollers emanating from the Tory back benches, from the rural members who suggested that it was the height of cheek for a Toronto lawyer to suggest that there could be something wrong with an agricultural bill.

Eventually we got through, even despite the barracking that emanated from the nether regions and proper safeguards were written into that bill.

The third item came from The Department of Health. It arose as a result of a series of questions concerning a nursing home and the handling of certain patients in that home, and to say the least, the procedure was unusual. I recall, sir, asking the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), if during the course of his investigations and before he had decided to embark upon the action that he took or his officials took, had he consulted the Attorney General.

The Minister of Health—I give him credit, he is an honest man—said it just did not occur to him, but he would do it right away. He did, and in due course certain charges were laid. I gather those are going to be determined or they may have already been determined. They are coming before the court or have been dealt with by the court.

The fourth item that I want to mention is The Planning Act. We had the frightening bill which gives, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the right to amend any zoning bylaw in any municipality in the province of Ontario without notice, without hearing and without assigning reason.

Well, that Minister—to his discredit—refused to budge an inch from the invidious position that he had taken, and the government majority pushed that bill through the House, notwithstanding all the criticism that was levied here and—fascinatingly—the criticism that appeared in the important editorial in the Toronto *Telegram*, a newspaper that is not overly well recognized as being quick to adopt most of the ideas that come from this side of the House.

However, in that particular editorial the writer said that they agreed completely with the view that we put forward, that it was an infamous provision, that no single Minister of the Crown should ever be given that kind of power and authority and they hoped, vainly unfortunately, that the government would reconsider its position and put in proper safeguards if this kind of procedure was going to become part of our law. As I say, the government did not see fit to do that.

Now those are four incidents, sir, touching three departments and there are more. But those are four of the outstanding ones and they indicate to me beyond any doubt that the position we, on this side of the House, the official Opposition, have taken over the years is a most valid one.

We cannot have a series of little empires, little legal empires in all of the 20-odd government departments, each one of which becomes its own authority, each one of which drafts statutes, each one of which advises its particular Minister in a different way and each one of which—unfortunately on so many occasions—has no proper understanding or appreciation of the horrifying responsibility that that little legal department has in drawing a statute, presenting it to the Minister, having the Minister put it through Cabinet counsel and then it comes forward with all the blessing of the majority in this House.

The point is a very simple one, sir. The point is that there should be one set of legal advisors for all of the government of Ontario. If that is done as we have recommended, and as Mr. McRuer has recommended, I would suggest to you sir, that we would have a series of statutes on our books that at least pay substantial concern, interest and attention to the rights of individuals. Now, those are four incidents that happened in this session of this Legislature, and I say that they never should have come before us at all.

Again I will give credit to the Ministers who were responsible and will admit the first three cases, the Minister of Agriculture, saw fit to amend one Act before it went through, to withhold the other one, and it still sits on the order paper. The Minister of Health saw fit, when it was drawn to his attention, to refer the matter to the Attorney General. The Minister of Municipal Affairs did not see fit to act at all, except to bulldoze that Act through the House, and I say that this is wrong, and unfair to those Ministers that they do not have advising them all of the intelligence and experience of the chief law officer of the Crown. I wonder if the Attorney General is prepared to say at this time whether or not there is any intention in the mind of the government that this situation is going to change? If so, when, and how are the changes going to be brought about?

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, does the Attorney General wish to reply now?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. member that it is advisable and proper that all government legislation come through and be examined by The Department of the Attorney General as the law office of the Crown. As a matter of fact, this generally is the policy of all the legislation prepared by all the departments to be submitted to the legislative counsel. There have been occasions—I think even some of the cases which the hon. member cited—where the bills came forward, but the legislative counsel, who are not critics or makers of policy, examined the legislation particularly as to draughtsmanship, and cleared it in that respect.

There may have been occasions where they have failed to have the bills submitted to them, but I think that these are rare. It is a definite policy of government that the legislation of departments of government shall be cleared through the office of the Attorney General and the legislative counsel.

The legislative counsel are servants of this Legislature, and they do examine private members' bills which do not come to the Attorney General. I think that a Minister has no right to obstruct them in some things. I would say, further, that I have, of course, read the recommendations of the McRuer report, referred to by all the speakers tonight. We have examined the legislation related to the office of the Attorney General or the Minister of Justice in the provinces, and have our views as to what should be done to formulate an Act for this province, which, of course, will not be in this session, but we are moving in the direction of carrying out those recommendations.

I would hope that next time when the estimates of the Attorney General are before you you will find that we have accomplished many of the suggestions that were put forward in that respect. I can only say that I agree entirely with the comments of the hon. member and we are trying to achieve the objective.

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I have a few preliminary questions before I proceed.

I would like to know, under what vote the inspector of legal officers should be discussed?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Vote 207, Mr. Chairman—administration of justice.

Mr. Shulman: Under what vote would the administration of private detective agencies come?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That would be the vote covering the Ontario provincial police, which is vote 211.

Mr. Shulman: Would the administration of the law society come under any of the votes in this particular estimate?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We do not administer the law society of Upper Canada, if that is what you refer to.

Mr. Shulman: Are the reports in any way of their findings sent to The Department of the Attorney General? I am referring to matters of discipline.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Only with respect to legal aid; that is administered by the law society.

Mr. Shulman: Now, one more. Wire tapping—provision or authority for such—would that come under this particular vote? Would it come under the Ontario provincial police?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If we were to discuss that it would be under vote 210, the Ontario police commission.

Mr. Shulman: Under vote 201, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks with respect to Royal commissions.

I think that, in this House, I have perhaps a little closer contact with this particular animal than the other members, in having come through one rather interesting Royal commission. I would like to make one suggestion. It is absolutely essential for a person who is involved in a Royal commission, and whose reputation is at stake, to have the very best legal counsel.

In my innocence and ignorance, I personally entered a Royal commission without counsel, and very rapidly found that I had entered an arena without proper weapons. You should have the best weapons in trying to fight the machine. Let me say that in some Royal commissions, the best lawyers in the world cannot help you, but you should at least have the benefit of legal counsel, and the very best legal counsel.

We have seen two Royal commissions recently in the province—the Timbrell inquiry, and my own particular Parker inquiry. In one case we found that a young lawyer, young in terms of experience, became pitted against a very senior member of the legal society. In my own case, I ultimately ended up with excellent legal counsel, but the counsel found himself in the rather difficult position of fighting an apparently impartial commission counsel.

The point that I am coming to is that if you are very poor and you get involved in a situation like this, as Mrs. Timbrell was, you are given legal aid. If you are wealthy and can afford to hire the best you are all right. But if you happen to be an ordinary citizen —and in this province we now have two ordinary citizens who have been thrown into this situation—you cannot really afford to hire the best and you are pitted against the very, very best counsel which the government will hire at very high prices.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): We have legal aid.

Mr. Shulman: But these men cannot apply for legal aid. I am not talking about the poor, but the average individual, so what he has to do is to either hire a second-rate counsel, or more likely—because these are intelligent men, and I will not go into the details of this case—they will hire the best counsel, and impoverish themselves.

Today I asked the Attorney General, Mr. Chairman, if, in a Royal commission, the men are exonerated, will the government pay the legal expenses? I hoped, being a just man, that the Attorney General would have jumped to his feet and said, "Yes," but he did not. He said, "We will think about it."

This is not now a matter of these two men in front of this Royal commission; this is a matter of principle.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman if I may be permitted, the comments that the hon.

member is making, while I am very glad to listen to them, apply to our system of legal proceedings—not only to the commissions, but before the courts. And he mentioned that if you are poor—unable to afford to pay legal counsel, you can get counsel. This is the whole context, and purpose and scheme which is carried out under the legal aid plan. If you are rich, or well-to-do, or fairly well off, we have not seen fit to supply counsel.

I do not think anyone has ever suggested that we should supply legal counsel to everyone. This does not apply to the commission. And if I might just say, today, I believe Mr. Justice Grant announced—so it is known to members of this House—that with respect to the counsel we are supplying we have not gone outside the office of the Attorney General. It will be Mr. Frank Callaghan, Q.C., one of the senior law officers of my department.

We do not think, again, of supplying this to the whole legal system. Persons go before the courts—and I believe this has been before the House this session as a question—we do not pay persons if they are brought to the court and acquitted, either in civil or criminal matters. Particularly in criminal matters, we do not pay. There is not a policy—I do not think it has ever been suggested—that a person who is tried for an offence or a charge should be compensated because they are found not guilty. I think we have never contemplated going that far.

I think there have been cases where there has been a mistaken prosecution or an unjust prosecution. We have contemplated some compensation in those cases, but the whole system of our administration of justice does not contemplate that persons who go to court on criminal charges and are not, for one reason or another, found guilty are to be compensated. This does not apply just to commissions.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Attorney General for his interjection, because it really makes the very point which I am coming to and that is that Royal commissions are not the same as criminal or civil proceedings. But before I go back to that point, in relation to what he has just said, I think perhaps in our system and our just society, which we hear so much about, perhaps the Attorney General should be thinking that if someone has a criminal charge laid against him and is found not guilty, perhaps their legal costs should be paid by the state. I think so. The Attorney General has said no one has ever suggested it. Well, let me suggest it now. If someone has been charged with a criminal act and is found not guilty, I believe they are not guilty, and if they are not guilty why are they being punished?

Mr. Kerr: Because there are reasonable grounds to believe—

Mr. Shulman: Here we see the Conservative mentality, Mr. Chairman, he says if they are charged there are reasonable grounds, therefore they should be punished. What druck, what nonsense!

Mr. Kerr: I did not say that.

Mr. Shulman: What nonsense! If a man is charged and is found not guilty, he is not guilty, and he should not be punished and his legal costs should be paid by the state.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): You just bring back the old charge of a verdict of not proven.

Mr. Shulman: Obviously they do not understand.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: To come back to Royal commissions. Royal commissions, unfortunately or fortunately, are a little different from criminal charges. In a criminal charge, we have not two adversaries, I like to believe, but we have a lawyer for the person who is charged and a Crown attorney whose job should not be to provide a conviction, but whose job it should be to produce the truth, and I think by and large our Crown attorneys do that.

So that we do not have this fantastic adversary situation where a very high-priced lawyer—and we have seen this in this province very recently—is doing his damndest to condemn a man, while on the other side the person involved is fighting back with his own legal help to clear himself.

This is the entire difference. You have the adversary system here. The same principle applies really as when a criminal charge is laid. If a man, and again as an example I will refer to the Royal commission coming up now, if a man suddenly finds himself involved in a Royal commission, and it may very well be they may be involved in a Royal commission through no fault of their own, and if subsequently the person at the head of that Royal commission exonerates or finds correct these people, surely it is not unreason-

able for the state to pay the legal expenses of the person involved.

And let me say there is not a great deal of money involved here because, thank goodness, we do not have that many Royal commissions. When we do have Royal commissions, many of them are fact-finding commissions, they are not this rather horrible type which we see once or twice every year foisted upon us by the Conservative government. Most of them are honest, fact-finding commissions, but some of them have political purposes.

Mr. Kerr: Will this change be retroactive?

Mr. Shulman: That is not a bad idea. Let me say I have no desire for any retroactivity. I was quite able in my own case to manage things.

Similarly, in the other Royal commission which came up last year there was legal aid which looked after a woman involved. But the Royal commission that is coming up now typifies the injustice of this situation.

I can very well foresee where a man may be bankrupted or literally spend his entire savings in an effort to protect himself. Let me tell you about the costs of lawyers, we have heard a great deal about lawyers in this House, well, I have some comments about lawyers, the cost of lawyers is beyond all reasonableness.

Mr. D. M. De Monte (Dovercourt): Oh, stop it, that is ridiculous.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: We have other professions —the lawyers are getting a little upset, and with good reason, they have good reason to get upset.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): They are almost as good as the doctors.

Mr. Shulman: Doctors, I think, are as reasonably well trained as lawyers. They take as many years in school, they take longer in post-graduate work, and yet their fees come nowhere near that of the top lawyers.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. De Monte: When are we going to get back on the issue here?

On a point of order, has this anything to do with the estimates?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. De Monte: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I suggest that the hon. member for High Park stick to the estimates. We are sick and tired of hearing this—

Mr. Chairman: In the opinion of the chair, the member does not have a point of order. The member for High Park may proceed.

Mr. Shulman: It seems that some of the members, Mr. Chairman, are a little touchy on one particular subject and with good reason. However, for the benefit of the members, since he does not understand, I will explain. I am talking about Royal commissions, that is item 4 of vote 201, it is in the estimates.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Get on to medicine, doctor.

Mr. Shulman: We will get to that in another estimate.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Stick to medicine.

Mr. Shulman: The point I am making is under Royal commissions, and I hope that the Attorney General will take it more seriously than the backbench lawyers who do not understand the problem, and that is that this is a serious problem. It can be a very serious injustice, and I request the Attorney General, I ask him humbly, will he reconsider his stand on this particular matter, because surely if a man is found innocent he should not be punished.

Mr. Chairman: I believe the member directed a question to the Attorney General?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I did, sir.

Mr. Chairman: Would the Attorney General like to reply at this particular time?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I could take the matter under consideration.

Mr. Shulman: I thank the Attorney General, I appreciate that.

I just have one further brief question under this vote. I see in the public accounts of the province of Ontario for the year ended March 31, 1967, that we have spent up to that point some $750,000 on the Atlantic Acceptance investigation. May I ask at what time we can expect some results from this investigation? It seems to have been going on for a very long time. When will the findings be down?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: From what I am aware, Mr. Chairman, of the extent and the progress of this commission, I would not expect

Mr. Justice Hughes to make his report certainly before the end of this year I am doubtful if we might receive it in this year. I would think it ought to be along shortly after.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, if I might just digress for a moment, I do not want to unduly personalize, but I do feel that I would like to record to this House one personal comment in defence of the profession.

In October of 1966, I defended—

Mr. Chairman: On vote 201?

Mr. Bullbrook: Vote 201. You permitted some aspersion to be cast upon our profession by the hon. member for High Park.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: If I might say this to you, that month of October I spent five days defending a young lady for murder. It cost me approximately $426 in investigatory fees and I was not paid one red cent for defending that lady for murder.

Now, the point I make is this, not for self-adulation, but before our legal aid system came in, I would like the hon. member for High Park to know that many of us served without fees and expense out of our own pocket in connection with serving the public.

I know the hon. member for Riverdale serves many of his constituents and other people here in Metropolitan Toronto without charge. Perhaps our services are worth that, I do not know.

But, you know, one has to say this, this digresses somewhat from vote 201, but the hon. member for High Park is a veritable "Thesaurus" on everything. He knows everything, really.

I was taking the car down to the hotel tonight and I heard a news flash. "Flash—Dr. Shulman, member for High Park, is going to bring in a resolution tomorrow morning in connection with wire-tapping."

Now this is—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Have we not had enough? To quote yourself from an hour or so ago: Have we not had enough?

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 201 carried?

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, I want to continue if I might—

Mr. Chairman: No.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, I have not said anything yet, really.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: First of all, just a very minor matter. I am interested from a financial point of view here as I analyze your estimates previously under this 201 item. You estimated in 1966-1967 $368,000; you of $97,000; you spent $389,722 as I see it. You estimated in 1966- 1967 $368,000; you spent $679,968. I believe your estimate last year was $428,000, and this year, aside from statutory, it is $254,000.

It seems to me, respectfully, and this might have been before your term, I am not certain, but your estimating of your expenditure on main office seems to be far from actual. I am wondering if you have any idea what your actual was last year as it relates to your estimates, and I am wondering also, if you are not taking a less than realistic approach in connection with your expenditures on this. I have further questions to ask but perhaps you might comment on this.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think the only item that is not estimated with reasonably good accuracy, and we cannot estimate that, is the item which we require for Royal commissions.

Mr. MacDonald: Most of that may be legal fees.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Part of the expense is legal fees but these come on at any time during the year. The Atlantic one, for instance, has been running since 1965 and as the hon. member for High Park pointed out, it has cost close to $750,000 in that time. That, I think, is the only element of the estimate for the main office which is not estimated very closely. We cannot do better.

Mr. Bulbrook: For the contingency aspect of Royal commissions, you have set aside $125,000 in this connection. Now, if I might not unduly belabour my colleagues in the House in connection with something that was brought up by the member for Downsview, I intended to remark upon it. It does bring McRuer in, but I would like to request the attitude of the Attorney General in this connection. What is his attitude going to be in the future?

I think you will agree with me that it has been obvious that some legislation has come into this House without your knowledge in the past. You have been called upon, as I

did mention before, to rationalize the position of the government in connection with the substance contained in that legislation. I think back to the second section of the amendment to The Planning Act vesting powers in the Minister of Municipal Affairs, relative to rezoning matters.

I am fortunate in this respect, that I am able to say that we have a Minister of Municipal Affairs who is somewhat jealous in connection with that discretion. I am happy to say that. I, unfortunately, requested the exercise of this discretion and he set me straight; in supporting my municipal council, he set me straight. But I say this to you, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Attorney General, you realize what we have given to this man and his successors in title.

What we have told him, in effect, and we cannot magnify this unduly, is that he can go out anywhere in the province of Ontario and notwithstanding the wishes of elected officials, notwithstanding the attitudes of people in areas, notwithstanding the statutory recourse that they should have to the Ontario municipal board, he can do that which he wishes, at his whim. That is not good law; that never will be, in my respectful submission, good law.

You have also been faced on several occasions with interpretations of matters in this House. I relate back to that particular one where you did, in effect, feel that it was some substitutional effect for an appeal to the Ontario municipal board. I think if you review *Hansard*, in connection with your comments there, you will find that this was the tone of your remark.

I suggest again to you, respectfully, that this was far from the situation in effect. And perhaps you nod in agreement; if you do, I very much appreciate the frankness of your present attitude because really the intent of that legislation was to give to this office, not the man but this office, these rights.

Now to give these rights is not proper. I am very interested in connection with this vote—where does your responsibility come? I realize there is some private information there that you cannot give to me in connection probably with your Cabinet situation, but when do you first get a look at these? McRuer says, in effect, you should be looking at them ahead of time so that you come in here and you are able to intelligently put forward the legal position here.

When do you really get the opportunity to say, in effect, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs—since I am directing a question, I want it to have the hon. Attorney General's attention—when do you get the opportunity of saying to your Cabinet colleagues, "This is too much power," if you feel it is too much power? I would like you, perhaps, to relate to this situation.

It might not remain on vote 201, but when do you get to the situation that you say "in my opinion" as you are supposed to? Historically, as you have said yourself in your opening statement, the background of your position is one of relative independence. When do you say to these people "these powers are too broad, you should not have them; they are against the proper principles of justice"?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think I have pointed out to some extent, at least, in my remarks in reply to the hon. member for Downsview, that legislative counsel is historically the advisor to the Legislature. All bills, all legislation, as a matter of government policy, are submitted to legislative counsel. As I pointed out also before, it is not the function of that counsel perhaps to advise on matters of policy. Now, I think I can go further than that and say this to you, that generally, as a member of the council, the Cabinet, I see and observe and study the legislation of my colleagues as it is presented to the council. It is conceivable that —although I think my attendance record is pretty good in that respect—a bill might pass without my having an opportunity to examine it. But this is very, very seldom.

I would say this, further, that the recommendations made by the hon. Mr. McRuer in his report "Inquiry as to Civil Rights" was immediately examined by government. Direction was given that the recommendations be studied by the heads of all departments to see how they were affected. We have committees working on this particular matter, which the hon. member refers to, as well as on the various other recommendations. Legislative counsel themselves have been directed to study this area. It is curious, I think I might mention, to say that I did not enlarge upon this in speaking of the functions of the Attorney General. In this province, there is no department of the Attorney General; there is an Attorney General. If you look at the Act, you will see The Legislative Assembly Act provides for an Attorney General; there is no department of the Attorney General. There are no duties set for the Attorney General so that—

Mr. Ben: That is not what you said.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He must assume and understand, historically, what his duties are.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think I am right in saying that.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I am looking here at the province of Ontario public accounts and it lists a Department of the Attorney General. Evidently this misprint has been carried on for a long time. They should correct it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There is no statute establishing The Department of the Attorney General.

Mr. Ben: Then correct the misprint in the public accounts!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is the title we use, but there is none established by any statute.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. McRuer does recommend the establishment by statute of your responsibilities.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is right and I say we are moving to that.

Mr. Bullbrook: Without unduly belabouring this point, we recognize that the legislative counsel have no function in analyzing the substantive portion of legislation. I take it then from your comments that you agree, in principle, with the responsibility on your part. But I must say this to you and I have heard this before, I think your duties are so onerous that one cannot really expect you, personally, to analyze the intricacies of every piece of legislation. To be overly technical for the moment, I ask you to harken back to the provincial courts bit. I argued with you over the interpretation—what is it the rule inclusio unius exclusio alterius between sections 4 and 8.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Keep it clean.

Mr. Bullbrook: No, but in fairness. It is all right for me, at my leisure, to be able to sit down but you have got a great deal of responsibility. Now do you agree, too, that there is some merit in McRuer's recommendations and, too, that probably you should be surrounding yourself with more people to assist you in this connection? Would that be unfair?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The latter part yes. I certainly think I should have assistance.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I help the Attorney General—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And you are—

Mr. Singer: That is what is wrong.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If you are referring to all of Mr. McRuer's recommendations in this area I take it, you are speaking—

Mr. Bullbrook: No, just the reference to your office.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes. I think generally I say, yes, I do.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, under this vote—the Royal commission—I am concerned about the facts, the growing tendency to carry on these witch hunts as it were. Last year, you spent $500,000 on Royal commissions and we have another Royal commission upon us at this point.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that the Minister may or may not have any control insofar as the calling of a Royal commission, but I am shocked at the way this Gardhouse-Bannon affair has grown into the serious thing it can be for these men. If they are not guilty of these things then they are ruined forever.

Here we have a Royal commission being planned for these men and the matter, with all the intricacies of a great melodrama—the wire tapping going on and the thing could have been very—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for Downsview has done most to make it a melodrama.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Sargent: Just a moment now—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about Royal commissions.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. I would say to the member that he should refrain from any specific reference at this time to the Royal commission to which references were made earlier today during the questions. He is speaking generally on Royal commissions.

Mr. Sargent: Well I think, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Bullbrook: Well on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: Surely the mention of the name—it cannot be excluded.

Mr. Chairman: No, I—

Mr. Bullbrook: I recognise the mention of the basic foundation of the inquiry should not be gone into, but you certainly—

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member this is just what I wanted to prevent. I wanted to prevent the member from getting into any specific, when he started mentioning wire tapping if I may point out respectfully. I think he should not go on any further.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your ruling on this, but you can look in the paper tonight and listen to television or radio and the whole thing is there and we cannot even talk about it in the House. I think this is wrong. This matter could have been very simply handled. If there is a suspicion of wrong-doing on these men, they could have been advised not to show up in court, to call in sick or something until the investigation went along quietly to see if anything could be done. What is the commission called for? Here we have the lives of two men ruined because of lack of co-ordination. Here we have Royal commission aobut something that may be nothing, or it may be a great part of a wrong doing. Maybe there should be an investigation of the magistrates, not only in Metro Toronto. I know magistrates in our area who should have been investigated a long time ago.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: But I am saying insofar as public knowledge of what has gone on but—

Mr. E. A. Winkler (Grey South): What were you up on, Eddie?

Mr. MacDonald: Nobody has done so much to bring the magistrates under a cloud than the hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I say, Mr. Chairman, very honestly that I have never tried to hurt any man in my life who did not deserve criticism.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It just comes out that way.

Mr. Sargent: But I am concerned about the right of the individual and these two men. These are human beings too and I think that the matter has been very wrongly handled—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let us get the facts first—

Mr. Sargent: Wrongly handled! And they should have been investigated—they should have had the investigations going on quietly before all this hullabaloo in the press.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! I think that the member should refrain from any such references to the particular incident—

Mr. Sargent: Well, it is in the paper.

Mr. Chairman: We can deal with item 4 and vote 201 on Royal commissions.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, is it your ruling then that we cannot talk of the *modus operandi*—that is a good one—

Mr. Chairman: No that is not—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: But if you are going to—

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman has not ruled that you may not discuss the *modus operandi.*

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, you are now on the verge of another inquiry into the Myer Rush case and I want to ask the Attorney General how you can arrest a man in London without a warrant? This man Rush has been arrested in London, England, without a warrant—

Mr. Chairman: This has nothing to do with the Royal commissions. If the member is speaking about Royal commissions he may proceed—

Mr. Sargent: Well, you are on the verge of—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I could not hear what you were saying, but certainly this has not anything to do with Royal commissions—the Myer Rush case.

Mr. Sargent: Well, in your department—

Mr. MacDonald: It is in Canada where legal action was initiated.

Mr. Sargent: He is in England—

Mr. Chairman: Vote 201, main office vote.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am talking about Royal commissions. Will the Attorney General tell me what are the terms of reference to call a Royal commission? What do you have to do to have a Royal commission on you?

Mr. Chairman: Well, the member is—

Mr. Sargent: I would like to know what we are paying them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I do not have before me—although I could get it, perhaps very quickly—The Public Inquiries Act. The first section of that Act sets out the matters which may be investigated by a Royal commission—commission of inquiry. One of those things is the administration of justice. There are a number of others. I do not have it before me, but that Act is an Act on our statute books, an Act of this province which sets forth certain matters of great public concern where there should be a full and open public inquiry before a commissioner appointed by the government—Lieutenant-Governor in council for that purpose. That is what you do.

Mr. Sargent: Who pulls the switch?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps if I could have volume four of the statutes which must be here, I could answer a little more specifically and in detail and I will give you the language and then I will tell you how it is done. This will help the hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I do not know that much about it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I will try to be brief. I know the hon. member does not want to have great detail but The Public Inquiries Act is chapter 323 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario and here is the way the section reads:

Mr. Singer: It is not quite volume one!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is volume 4. The section 1 of that Act reads—it is not too long and perhaps I might read it:

> Whenever the Lieutenant Governor in council deems it expedient to cause inquiry to be made concerning any matter connected with or affecting the good government of Ontario, or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof, or of the administration of justice therein and such inquiry is not regulated by any special law, he may; by commission, appoint one or more persons to conduct such inquiry and may confer the power of summoning any person and requiring him to give evidence on oath and to produce such documents and things as the commissioner or commissioners deem requisite for the full investigation of the matters into he or they are appointed to examine.

Now that is the authority—subjects which may be investigated, those are the powers that the commissioner has.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What could be simpler?

Mr. Sargent: So in effect, Mr. Chairman, on the Attorney General's advice the Lieutenant-Governor then calls a Royal commission.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not necessarily.

Mr. Sargent: Well on your recommendation to the Cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, not necessarily on the advice alone of the Attorney General; that might be the case but it might very well be the consensus and I think, generally would be the opinion of the members of the Cabinet or government.

Mr. Sargent: It would not go through Agriculture?

An hon. member: It might!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would think it would be, if you will allow me to say, the consensus of all the members of the council which advises the Lieutenant-Governor. It could very well be reviewed by the Attorney General, and most certainly would be where it is a matter of law. But as I read to you the matter concerning good government of Ontario would not necessarily be in the field of justice. It might be some other field. As I say, it would generally be, I think, the concensus of those who advise the Lieutenant-Governor, otherwise his council, and the section is very clear.

Mr. Sargent: One more point then. The evidence that you have now is sufficient evidence for you to call a Royal commission on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss specific evidence of a commission that is sitting now, because I feel this is *sub judice.*

Mr. Sargent: No this is not *sub judice* at all. The most important study point is: Do you have sufficient to call a Royal commission?

Mr. Chairman: Is the member referring to the Royal commission to investigate the matter of the two magistrates mentioned earlier in this House? Well, I would say to the member that any reference about evidence or activities further than has been previously discussed is out of order.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply reports progress and begs leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Tomorrow we will continue with the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.,

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.00 of the clock, p.m.

No. 131



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Friday, June 28, 1968

Speaker: Honourable Fred McIntosh Cass, Q.C.
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1968



Price per session, $5.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.

CONTENTS

Friday, June 28, 1968

Public Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 4921

Department of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 4921

Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 4921

Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading 4921

Resident fishing licences, statement by Mr. Brunelle 4923

Fluid milk producers in Essex and Kent counties, question to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Ruston 4924

Magistrates Gardhouse and Bannon, questions to Mr. Wishart, Mr. Singer and Mr. MacDonald 4925

Estimates, Department of the Attorney General, Mr. Wishart, continued 4927

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Sargent, Mr. T. Reid 4958

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. T. Reid, agreed to 4966

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Dymond, agreed to 4966

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 1968

The House met at 9:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: This is a most unusual morning as we have no students to welcome. I am not sure that I can remember a sitting this session that we have not had students during the proceedings of this House.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, these three bills are basically housekeeping, but they relate to Bill 44 and to the bill that I am now going to introduce. These bills will go to the education committee.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to present to this House legislation to establish larger units of administration for Roman Catholic separate school purposes. The Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) indicated that the government was contemplating this action in his announcement concerning the establishment of boards of education on a county-wide basis.

The legislation completes the basic reorganization of school jurisdictions in the province of Ontario. When I introduced Bill 44 on March 15, I stated:

> The major goal of the reorganization is to create educational jurisdictions capable of extending equal educational opportunity to the boys and girls of Ontario. This goal applies equally to the separate school reorganization which I now propose.

The availability of broader school programmes, the provision of special services to schools, and improvement in the ability to attract, retain and organize to best advantage its professional resources are all factors which will be an advantage to the new separate school boards as they seek to extend and improve the quality of education.

As will be the case for the new county and district boards of education, the new separate school boards will facilitate planning on a broader base than is now possible in most situations, and will permit the establishment and implementation of a system of priorities in the programming and financing of education in their jurisdictions.

These boards, I am sure, will be able to utilize to the maximum the accommodation, transportation, special services and staff, thus establishing a sound basis for the expenditure of the tax dollar without prejudice to the educational needs of the children.

Other benefits will also accrue from the reorganization in the area of equalization of costs. The larger units will be supported by a broader tax base. The cost of the educational programme will be spread across the entire tax base, thus eliminating many of the inequities which may now exist among the present boards. The creation of the new units for public, secondary and separate school purposes will permit the development of a

simplified grants plan designed to reduce further any imbalances which may still exist.

The legislation provides, by regulation, for the establishment of combined Roman Catholic separate school zones by uniting the existing zones and any new zones established in the future, whose centres are within a county or combination of counties. Provision is also made for the future alteration of the boundaries within which a combined Roman Catholic separate school zone may be formed. Cities and separated towns, except those which I will specify in a moment, will be included in the new zones.

Windsor will continue as a separate school zone. The Ottawa zone will include the city of Eastview and the village of Rockcliffe Park. The Carleton zone will include the remaining area municipalities as defined in The Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton Act, 1968.

Each separate school zone now in existence in a county will be combined, effective January 1, 1969, to form the new county combined Roman Catholic separate school zone, and only those portions of a county now lying within the three-mile limit of a zone will be included in the new combined zone.

The separate school jurisdictions for Metropolitan Toronto shall be provided in The Metropolitan Separate School Board Act, 1953.

A combined separate school board will be elected in each zone. Each separate school board will consist of 8, 10, 12, 14 or 16 elected trustees based on the total population within the county or combination of counties.

In a county zone that includes one or more cities or separated towns, the number of trustees to be elected in such cities or separated towns will be determined by the ratio of the provincial equalized residential and farm assessment for separate school purposes of the cities or separated towns to that of the entire combined zone.

The number of trustees to be elected to the county separate school boards will be allocated to a municipality or group of municipalities as nearly as is practicable on the basis of provincial equalized residential and farm assessment for separate school purposes. Where two or more members are to be elected in one municipality, wards may be established.

All separate school trustees will be elected at biennial elections for two-year terms with the first elections to be held on the first Monday in December, 1968. Special provision, however, is made in connection with the Windsor, Ottawa and Carleton boards.

The legislation also provides for the designation, by regulation, of district combined separate school zones in the territorial districts, with similar provision for the election of trustees in the district zones. A few separate school zones, Mr. Speaker, that are too remote to be included in a district combined separate school zone will remain under the jurisdiction of local boards as at present.

Provisions parallel to those made for public and secondary school boards in Bill 44 have been made in this bill for separate school boards with respect to assets and liabilities, appointment of auditors, the machinery necessary for the nomination and election of trustees, the transitional period, the right of attendance of pupils, and the appointment of supervisory officers.

In the preparation of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I have consulted with the Ontario separate school trustees' association, l'association des commission des écoles bilingues d'Ontario, and other interested groups. I should like to indicate at this time my sincere appreciation to these organizations for their suggestions and the overall contribution which they have made in the development of this legislation.

As is the case with the reorganization of public and secondary school boards, Mr. Speaker, this is a major undertaking. There may be some administrative problems in the transitional period. I am assured that the trustees, officials and teachers of the separate schools will look beyond these problems to the opportunity to do a better job for our students.

Guides for the reorganization of Roman Catholic separate school jurisdictions will be provided for separate school boards and officials in order that they may study the plan and effectively prepare for the transition to the new combined separate school boards. In the guides, suggestions will be made for the establishment of an interim separate school organization committee for each new zone. Further assistance will be provided to the committees, existing school boards and the new combined boards to facilitate the transition. In addition, it is proposed to hold a series of conferences to discuss the implications of, and the possibilities inherent in, the new organization.

The Ontario teachers' federation is arranging to appoint a committee of teachers in each combined separate school zone to meet

with the interim separate school organization committee to discuss matters of mutual interest. This action is in accordance with the suggestion which will be contained in the guides.

With the introduction, Mr. Speaker, of legislation to establish county and district divisional boards of education, as in Bill 144, and the subsequent legislation to bring the schools for trainable retarded children under the jurisdiction of these boards in Bill 120, I believe that we have completed the foundation upon which we can build a future full of promise for the young people of this province.

Mr. Speaker: Last evening the member for Riverdale (Mr. J. Renwick) raised a point with respect to the application of the so-called rule of *sub judice*, and I promised that, if at all possible, I would take it into consideration and bring in a ruling this morning. I have had the opportunity of consulting with the Clerk of the House, and I am now in a position to give my ruling with respect to this matter which, actually, as I mentioned last evening, is based very definitely on the ruling given by Mr. Speaker Morrow a year or two ago.

As requested, I have considered the application of the *sub judice* rule to the proceedings of the House, particularly taking into consideration the suggestion that the rule is not applied as broadly in the Parliament of the United Kingdom as in this House. I find the contrary to be true. There is no doubt that in all jurisdictions that have been examined, including the United Kingdom, the matters referred to Royal commissions are *sub judice* whether referred by order in council or by the House itself.

In the United Kingdom, the rule has also been extended to matters referred by the House to such tribunals, or even to select committees of the House. As Mr. Speaker Morrow pointed out in his review of the *sub judice* rule on March 30, 1966, the rule has even been extended to minor boards and commissions such as arbitration boards, or any other boards to which matters have been referred, and the discussion of which could prejudice the rights of people being examined thereby.

However, as Mr. Speaker Morrow pointed out at that time, wider discretion is permitted to the Speaker in matters referred to these minor boards. If he is concerned that the rights of someone may be prejudiced, he will intervene immediately, otherwise he may allow the discussion to proceed. This discretion also applies to the Chairman, of the committee of the whole House. To sum up, the whole basis of the rule—and I think this is most important—is that the House must be extremely careful not to discuss any matter when that discussion is recorded in the public press, and might prejudice someone's right to a fair hearing.

For a comprehensive review of the rule, I refer members to the ruling of Mr. Speaker Morrow, referred to above and found on page 106 of the journals of the House for 1966.

The Minister of Lands and Forests has a statement to make.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker I have an announcement that I believe will meet the approval of all the hon. members of this House.

After further consideration, as to our fee structure for angling rates in the province, it has now been decided that the resident ladies of this great province of Ontario—and may I add, Mr. Speaker, that we are very fortunate to have such charming and beautiful ladies—will not be required to have a fishing licence.

It is also my pleasure to announce that the fee for resident hunting licences has been set at $3, effective September 1, 1968, and not $5 as previously announced.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: According to my records, the member for High Park has a question from yesterday. This is question 720 about the brief from the Port Elgin police.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have submitted that question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That was asked? I am sorry. Will you proceed to today's questions?

Mr. Shulman: I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker. On Thursday last I asked the Prime Minister a series of questions about a $200,000 cheque that was sent to the Halton council. One of the questions asked if a complaint had come from the county clerk, to the government, and the Prime Minister answered that it had not. I would like to inform the Prime Minister and the House that Mr. Garfield Brown, the county clerk administrator, informed the Halton county council that a protest had been made to "Mr. John Yaremko, the Minister of Social and Family Services, over the delay in turning the cheque over to the county."

Now, I am quite certain that the Premier would not knowingly mislead the House, and I would like to request him to make a further investigation into this matter and perhaps report back to us.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Is it not kind of the hon. member to state the Premier would not mislead the House?

Mr. Shulman: I have more faith in him than I have in you.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question today, but in your wisdom, you have ruled out the first portion of it and this makes the balance of it rather senseless. Inasmuch as the estimates of the Attorney General are now up and I can ask that question in the estimates, I shall do so and I shall not appeal your ruling.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well then why bother doing so?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food. Is the Minister aware of the reduced income of fluid milk producers in Essex and Kent counties as reported in the Windsor *Star* of June 20, 1968, which states that losses varied from $141 to $443 per month? Is the Minister aware of the dissatisfaction and unrest of the advisory boards of these counties and the statement, as quoted in the Windsor *Star*, of Mr. Lee Montgomery who recently resigned from the Kent board, that—and I quote:

> The Ontario milk marketing board was destroying the fluid milk industry in the province, and that it was bureaucratic and arrogant and made arbitrary quotas that could be cut at any time.

What action will the Minister take to correct the present serious condition faced by milk producers in Essex and Kent counties who are faced with large financial responsibilities and reduced income?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, I did not know anything about this question until I arrived at my desk a few minutes ago. I can only speak from memory of the discussions that were held on June 18 in the standing committee on agriculture when the chairman of the Ontario milk marketing board, Mr. McLaughlin, appeared before the committee and for a period of, I believe, about two hours discussed matters concerning the Ontario milk marketing board in the establishment of quotas. The hon. member who has asked this question today, was in attendance at the committee, and discussed in great detail and length these very points, with Mr. McLaughlin.

Now first of all there are no such things as advisory boards in the various counties. There are county milk committees which are appointed by the milk producers in the respective counties. If there is dissatisfaction and unrest in the county milk committees referred to by the hon. member in Essex and Kent counties, I have no knowledge of it other than the letter of resignation that was directed to me by Mr. Lee Montgomery.

In the first place, Mr. Montgomery—while he wrote to me resigning from the committee—really should have advised the local county milk committee that he was resigning, because we have nothing whatever to do with the appointment of the county milk committees. And if he felt that he wanted to resign from the Kent county milk committee he might very well have addressed his resignation to that committee.

I would say this, that in the letter of resignation—which he directed to very many people including your party, the leader of the Opposition as well as the chairman of the milk marketing board—he mentions, as is quoted here in this letter, the way the quotas were established by the milk marketing board. All I can do is say that the quotas were established by the Ontario milk marketing board after, I believe, three or four meetings. Three that I know of, and I believe it was four, were held between the milk marketing board of this province and the local county committees of every county and district across this province.

Now if that is an arbitrary and bureaucratic way to establish milk quotas, then I would wonder just how better they could be established. It was done in full consultation at every move with those local producer committees. Now, the Ontario milk marketing board, in its first instance, was appointed by this government and I assume responsibility for the choice of members that were on that milk marketing board. Elections have been held, including the area of Kent and Essex counties who are members of a zone of counties in southwestern Ontario who elected their own representative last year to the Ontario milk marketing board. I believe in Kent county there are 60 whole milk producers.

How better we could establish a democratic process for the development of policy,

which admittedly is complex and of great concern to all the milk producers in this province, I do not know. Certainly those people who enjoyed fluid milk quotas prior to the introduction of The Milk Act of 1965 enjoyed those quotas at the expense of other producers throughout this province by legislation that had been drafted by this Legislature of many years ago. They were protected in their own individual markets by that legislation.

That legislation was challenged by industrial producers across this province who said we have produced in many cases just as good and just as high quality milk as that being produced by fluid producers and we will no longer be denied access to the fluid market. This is what generated The Milk Act of 1965. I sympathize with and respect the position of the milk producers of Essex and Kent counties and certain other producers in this province who admittedly have suffered because of the pooling of the milk quotas across this province.

We must remember that 70 per cent of the fluid milk producers of this province are as well off or better off than they were before pooling started; and about 30 per cent, including the group in Essex and Kent counties, are not as well off. But I believe that as time goes on the matter will straighten itself out.

I do not think that the Legislature of Ontario would wish the Minister of Agriculture and Food to step into the picture and say to the milk marketing board: "The policy which you have established through such a democratic process of consultation with the committees that have been elected by producers across this province is not good, it is not sound, and you should abandon it and take some other course of action."

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside). Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) but he is not present.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, that question is automatically held until the Minister and the member are both here.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I had two questions which I posed on Wednesday to the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart); yesterday there was some confusion about whether they were still standing, and I thought we had cleared that up. I have since been through the *Hansard* report for Wednesday, and the Attorney General undertook to answer them. Are there any answers available now? Questions 2 and 3 of my first set of questions—

Mr. Speaker: Those were the questions with respect to the power of the Attorney General on a summons to suspend magistrates—

Mr. Singer: That is right, and specific details about notice to the two magistrates.

Mr. Speaker: I believe that last evening or yesterday afternoon when the question was raised the Attorney General agreed that he would produce the answers. They may or may not be ready this morning.

Mr. Singer: That is my enquiry.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Actually, Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity to study the questions or prepare an answer, but I think I can answer them if I recall them.

Mr. Singer: I would like them answered in detail.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think the first one was as to the power to direct the magistrate in his duties. I think that was dealt with two days ago or thereabouts under section 19, I believe it is subsection 2 of The Magistrates Act, which authorizes the chief magistrate to direct the magistrate in his duties. We discussed that at the time.

If the other question was as to the notice given, the two magistrates are now the subject of the judicial enquiry, or the public enquiry. I can inform the hon. member in the presence of the House, Mr. Speaker, that immediately the enquiry was established I had an interview with Mr. Justice Grant. Yesterday he appointed a counsel, senior counsel of the Attorney General's office, Mr. Frank Callaghan. Mr. Callaghan in turn immediately consulted with counsel for Magistrate Gardhouse and Magistrate Bannon and acquainted them with all the material which was available to the Attorney General. He undertook to make copies of certain of the material for them so that they were informed and made fully aware of the nature of the matter, and all the material which is in their hands.

Now this was done as promptly, I think, as could possibly be done. The enquiry was established on Wednesday, and immediately the commissioner has moved to get the enquiry under way and the counsel for the persons involved have been fully informed.

Mr. Singer: By way of a supplementary question—am I correct in assuming that neither of the two magistrates concerned were told anything about it until yesterday?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is not quite right, Mr. Speaker. The two magistrates concerned, when they were first informed of the information which had come to our attention, were told through the chief magistrate that as a result of information which had come to the attention of the Attorney General they would not be assigned to any further duties in court, that the matter was being investigated, and that until that investigation was completed they would not be serving or presiding in court, and when the investigation was completed it would be decided what further action it will be necessary to take. They know, therefore, that certain information affecting their conduct or the conduct of their courts was in the hands of the Attorney General. They knew that this matter was being further investigated. They knew that when the investigation was completed they would be informed of what further action would be taken. I think they were not informed as to detail, as to how the investigation was to be carried on. They were just asked—

Mr. Shulman: Or what was being investigated?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, they did not, nor did the public, nor did we give out any information to anyone, neither my department nor the investigating detail of police. Nobody. It was done quietly, as I pointed out in my statement to the House.

If the information which came to our hands had proven baseless or untrue there would have been nothing known or said and the magistrates would have been restored to their courts; the matter would have gone on. On the other hand—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): It has not yet been proven.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: On the other hand, I do not say it has been proven true yet.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, do not say it even if it had been proven untrue.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No. I say if it had been proven untrue, yes, I say that. It could have been proven untrue. I also said in my statement to the House that if that investigation indicated good grounds for believing there had been misconduct, then it would be wrong for us to allow those magistrates to continue and preside in court and carry on their administration of justice. I think there was no other course open. It was a normal, proper way to proceed and we did not publicize the investigation to anyone.

Mr. Singer: By way of a further supplementary question. The information that was given to them yesterday, was it any more extensive than providing for them copies of the orders in council?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, it was all—the whole—material as we have it, and with an undertaking to make copies of certain of the material for counsel, for those magistrates.

Mr. Singer: Why did you not tell us that yesterday? That is what we were trying to get at. Suddenly, we have the great revelation. That is why we were so perturbed.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, if the hon. member had not been so perturbed perhaps he might understand that when I answered the questions of the House yesterday, counsel for the enquiry was, at that time, arranging to meet with counsel for the magistrates and this was done yesterday afternoon. His discussions with them, his disclosures to them was done yesterday afternoon.

I was not in a position to say, when the House opened yesterday, that this had actually been done and I know the hon. member wants me to be very accurate and careful in anything I say.

Mr. Singer: Indeed I do. It is a good thing there is an Opposition here.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh no. Let me inform you—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Minister of Mines): We are all agreed that it is a good thing hon. members opposite are there.

Mr. Singer: It is a good thing somebody is here.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, let me say that my conduct is not governed by any attitudes or comments of any other member of this House except my own conscience, my own belief in what is right and proper—

An hon. member: That is what the member for Sarnia said last night.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I wonder if I might be permitted to ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: The rules and the procedures do not, I think, allow any member who has not asked the original question to ask a sup-

plementary question. If the member can phrase it by way of personal privilege or order, then I think he is entitled to the floor.

Mr. MacDonald: I think that can be done without too much difficulty, Mr. Speaker.

I think in light of the number of statements that the Minister has made there is one point on which I would like clarification, and I am certain the public would.

The Attorney General has spelled out, with considerable detail, the care that he has taken to avoid premature public discussion of this whole matter. Quite frankly, I am rather impressed with the care that he has taken, though it is a very tricky kind of situation.

Can the Attorney General inform the House as to where the leak came in the premature break of the whole thing and, therefore, all of the difficulties?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, no, I do not know. I wish I did.

Mr. MacDonald: Are you going to investigate it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think for me to say anything more would be to speculate as to how it came about.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, my question to the Attorney General is, are you going to seek and find out who it was that frustrated all your careful efforts to handle this in an orderly way that would protect the interest of everybody, both the magistrates and the public?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, when this news broke I made enquiries as full and detailed as I could, to see if I could ascertain how this news broke in the press, the news media. The investigations, as I said in my statement, have been going on—police investigations—for some three months. It came to me some four or five weeks ago and we worked without any comments whatever. There were just a few persons who knew and just a small detail of police who knew.

We were unable to find out how that news broke. It was certainly not our intention to give it any publicity.

I can suppose, if I may say this, that when two magistrates who are daily in the courts no longer appear, possibly this would excite some curiosity in those who attend the court —reporters, lawyers—and whether someone then sought out the reason from some persons involved I do not know. Certainly, it did not come out of our office, and as far as I can ascertain, from the police, they say there was no information given out and I think that is so. To say further than that would just be to speculate.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the point of order for just a moment by way of enquiry?

One recognizes your regret as expressed, Mr. Speaker, that is the regret of the Attorney General in connection with the premature publicity relative to this investigation initially, but again, in this House, yesterday evening in response to a point of personal privilege or order taken by the hon. member for Downsview, the hon. Attorney General attempted to rationalize his change of position both inside and outside of the House because of the fact that certain publicity was also given in one of the editions of the Toronto *Daily Star* yesterday.

I ask the Attorney General to recognize that when he brought to our attention this edition of the Toronto *Daily Star* yesterday, it said that the police admit wire tapping.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the leak comes from the police department, and I suggest that there is some incumbency upon the Attorney General to look into the leak that took place yesterday from the police department.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that the Minister will deal with the matters which have been raised here quite properly, and I think that this discussion at this time should be concluded.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 23rd order, House in committee of supply; Mr. A. E. Reuter in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

(Continued)

On vote 201:

Mr. G. Ben (Humber): Mr. Chairman, I was interested in listening to the Attorney General yesterday afternoon and evening making his preliminary address on the responsibilities of the Attorney General, and giving a summary of how the office of the Attorney General had come to be one that involved a seat in the House.

I sort of suspected that perhaps the words of Sir Hartley Shawcross and the Rt. Hon. Harold Wilson may have stuck in his throat as he was reading them.

May I just read those quotes again? This is the one from the Rt. Hon. Harold Wilson:

> The Attorney General, whoever he may be, is not only the legal adviser to the Crown and to the government, he is also the servant of the House. It is, from time to time, his duty to advise the House on legal matters, a duty going on beyond his responsibility to the government and to the Crown.
>
> In other words, he is a servant of this whole House and he should protect the interests of this House.

Then, quoting from the statement of Sir Hartley Shawcross:

> Whilst participation in party politics and, of course, a shared collective responsibility of the government for action that is taken are normally incidental to the office of the Attorney General, it remains the clearest rule that in the discharge of his legal and discretionary duties the Attorney General is completely divorced from party political considerations and from any kind of political control.

I raise this point, Mr. Chairman, with reference to this question of *sub judice,* because no doubt Mr. Speaker was right—I should add here that in law school we were taught to use the English expression *sub judice*—the Speaker was undoubtedly right in that there are precedents which would support his interpretation of the rule, but I say it was incumbent upon the Attorney General to get up as a servant of this House to say that ruling does not hold water, that the ruling grew out of an arrogant government's desire and decision to gag the Opposition. I will elaborate on that, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I asked the Speaker yesterday that he consider the phrase *persona designata* in arriving at his ruling or considering what ruling he should arrive at on this question of *sub judice,* because there is a marked difference between a judge and a *persona designata,* although a *persona designata* may in fact be a judge.

Yesterday, the Attorney General read section 1 of The Public Inquiries Act and in order to make my argument clear, I will have to read it:

> Whenever the Lieutenant-Governor in council deems it expedient to cause enquiry to be made concerning any matter connected with or affecting the good government of Ontario or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof or of the administration of justice therein, and such enquiry is not regulated by any special law, he may, by commission, appoint one or more persons to conduct such enquiry—

The words I want to stress are "appoint one or more persons"; it does not refer to the appointment of a judge. Any member of this House could be *persona designata,* any man off the street, the way they impanel the jurors. Therefore, it is not the holding of the office of the enquiring individual that makes a person a judge, it is the fact that he has already been appointed a judge. So the mere fact that the person who was designated to hold this enquiry is a judge does not make this a court.

Now, the Attorney General knows this, because it is trite law, it is something you take up in first year of law school. There is a difference between a *persona designata* and a judge. There have been many commissions that were not headed by a judge. All I have to do is mention the Smith commission, the Glassco commission, the Watkins report, the most recent and famous ones. Therefore I say that a commission under The Public Inquiries Act is not a court.

Now, what does *sub judice* mean? It means "under judicial consideration". And 90 per cent of the commissions appointed are not commissions where anything is under judicial consideration. Therefore, 90 per cent of the commissions, I suggest to you, are or could not under the wildest stretch of the imagination be *sub judice.* An example, for instance, is the workmen's compensation board. Did the mere fact that Mr. Justice McGillivray was sitting as the *persona designata* to enquire into proposed amendments to the workmen's compensation board, deprive us of the right to discuss The Workmen's Compensation Act in this House or in the committee? It did not. Where was the distinction, Mr. Chairman? Obviously it was not *sub judice* as far as that commission was concerned. We discussed many aspects of the workmen's compensation board in this House and in the committees of this House during the time that the commission was sitting. The same with the Watkins report; we discussed many aspects—although it was not our commission—pertaining to control of our industry. We raised the issues covered by the Smith report many, many times while that commission

was sitting and nobody got up and said, "We cannot discuss this because it is *sub judice*".

For instance, if this government assigns a commission to some individual, be he judge or otherwise, enquiring into the marketing and the growing of farm produce, the marketing of that farm produce and the selling to supermarkets, would that mean that we could not discuss agriculture at all? I think anyone who made such a submission would be laughed at.

And yet if we follow the ruling that was made by Mr. Speaker—a ruling which the Attorney General, a servant of this House, did not get up to contradict—we would in effect be gagged completely. There may be a precedent for this but it is a precedent brought in by an arrogant government trying to stifle the Opposition and the right of the Opposition to enquire into aspects of government operation. And why did the Attorney General not get up and say that is wrong, that the members of this House are being gagged? The ruling is there, there is no way we can upset the ruling unless the House agrees to change that ruling; but I just want to suggest that the Attorney General was derelict in his duty as a servant of this House in not getting up and pointing out the weaknesses in the ruling of Mr. Speaker.

If the Attorney General wants to rise, I will yield.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): I just wanted to know if the hon. member would permit me to ask him, Mr. Chairman, does he accept the Speaker's ruling insofar as it affects the present enquiry into the conduct of these magistrates? Would he say that was *sub judice*?

Mr. Ben: I would say it is not *sub judice*, Mr. Chairman, but I would say that it is incumbent upon every member of the House to so govern himself—while he is protected by the rule that we cannot be sued for libel or slander—that he in no way prejudices the right of any individual.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I appreciate that.

Mr. Ben: Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with just one other thing that arose out of the discussion this morning before the orders of the day, and that is the implication that there is, in fact, a different type of justice for different people. This may strike some members as being rather odd but the Attorney General, Mr. Chairman, informed this House that Mr. Callaghan, who had been appointed as counsel to Mr. Justice Grant, was preparing copies of all the material available to whom you might refer to as the prosecution—making copies of all the evidence and material that was available to the government counsel—available to the solicitors for Magistrates Gardhouse and Bannon. This morning's paper dealt with the matter of the charge that was laid against the police officer resulting from the shooting of a young juvenile who had escaped from training school, and the enquiry pertaining to that. The article in question dealt with information being given by the board of education.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think that juvenile died.

Mr. Ben: No. Did I say he died?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think there was any death involved.

Mr. Ben: Oh, I am sorry, I thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He was shot in the leg.

Mr. Ben: I thank the Attorney General, Mr. Chairman, for correcting me. The shooting of a juvenile. The article dealt with information that had been given by a vice-principal touching on the character of one of the witnesses and the fact that this particular witness had an IQ, if my memory serves me correctly, of between 85 and 95. Mr. William Ross, one of the members of the board of education, was quite incensed that confidential information was given to a police officer touching on a witness and that this information then was given to the defence. In other words, the police were obtaining material to pass on to the defence. It struck me as strange because normally an accused does not receive even the benefit of being told what is in the confidential information to the Crown, the sheet that is put in front of the Crown with reference to every prosecution. There is a sheet put in front of the Crown; it is confidential information for the Crown.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Could I ask another question right here? I think before the hon. member goes further, does he take exception to the fact that the services of the police are made available to the defence?

Mr. Ben: On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, on the contrary. My whole reason for rising

is that I think it is wonderful and I want to ask: Why are not all counsel for the accused, or the accused themselves, given copies of all information available to the Crown? I think it is wonderful. And since the Minister got up and expressed amazement that I might be criticizing such a procedure, then I take it that he agrees with my contention, and that henceforth he will instruct all Crown attorneys to show to defence counsel this so-called "confidential information" for the Crown.

If magistrates can obtain copies of all the evidence that will be adduced in a hearing; if, where a policeman is charged, the police can go out and gather evidence for the defence, why cannot the Crown do the simple little thing of showing to the defence counsel the so-called "confidential information" so that he may properly defend the accused? This is why I imply that there are two types of justices in this province as long as you maintain this distinction. And there will remain two types of justices—one for the high and mighty and one for the lowly man—until such time as you do co-operate with the defence counsel and permit him to have all this information. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman; the Attorney General did get up rather incensed—if I may use that word for want of a better one—that I might be implying that they should not have done this.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Slightly aroused.

Mr. Ben: Slightly aroused, that might be a better expression.

As I say, I trust that henceforth all Crown attorneys will be instructed to co-operate with the police department. You know it is rather difficult, Mr. Chairman, to debate with the Attorney General. Listening to my learned friend from Sarnia, he was eulogizing yesterday while the Attorney General was still vertical. And you know, it is tough enough tilting windmills, but when you try to—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I was trying to make him horizontal.

Mr. Ben: But when you try to stab a halo it is too much.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): It is easier arguing with me, is it not?

Mr. Ben: It is much easier, yes.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 201.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment briefly on the ruling of the Speaker this morning on the *sub judice* rule. I think it is an incorrect ruling and the reason why I think it is incorrect is the very simple ground that the salutary version of the *sub judice* rule is for the protection of an individual who is appearing before a court in a court action, in a court of law. It is to preserve for him, in all aspects of public affairs, the protection of the rules of evidence.

In a criminal case, he is entitled to the protection of the rules of evidence as he is in a civil case. And it is the protection of the rights of that individual in a court of law, under the rules of evidence, which has led the assembly to adopt a rule that they will inhibit their discussion of the matter in order not to intrude on that person's protection.

In an enquiry under The Public Inquiries Act, or the enquiries which have been just set up, or the enquiry that was held in the case of Mrs. Timbrell and the children's aid society, and the previous enquiry into the allegations of my colleague, the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), it is perfectly clear now that the enquiry is not limited by the rules of evidence.

Indeed, sir, the objective of the enquiry is to have such a wide-ranging enquiry as to allay all doubts. Therefore, anyone who has any knowledge or any information regardless of how remote or how much hearsay is involved in it, is either entitled or bound to come before the enquiry and to tell what he knows.

The person holding the enquiry is bound to hear everything—whether it is mere rumour, gossip of any kind. What the person holding the enquiry then does with what comes before him, of course, is a different matter. He may very well, in assessing the evidence, be guided by the traditional rules of evidence.

But the fact of the matter is that so far as the form of the enquiry is concerned it is just as wide-ranging as it could possibly be or as wide-ranging as it could be in this assembly.

It seems to me, therefore, that it is improper for a ruling of this House to apply the *sub judice* rule to the enquiry which is being held, which the Attorney General announced in the last day or so. It is quite true that under the public enquiry, as in this Legislature, in open debate and discussion, somebody may get hurt, but we rely on the judgment of people to say that, "All right,

if it is in the public interest that an individual does get hurt, the public interest overrides it," and that is a judgment we all must make here, as is the judgment which must be made by people who give evidence at a public enquiry.

It may well be that the net result of the public enquiry, when the hearing is completed and the report is made, will result in charges being laid. That person would come before the court, where he would be entitled to the benefit of the rules of evidence, regardless of what had been said at the enquiry. It requires the exercise of a great deal of skill and judgment in order to separate out what has been public knowledge, because of the enquiry, from what is then permitted to be heard in the court of law as a result of the charges.

I think if the Attorney General would cast his mind back to the spy probe in the years immediately following the war, the point was very clearly made when Mr. Justice Kellock and Mr. Justice Taschereau both said that it may well be that they were satisfied that these specific individuals had in fact been engaged in an espionage conspiracy, and they went on to say in substance in their report, but we doubt very much whether it would be possible in all the instances in which we are satisfied, that these persons could be convicted in a court of law because of the protection which those persons would be entitled to by the rules of evidence.

And the event proved that to be so, because certain of the men who were charged were convicted, certain others were not convicted, even though the two eminent justices at that time, skilled as they were in the knowledge of what is required to prove something, were satisfied, as commissioners, that the espionage had taken place. Though they were satisfied in their capacity as judges it did not necessarily mean that a conviction would follow when a charge was laid under whatever the appropriate statute was at that time.

I think we have got to be perfectly clear when we use the *sub judice* rule that we restrict its application to civil proceedings in a court of law, criminal proceeding in a court of law, and I think the other area is a court martial which, again, is a military hearing having all the aspects of a court of law. We should not extend it to these enquiries under The Public Inquiries Act, where the persons who are involved in it, and the public who are involved in it, are not entitled to the rules of evidence. I think we should not extend the rule that far.

I think there may well be another aspect to it. I tried to express this last night when I was asking the Speaker for the ruling which he has now given. It may well be that because the matter is before the enquiry that this House would say: "It is a procedural matter; let us not waste the time of the House in discussing this problem, when a more adequate forum is available for a proper airing of it." But that is a procedural matter for the assembly and has nothing to do with the rights of other people, which is the basis of the *sub judice* rule.

We would not—by discussing in this House, in a less professional way than will be done at the enquiry, aspects of the enquiry—in fact be hurting the persons involved. It would be our right or our privilege if we wanted to do so to discuss it. I say, as a strictly procedural matter of the House, the House may say: "Well, all right, let us not waste our time. The enquiry has been set up; let it go ahead. When the report comes in, we will discuss it. In the meantime, we will go on with the other aspects of public business."

I think that there is a great deal of merit as a procedural matter but that is a basis quite distinct from the other basis involved. I think that the reason why an enquiry in the British House of Commons is still called *sub judice* is that the enquiry is created by resolution of the House of Commons. I think that this is also true in the House of Commons at Ottawa—that when an enquiry is set up, a resolution is introduced by the government with the terms of reference of the enquiry which is then subject to debate. Then, when the resolution is adopted by the House appointing and setting up the enquiry, the House considers it *sub judice*, because they have set it up, if it falls within this category of a judicial enquiry.

Your government, for reasons which escape me, insists that the appointment of all enquiries be an executive act of government, without any reference to this assembly. We had the same problem when the commission was set up on the allegations made by the then chief coroner of Toronto, my colleague the member for High Park.

We had great difficulty debating the terms of reference. Indeed, there are quotations in *Hansard* that would indicate that the very limited opportunty we had to comment on those terms of reference elicited abuse from the government. Debate, in fact, never ever did take place.

The record is perfectly clear, certainly in my judgment, that, intentionally or unintentionally, I was misled as to what the terms of reference would be and what the enquiry would, in fact, look into. I specifically asked for and was specifically given the assurance of the Prime Minister that the role of the coroner would be looked into, and would be an essential and fundamental part of that enquiry. That was not done at all.

This is the trap that the government falls into and the difficulty that we face if the government, by executive order, decides that it will set up an enquiry, instead of using the procedure of bringing the matter on to the floor of the House, my way of resolution, where the terms of reference could be debated.

The frustration and the hang-up of the interchange of the last few days in the assembly has been the inability of anyone to come to grips with the terms of reference. To, in an orderly way, have before us the resolution that sets out what the terms of reference are, so that all members of the House could debate those terms of reference. True, the government in their majority can always pass it as they wish, but at least there would have been a proper forum under which people could have exchanged views as to what the terms of reference should have been, and how specific they should have been, whether there should have been time limits beyond which the enquiry was not to go. If I may use the exact words, what is the time span during which the behaviour of the magistrates is to be enquired into?

Does it stem from the date of their respective appointments until the present time? Or is it to be curtailed to the specific matter which prompted this investigation? Again, my colleague from High Park, and the member for Downsview have been concerned about the lack of specifics for the terms of reference, that they should have been more specific, and more informative, rather than this general enquiry. They were concerned that, in some way or another, this was turning into a very wide-ranging fishing expedition.

The reason why these problems persist is that the government will not—when they want to set up such an enquiry—introduce a resolution setting out the terms of reference, which would then be the subject of debate in the Legislature. Then when the resolution was passed—whether it was a *sub judice* matter or a procedural matter—the House would say: "Look, having referred it by resolution to another body, we are not going to engage in debate about it until such time as the report comes back on the reference."

I would ask the Attorney General—whether he is talking about *sub judice* or procedural matters—that the government seriously consider bringing these matters forward by resolution, so that we do not have this unintelligible confrontation in this House, or by questions before the orders of the day, limited as they are, in terms of eliciting information.

We have the problem that the government is faced with, and the trap that the Attorney General came very close to falling into yesterday. If there is no debate in the House that brings it out, he is subject to the questions of the press outside. The members of the Opposition, who are frustrated by not being able to come to grips with the matter within the forum of the assembly, find that they want to get their views out to the media, instead of it being done here properly on the floor. The government in my view circumvents that by introducing it as an executive order, which produces this inadequate public discussion of the matter.

That is the substance of my comments. I think, in very brief summary, that the *sub judice* rule is not applied to an enquiry, because the rules of evidence are not involved in an enquiry, and the protection of the individual is non-existent in public enquiry as far as the rules of evidence are concerned. Therefore there is no need to extend the *sub judice* rule that far. Secondly, it may be a procedural matter that this House would say: "Well, we will go on with other public business until a report comes through."

Third, I ask the government that when they are going to institute enquiries, they bring the matter forward as they do at Westminster and as they do in Ottawa, by way of resolution, so that the terms of reference and the appointment of a commission can be thoroughly debated here and, in due course, passed. The government accomplishes its objective anyway, but it has been properly debated, so that we avoid the kind of unsatisfactory give and take which took place over that last few days in this assembly.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, before the Attorney General replies, there is a footnote that I would like to add to what my colleague has just said. I think that this is an extremely important matter, and it is rather fortunate that we have got the Attorney General's estimates before us, with Royal

commissions as an estimate to look at. At the same time, we are contemplating reflecting on the ruling that the Speaker has just given.

There is one aspect of the Speaker's ruling, with reference to the operation of Royal commissions or public enquiry, which disturbs me profoundly. That is, if the ruling is accepted and obeyed completely, it means that debate in this House is forbidden and will go on outside the House. The proposition is that what is before a Royal commission or a public enquiry, is not accepted by the public as *sub judice* and quite rightly so.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. I would point out to the member for York South that the Speaker's ruling is not debatable. It seems to the Chairman that the member is now debating the merit or otherwise of the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not really debating it, although I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that the two of them are mixed up. I plead with you, since you let something like an hour of debate go on, that we complete this matter now—and then hear the Attorney General, because it is not going to end now. If it ends in this House, it is not going to end outside the House, because the proposition that public enquiries established by the government be *sub judice*, so that what is going on is not going to be subject to public comment, is simply not accepted by the general public, and—as I said Mr. Chairman, rightly so.

It is widely acknowledged that one of the techniques or tactics of government when they are faced with a hot issue, particularly if it happens to be during an election campaign, is to set up a Royal commission. Then presumably the issue becomes *sub judice* and it cannot even be discussed during the course of the election. This happened in the last campaign. People do not respect it, and there is continuing discussion of it, but because of reasons that my colleague has put on the paper, it really is not *sub judice*.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, as the man who presides over this House, I draw to your attention—though I agree that, in effect, I am debating the Speaker's ruling within the context of these estimates—that what we are doing is saying that we cannot debate in this House what will be debated outside the House. That is surely a very anomalous situation.

That a Parliament, which is normally given the historic right to freer debate, should be denied any opportunity to debate when it goes on in the editorials and with the general public is one of the consequences of the situation that we now face. I think we have go to continue to review it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I also acknowledge—and am aware of the fact—that the Speaker's ruling is not debatable. Last night when the hon. member for Riverview rose and asked the Speaker to define *sub judice*—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Riverdale.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Riverdale, thank you. At that point I was getting to my feet. I was anxious to offer the Speaker some comments I thought might be useful advice. I might say this particularly for the benefit of the hon. member for Humber, but the Speaker did not allow me to get to my feet. Had I been able to do so, I may very well have said to him many things along the same line as have been said this morning by the member for Riverdale. I was not allowed to speak.

He made another ruling last night, a portion of whicsh I did not certainly agree with, but I did not debate that ruling either. I understand that this ruling is not debatable, but had there been an opportunity for debate before the definition I should certainly have offered views, though perhaps not going quite so far as those expressed by the hon. member for Riverdale.

I do agree that an enquiry under The Public Inquiries Act is not the same as a court hearing, that the rules of evidence do not apply in the same way at all. They go much wider under the enquiry, and almost anything may be heard.

I think this matter may be perhaps reviewed and settled at some other time. This should not be a matter of my estimates in the strict sense.

I do think I certainly agree that I do not know whether this goes really far enough, but that a matter such as is now before a commissioner under The Public Inquiries Act could very well be ruled by the Speaker to be a matter improper to debate. I think you might accept the definition of *sub judice* perhaps to apply to that sort of thing, because the reputations of persons are being considered almost in the same way as if they were charged with an offence before a criminal court, before the criminal jurisdiction.

There are many matters such as have been mentioned here which are in the general

line of public administration, government or that sort of thing, where *sub judice* perhaps in its most confining meaning should not be applied.

On the question as to whether the government should bring forward by way of a resolution the matter that is to be referred to a commission under The Public Inquiries Act or whether it should be done as an executive act as was done in this most recent case, and as has been done in the past, I have this to say. I think there are many cases perhaps where the government could very well propose the matter by way of resolution and have it debated.

I think there are cases where the government must be allowed its discretion and its authority to say we will do it as an executive act of government. I think that the most recent case is one of those, because in my thinking here again, where it is a case where persons are being brought before this type of enquiry, how are you going to discuss, how are you going to allow debate when there has been no enquiry set up? There is no charge as it were, before any court of enquiry, and the matter is widely open.

How then are you going to permit debate? How are questions to be asked and answered without impunging and infringing on the very thing you want to avoid, that is damage to the reputation of the persons concerned?

The whole extension of the *sub judice* rule was designed so that persons would not in the freedom of expression which is allowed in Parliament be hurt, be unfairly prejudiced, be damaged. To debate, let us say, the terms of reference set forth in this enquiry there would be bound to be questions saying: Why are they framed in that way? What is the reason? What is the background?

In saying those things, or in replying to those things, or even refusing to reply, I think there might well have been a situation where, in the discretion of those who had the knowledge, perhaps myself, if I may say as the Attorney General, I would have felt in fairness to the persons concerned that they should not give out information.

I think you will be infringing upon the very situation to which you apply the *sub judice* rule and for the purposes for which it has been designed. So, there is to my mind some discretion to be exercised by a government.

I think I would go so far as to say that in many cases it might very well be proper to advise the government to bring it forward as a motion to be debated by the House. As the hon. member for Riverdale pointed out, he spoke of yesterday's situation as an expression of views, and I just wanted to say that in whatever was said yesterday there was no expression of views. Anything that was said was simply fact. Very briefly, certain facts inside the House and out. I would prefer not to say anything more at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The Attorney General makes a nice point when he refers to two kinds of Royal commissions or public enquiries.

As I recall Mr. Speaker Morrow's ruling some years ago, pertained to a public enquiry that did not involve individuals nor their reputation. It involved the civil servants' pay scale and certain jurisdictions there. I suppose it is as much out of order now to debate Mr. Speaker Morrow's ruling as it is to debate Mr. Speaker's ruling made this morning.

But I do believe that we must be careful in our efforts to safeguard the reputations of individuals, that we, at the same time, bear in mind our responsibility here in order to keep this as the chief forum for public discussion on matters of urgent public importance.

I believe there might be some means whereby this House can amend its rule of just what is *sub judice* with regard to these matters. If we could follow the comments made by the Attorney General and member speaking previously and accept our respsonsibilities to safeguard the individuals probably as being primary, but draw some sort of distinction—and this would be a difficult thing for the House to do under the leadership of any Speaker—so that when individuals are not concerned but specific action or matters of policy are concerned with the decision, that these be properly discussed here.

I do not know what the procedure would be to arrive at some reasonable decision in this House. Both the decisions made by Mr. Speaker Morrow, and the Speaker this morning seemed to preclude any discussion of matters that are before a public enquiry. I would agree with the members who have spoken previously that this really does not meet the needs of this House in the observance of our duties.

I cannot suggest what an alternative would be, but one of them, surely, would be the discussion and debate in the House of the terms of reference of a Royal commission

when the House is in session. I would think that when we were not in session the government would, of course, have to have the responsibility to set up these enquiries by order in council.

But the procedures carried out by the government in the last few days, in my view, have been adequate and I hope that the Attorney General would contemplate changes.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 201 agreed to?

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman, I have got a couple of points that disturb me.

In connection with the ordering of the Royal commission to investigate the conduct of Magistrate Bannon, I am quite satisfied that what I am going to say does not breach the Speaker's ruling.

I just do not understand why, when an investigation had taken place over a period of three yeeks, the Attorney General took certain actions on June 18 but neglected to advise Magistrate Bannon of the reason that those actions had been taken until June 27. I think that this kind of action is completely inexcusable.

I would think, Mr. Chairman, if I could attempt to draw some kind of a parallel, that if we ascertained in this House that John Doe had been arrested and held without charge for a period of eight days, that we would have risen in righteous anger and demanded an explanation from the people responsible for that.

I do not think there is any difference. Surely, magistrates are equal before the law as well. The Attorney General tells us he wanted to keep it quiet; it would disturb the normal process of the administration of justice; it might cast doubts on how we were functioning.

But surely if the investigation had gone on that length of time there must have come a time in the Attorney General's mind when he had to either put up or shut up.

On June 18 he half made up his mind so he suspended those men. All right, he relieved them of their duties and I am not going to get into the technical argument under 19(a). It is my respectful submission that you are quite wrong under 19(a).

But he took certain action on June 18 that half condemned them. It is my simple contention, Mr. Chairman, that when he made up his mind to move he should have moved either toward the Royal commission or to lay criminal charges. And he acted in a most unfair and arbitrary way in effecting those suspensions without advising the persons affected as to the reason why it was being done.

The end result of this has been all the newspapers' speculation. I would wonder, even if the broadest clean bill of health was given by Mr. Justice Grant, if these two men have any further usefulness.

What I am suggesting in simple language, Mr. Chairman, is these two men have been found guilty without a trial right at the beginning. Now, if the Attorney General in good conscience did, on June 18, believe he had to move, I suggest, very simply, that he had to move at that time and that was the day that the Royal commission should have been ordered, or the day the criminal charges laid. I do not think that magistrates can or should be treated in a different way and my second point is going to deal with that.

I do not know if the Attorney General wants to comment on that one or not. But I have a second point I will deal with in a moment.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Chairman, before the Attorney General answers, I have one particular point.

The thing that disturbs me in his having relieved the magistrates of their duties temporarily, without informing them as to the reason, is that—and we do not know the circumstances—without giving the magistrates the reason they had no opportunity to give the Attorney General whatever explanation was available. There may very well have been some explanation which would have prevented all of this occurring. That is why I would like to associate myself with the member for Downsview. I suggest that the Attorney General acted very incorrectly in taking his action without giving these magistrates an opportunity to explain.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the only way I could reply to either of the hon. members would be to breach the very rules which we have been debating and to state things which I feel should not be said anywhere except before the public enquiry. There, the magistrates will have the right to say and give any explanations that are available. For me to start now detailing facts, allegations, information which came forward as a result of our investigation would be to try the matter here in this House.

I do not propose to talk about that matter which is now before the enquiry. I

cannot. I am handicapped, I admit, I should like to. I have the answers but this is not my place here to give them.

Mr. Singer: All right. Mr. Chairman, I do not know if we can beat this point any further. I feel very strongly about this and I think this is such a paramount issue, I am surprised it does not get through to the Attorney General.

However, Mr. Chairman, there is another point that disturbs me—

Mr. J. Renwick: Could I comment? Will the member for Downsview yield?

Mr. Singer: Oh, all right.

Mr. J. Renwick: Thank you very much. I do not think that that is quite the point and I do not think the Attorney General, Mr. Chairman, has to go into any of the matters which will be dealt with before the Royal commission. I think, the way it came through to me from the member for Downsview and the member for High Park, they were simply saying why, on the day on which the two magistrates were relieved of their duties in court or not assigned duties in court, why on that day did the Attorney General not ask them what comment they had to make because he, as Attorney General, was placed in this very difficult position in protecting the public interest and indirectly relieving them of their responsibilities.

I think what bothers me—I think it is what is bothering the member for Downsview and the member for High Park—should they not, privately with you, have been given an opportunity of answering why they were going to be relieved of their duties? As the member for Downsview has said, it is going to be extremely difficult, in fact, for these men to repair the damage which has been done. They, perhaps, should have been given, up to the very last moment, the opportunity of forestalling the action which the Attorney General was going to take, and by themselves vocally to him, of saying whether this should be done or should not be done.

It would have made it somewhat, perhaps, more difficult for the Attorney General to go ahead but at least he would have had benefit of what their reaction was to the serious step which he took, which he tried to keep quiet. I am not certain in my own mind whether it should have been public or not and, as he said yesterday, had it not leaped into the press it probably would still be quiet.

But on the day that he had them cease their functions as magistrates it bothers me that they should not have had the opportunity of communicating to the Attorney General their comments about the action he was then going to take, as a last step by which they could have protected themselves from the damage which, and I tend to agree with the member for Downsview, regardless of the outcome is likely to have been done to the two men.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, just briefly again, I would say this. I see that point, perhaps I could say something on that.

Let us assume that the magistrates have been called before me. I have certain facts which I feel very seriously impugn their conduct. I say to them: Why? You do not ordinarily, necessarily, say even at that point, I am going to have to relieve you of your duty, and I may charge you with a criminal charge, or I may have to have an enquiry into this.

I do not know what that might have accomplished; it would still have, perhaps, taken a little time to have determined the course of action. I cannot really see that reputations of the persons involved would have benefited or been affected other than they have been.

Mr. Shulman: But you gave them no chance to explain or defend—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: When the hon. member becomes aware of the facts of this matter, he will realize that explanation would, perhaps, not have helped me in that situation. And, as I say, it is very delicate ground on which to speak because you force me to go very close to a breach of the rule I am trying to observe.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview was interrupted—were you going to continue?

Mr. Singer: Yes, I was. I wanted to talk for a moment about the telephone tapping incident. When we asked the questions of the Attorney General, one specific question that I asked was—who authorized it? The Attorney General did not answer that question. Could the Attorney General answer that question now?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It was not referred to me, Mr. Chairman. I do not ordinarily direct or authorize police in their investigations. I did not.

Mr. Singer: You do not know?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No.

Mr. Singer: All right. Now, it puzzles me, Mr. Chairman, that when the Attorney General talked to the press about this incident yesterday afternoon, he went to particular pains to say, "We did not tap the telephones of the magistrates"—or whoever did, did not tap the telephones of the magistrates—"but we did tap the telephones of criminals."

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: I said, "Whoever did tap the telephones did not tap the telephones of the magistrates, they tapped the telephones of the criminals." Now, if the telephone tapping was logical or justified at all, could the Attorney General tell us possibly what the distinction is? If you were suspicious—and I use the "you" collectively; I do not mean it as directed to you in any other capacity than as the Attorney General—if you were suspicious that something serious had gone wrong with the administration of justice, and that magistrates were involved, why did it seem almost a point of honour that you should not tap the telephones of magistrates but you should tap the telephones only of known criminals? Can you answer that one?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have no answer, Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is relevant at all. I do not propose to be drawn into this debate at this time.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 201 agreed to?

Mr. Singer: No, I am not finished yet. A third point is this: I would like to draw to the Attorney General's attention—I am sure he is aware of it—the provisions of The Ontario Telephone Act, and more particularly sections 110 and 112. I am not going to read them; the Attorney General is familiar with them—the provisions of section 372, subsection 1 of the criminal code—

Mr. Shulman: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: A point of order raised over here by the member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: I do not want to interrupt the member for Downsview unnecessarily but I specifically asked at the beginning of this debate under what vote this particular matter should be debated, and I was told by the Attorney General, vote 210.

Mr. Chairman: Well, we are certainly off vote 201.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am talking in relation to the Royal commission to investigate the conduct of Magistrate Bannon, and part of that investigation relates to what was said in this House, and outside the House, in connection with telephone tapping. I am not talking about telephone tapping generally; I am talking about it in relation to this specific Royal commission, and I would think, sir, it must be in order.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And we are voting the money to pay for this investigation.

Mr. Singer: Yes, sir, and we are voting the money to pay for this Royal commission and I am confining my remarks to that. At a later stage, under the proper vote, I too will have some general comments on telephone tapping. But I am just relating it to this particular incident because this is the first occasion in this House that we have had any admission that during the process of a police investigation there has been telephone tapping. And I just want to—

Mr. Chairman: Does the means of obtaining the evidence really relate to a discussion of the principles under which Royal commissions are handled under this code?

Mr. Singer: Yes, it relates to this specific Royal commission, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Royal commission; not the subject of wire tapping?

Mr. Singer: No. The Attorney General put them into it, or the newspaper writer put them into it. The Attorney General saw fit to comment on it inside the House and outside the House and certainly I think it is most pertinent here.

Mr. Chairman: But might not there be scores of ways in which the particular evidence is behind the Royal commission?

Mr. Singer: I am not asking that. I am asking particularly whether or not, Mr. Chairman—I was about to give my authority—whether or not an offence having been committed under certain statutes, the Attorney General intends, as the chief enforcement officer in Ontario, to take action under the provisions of The Ontario Telephone Act under the provisions of the criminal code, and under the provisions of The Bell Telephone Act, 1880, to prosecute those people for breaches that he admitted had taken place in the statutes? That is my simple question and that was all I wanted to ask.

If the Attorney General wants an elaboration, I will give it to him. I will give him the details. The Ontario Telephone Act, sections 110 and 112, subsection 372-1 of the code, section 25 of The Bell Telephone Act, 1880, applied together with section 107 of the code. But the Attorney General has said: "Offences have taken place," and I want to know if he is going to charge the people who committed those offences?

Mr. Chairman: Does the Attorney General wish to answer this question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I just want to clear up one point, Mr. Chairman. I have never said that offences took place in this regard whatsoever. I am not sure at all that The Ontario Telephone Act applies to the Bell Telephone Company; I have never thought that there was any breach here to be considered—and that is the question the hon. member asked. I certainly did not admit to any offences and I have not thought of any prosecution.

Mr. Singer: Well, all right.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Now, I would say this—I would expect if there was anything of that nature, that will be a matter again for the commissioner presiding at the enquiry to consider and weigh; he may bring some direction from that.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, now we have got the issue—

Mr. Chairman: I suggest to the member that he has received an answer and—

Mr. Singer: It is not quite an answer because, as quoted in the *Star*, and in quotation marks, "Electronic devices to pick up certain messages on the phones of certain other persons during the course of the investigation were used." Now, that is in direct quotation marks. I presume the Attorney General said that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Who says that is a breach?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Who says that?

Mr. Singer: All I am saying is this, that within the scheme of The Ontario Telephone Act—and if he cannot find solace there, I would suggest he can find it in the sections of the criminal code I referred to and in The Bell Telephone Act in 1880, section 25, that it is an offence to interfere with the privacy of telephone calls.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. For one who is not learned in the law, it has been difficult sometimes for me to follow some of this, although it has been very interesting. But it seems apparent to me, sir—and I do not often agree with the hon. member for High Park. The hon. member is right. The hon. member for High Park was told that this particular subject is to be discussed under another vote; I do not know that any other member should be permitted to discuss this subject under this vote.

Mr. Singer: That is wire tapping in general. This relates to this incident that the Attorney General referred to, and I have been careful to confine my remarks to the one incident. All I am suggesting is that if the Attorney General is not aware of these provisions that he should make immediate reference to those statutes, and I am of the opinion that an offence has taken place—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, may I have your ruling?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: —and that he should take action.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. May I suggest this—and in a way it is a repetition of my earlier comment—that mainly, if you are dealing with the adequacy or propriety of police methods, this is probably a matter that would come under 210. We are here dealing not with police methods but we are dealing with 201, a general section relating to policies, commissions and the background of these. Therefore, I would suggest that if you are getting into the details of the ways of collecting evidence, the ways of using evidence and their legality or propriety, you deal with it under 210 and not now.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I shall save the balance of my remarks for vote 210.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, I have a number of comments and questions to ask. But first of all arising out of some remarks made by the hon. member for Humber this morning, about "dope sheets" and about disclosures to defence counsel of Crown information; on the whole I think—particularly of the legal aid scheme for duty counsel—I find that the Crown is becoming ever more open with respect to it. I would

just make the wry comment that the day that the hon. member, as a counsel for the defence, make a disclosure of any portion or miniscule of his position, then I would think we would change the law.

The second point that I wish to make has to do with some comments made last evening as to the mentality and earning power of the legal profession. There was a brief remark made by Fuller in the text that I was reading last evening. He said, "Over the whole proceedings hovers what Lord Coate proudly called the artificial reason of the law." The legal profession, according to one of its critics, recruits its members by a kind of natural selection from among those temperamentally inclined to over-thinking and, listening to part of the debate this morning, I felt perhaps that a little overthought was in evidence here.

A point that was made at some length both by myself and the hon. member for Sarnia last evening has not particularly penetrated so far as I can see, particularly in the reply by the Attorney General last evening, Mr. Chairman. In order to drive it home, if I may be permitted, McRuer says at page 944, the following. It has to do with your relationship to the other Cabinet Ministers in the introduction of legislation:

> The major fault in the present system is that the responsibility for deciding the legal policy to be followed is not clearly placed on the Attorney General whose constitutional responsibility it is. Nor is he given proper opportunity to discharge it.

That is the big point.

> The departmental solicitor cannot and should not be expected to discharge the responsibilities of the Attorney General. Although he may have a particular familiarity with the branch of law to which a bill relates, his association with the administrative operation of his department will always tend to restrict his objectivity and breadth of view. His major interest will be to draft a bill to ensure that the administrators of his department can meet any administrative contingency with a minimum of hindrance.

That is precisely what we objected to last evening and what we take issue with.

In other words, we find in many pieces of legislation coming before this House, there is the feeling that it is a question of giving too much power to a Minister, and he does not want to be bothered with outside obstructive interference, all the gadflies of the Opposition and what not, and public comment, he wants to be a free-wheeling individual.

So, his department comes along with legislation about which the legislative counsel knows very little, I suggest, as to the substance and is not really equipped to peruse it. They forward it; it is so broad in its terms that it meets every administrative contingency that they can dream of with a minimum of hindrance from people like ourselves. The inevitable tendency is to confer broad powers with little procedural restriction, and little provision for appeal, in blatant disregard of fundamental legal policy.

I would again ask that the direction and tenor of those remarks be registered and have some effect on future legislation or you will have to listen to people like myself *ad nauseum* repeating the text just as it stands. This is a kind of penalty that you are going to pay.

Coming now to somewhat more concrete matters, in a report of the Toronto *Daily Star* of April 4, 1968, is says that justice takeover is to cost $19,500,000. In the report placed before this House, read yesterday by the hon. Minister, he has indicated that there was an increase in the estimates of $20,712,000, exclusive of the Ontario Provincial Police. He goes on to say of this very substantial increase, approximately $14 million is represented by the costs. Further down he says that this has not taken into account the costs of buildings, and this would be within Public Works.

I wonder, against the newspaper reports at the time of the announcement of the take-over of justice, has the Minister now got any shrewd idea of what the total cost of the take-over will be, and whether it exceeds previous estimates?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, first I would point out that the costs I referred to in the remarks that I read in the opening discussion of my estimates, do not include the costs of the take-over of the facilities which are within the jurisdiction of The Department of Reform Institutions. We have from the Provincial Treasurer—from that department that actually has the figures which have been prepared and revised and completed as closely, I believe, as possible—that the costs amount, as nearly as I can ascertain and that department can ascertain, to $19.5 million.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, might I continue for just a moment on Royal commissions? In 1966-67 year, the amount asked for by the Attorney General was $255,000. Actually spent in that year was about $559,400, a very considerable increase. True, that would be the year in which the Atlantic Acceptance got going.

Then last year the Attorney General asked for a little bit more than he had asked for in the previous year, $300,000. This year he is asking for $125,000, a good deal less, according to his estimates here.

In view of the enormous discrepancy in the last public accounts figure that we can get our hands on, first of all can the Minister indicate what was spent last year, over against what was asked for? Has he those figures at this time?

My second question has to do with the Royal commissions actually sitting and being paid at the present time. I would ask him to correct me if I am wrong. It seems that the Mackay commission is sitting, the Rand commission on labour legislation, and the Atlantic Acceptance enquiry, together with this new one. Are any others presently engaged in this work, and if there are I would think that $125,000 sounds like a pretty small figure?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think that I dealt with this in large part last night. I would point out that under the estimates, this under the main office, we cannot estimate with any accuracy what is going to be spent on commissions or an enquiry. Some of these are presently in the course of their progress and some may arise during the year. For instance, we have had this week the creation of another enquiry.

We cannot estimate those, and the large amounts which are increased beyond our estimate is due to the expenditures by the commission of enquiry.

The Atlantic and the commission on The Workmen's Compensation Act, came out of my estimates, the Royal commission on labour relations and the Royal commission on the pollution of air, soil and water. That is the explanation.

I think that the hon. member asked for the figure spent in the last fiscal year, and I am trying to find it. I do not have the actual figure, but I think I can say that we were very close to the appropriations that we obtained.

For the Atlantic Acceptance, the appropriation for 1967-68 was $255,000, and that was an increase of $183,000 in our estimates. This year the estimate for Atlantic is $72,000, which I am sorry, would be a decrease of $183,400, but we asked for what was appropriated last year. Workmen's compensation enquiry, it was $20,000 in 1967-68, this year we are asking for $5,000, a decrease of $15,000. Labour disputes enquiry, last year $25,000, this year we ask for $20,000, a decrease of $5,000. The pollution of air, soil and water, we asked for $28,000 in our estimate last year.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, there is a report in the *Globe and Mail* of June 28, 1968, and the author is Warren Gerard, which reads as follows:

> Police asked for and received private information from school records of a student who was a Crown witness in a recent court case, it was disclosed last night.
>
> The information, which not even parents are permitted to know, was given about William Robert Dwight, a 17-year-old former Brockton high school student. The vice-principal testified that the youth had an IQ of between 85 and 95.

I think that is a sufficient quote from the article on which to base my comments.

These matters, of course, come from an extensive file of information that is maintained on each student in the province of Ontario. These are normally maintained in the office of the school which he is attending, but they are cumulative and contain specific information besides the normal bits of information that have accrued from confidential reports from teachers over his whole academic career.

Now, if you think about this a moment, you would realize that there would be a considerable profile of his personal abilities and proclivities that would have been gathered over his 18 to 20 years' scholastic career, and what makes this particularly easy to deal with in modern technology computers have now been programmed to read this information out on request and in very complete and explicit detail. I have in my hand actually something that has been in my files in the education department for some considerable time and it is an example of the sort of computer read-out that is available when the computer is properly questioned.

There is no doubt that school officials and others must have authority in order to have access to this information. Much of it is routine and yet I suppose the best example of a piece of information that is some-

thing other than routine is the intelligent quotient of the individual itself.

This is, in many ways, a most important piece of information, usually not available to the individual, at least from public sources. I am not here to give you any expert opinion as to the precision of an IQ test or the importance of its reading and yet in my experience if an individual knows his IQ it is perhaps one of the most important pieces of information that he would have.

That this would be given in a court of law as evidence as to the ability of the person to testify and to be believed is incredible. I believe it is severe intrusion into individual right and I think the Attorney General has an immediate responsibility to see that it is well understood by statute and regulation that this information is not to be used in this particular way. I do not want to relate it to the case I have mentioned previously; the police officer was found not responsible under those circumstances and I do not want to relate it to that at all.

The fact that this information, which is surely privileged and personal, should be brought out in a court of law under these circumstances is something that I heartily disapprove of. I think the Attorney General is going to have to take steps to see that those who have access to it, school principals and others, will not be required to divulge it in this sort of detail in a court of law. I would be most interested in the Attorney General's comments and what he is prepared to do to protect the individual liberties of our citizens in this regard.

Mr. Shulman: Are we on vote 201, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: I presume so.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I just wish to speak briefly, Mr. Chairman, if I may do so. There is no privilege accorded for this type of information that I am aware of. There is privilege between solicitor and client; that information cannot be given. I read the article quickly this morning; I understood how the information was first obtained. I point out that the principal, or vice-principal, who had the information, had access to it, could have been subpoenaed and brought to court and asked to produce it. Then it would be for the judge presiding in the court to decide if the evidence is admissible and the weight to be given to it.

I think one would have to consider very carefully whether one should have a blanket rule, or a general rule, saying that such information is never admissible and is privileged and cannot be disclosed. I can think of situations where it would be most cogent and most valuable as evidence for a person charged, or the defence, and I think to say at this moment that I am prepared to do more than consider the suggestion of the hon. leader of the Opposition is all I could say. I think of situations where, if you have a general rule, it might very well not be justified. I could consider the matter, though.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I believe in many cases it is brought before the court by way of evidence of the psychological capacity and maybe the psychiatric difficulty that a witness might experience. But when we realize that every one of our citizens from now on, as they move through the school system, is going to have this information which can be read out to the court in great detail, it means that we are coming into a period where there is a tremendous departure from the impersonality of the individual; that his privacy has really been completely disrupted and lost. If these sheets—and I suppose a complete one would be 10 feet long—of information, can be tacked to a person's name, an individual, when he appears in court under a charge or as a witness, instead of that being simply a person standing before the judge, this, in fact, is the person standing before the judge. I plead most sincerely that automation and the technological advances of this type are often a real challenge in the matter of individual liberties and we must be aware of it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough East (Mr. T. Reid), I believe, had the floor first.

Mr. Bullbrook: I thought I made it, sir, but—

Mr. Chairman: If the member for Scarborough East will yield to the member for Sarnia, it will be quite in order.

Mr. Bullbrook: No, it is not the same point, so perhaps—

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, on the same point, I would like to draw the Minister's attention to *Hansard* for June 5, 1968, pages 3966 and 3967, where my leader and myself discussed this problem in the context of the Education estimates. I want to make sure that the Attorney General has seen our comments there and has seen

the reply the hon. Minister of Education gave to us.

Mr. Chairman, my leader has reiterated this concern with individual liberties in the context of the courts; I would like to suggest that the context is much broader than this. We are concerned with the collection of this information about students during their school years, particularly in primary and secondary schools, and who has access to it.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate the three areas where I think this government must take some action. I believe it probably should lie under the present Minister's department, the hon. Attorney General's department. The three points are these: First, I think the Minister of Education of this province has the responsibility to instruct the school boards of the province about the type of information they can record about individual students. In this context we are talking about liberties in our society, the liberties of the individual and the rights of individuals in our society. At that time, Mr. Chairman, my interpretation of *Hansard* is the Minister acknowledged this was a problem and that he was concerned with it. I would suggest that the Minister of Education and the Attorney General should get together on this because this government, no matter whose responsibility it is, must spell out specifically what the Hamilton school board, for example, is allowed to collect and what it is not allowed to collect.

The second point is that with the introduction of regional computers, storage centres if you like, this government does have a direct responsibility. It is a responsibility that should not lie at the local level and this government must make sure that the information that is stored, that is allowed to be collected, and is stored on those memory brains of the computers, is not leaked out in a way that is harmful to individual teenager's rights.

The third point, Mr. Chairman, was who had access to this information? With computers, access becomes much more possible, I believe, and I think that this government must spell out who can get at this information—someone in the department, who simply wants to find something out, or is it only those people who are actually programming the information?

I would like to underline what my leader has said, that this is the concern of the Liberal Party. We are very concerned, not only with this application to the courts of this province, but to employers who might be looking for records on potential employees and even to the universities, Mr. Chairman. I feel that there should be some very carefully thought out restrictions placed on the type of information that is collected on the individual such as subjective evaluation by teachers who might not like the young teenager because of his hair and put in a very subjective, very biased report on the character of that teenager. I think also, that we must spell out very carefully and very publicly, who has access to the computers and who can get the information from the computers.

The court is only one area; we are concerned with other areas in our society as well. For example, the credit rating agencies who like to get this type of information before they put a credit rating on someone. I think we need laws. I think they must be clearly spelled out and I urge the Attorney General, in conjunction with other members of the government, particularly, the Minister of Education, to put this at the top of their list of priorities in the current concern with human rights and individual liberties in our society.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, on the same subject. I am afraid I have a little advantage over my friend who just sat down and my illustrious leader because I am rather surprised.

I would remind my friend that there were civil rights involved. The civil rights of the policeman to a fair trial and the right to bring out all evidence which would point towards his innocence. It is quite conceivable that if this evidence had not been brought forward, to which objection is now taken, an innocent man may have been convicted. We must be extremely careful whose civil rights we talk about, because everybody is entitled to have civil rights. The accused as well as the innocent; the witness as well as the accused; all of them have certain civil rights.

But we have always strongly guarded the civil rights of the person who is on trial and whose very safety may be in jeopardy. The man who was accused, if my memory serves me correctly, of attempted murder or something—well it was not that, but it was a very serious offence at any rate and he could be sentenced to be incarcerated for many years. Now whose civil rights are more important? I suggest that the civil rights of this man who was charged there were just as important as anyone else's.

Now my friends do not know that I can summons, in a court of law, anyone to give

evidence as to a person's reputation in a community. All the computer has done is gather various opinions as to that person's reputation in a community—in this particular case, it is in classroom and has gathered it in one place and has made it readily available. In no way is it an invasion of anyone's civil or legal rights, because the defence counsel could have called every teacher into a court of law and said: "What is your opinion as to the character of 'A'? Is he trustworthy? Does he tell the truth? Is he prone to lie? Is he a person who exaggerates?"

All this is admissible evidence in a court of law. Now the reason we brought computers into being is to save mankind the necessity of labouring, manually, to accumulate all this information each time it is required. A computer does it faster. It does not change the situation in any way. It just does, in a split second, what would take a number of people maybe years and decades to do.

Now we have to be extremely careful that we do not deprive ourselves of civil rights when we talk about preserving civil rights and this is what could happen.

Now the sheet that my leader pointed out is not admissible in a court of law because it would be hearsay. You would have to produce the teachers themselves to give evidence as to their opinion. This would just be a correlation of certain facts and the sheet, the read-out itself, is not admissible in a court of law.

It would not be admitted by a judge. If it was admitted it would only go to show that there was a read-out on this particular individual, that certain facts had been accumulated on him. But it would not go to prove the truth of what was on that particular sheet of paper.

So I think we must be extremely careful that we do not bite our nose to spite our face, so to speak, and deprive ourselves of our civil rights by saying that we are fighting for our civil rights.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask something of the hon. leader of the Opposition, who was kind enough to send me this computerized record? I am somewhat interested in it myself, because of course, we have records of some 3,500 children in our training schools.

I have been unable to find anything in this sheet which gives an opinion at all. Have I missed it some place? It merely gives the attendance record and the grades and marks and so on but there does not seem to be anything here, that I can find, which gives an opinion.

Mr. Nixon: If I might provide a little more information for my hon. friend who asked the question:

This is information about an actual student. Anyone who attended the conference on computerizing was able to go to the machine and was given the code which would authorize the machine to give the information that is contained in that table. I understand that the first code gives name and address. Then a person in a certain position is provided with access to further information.

You will notice at the bottom of that sheet the answers come back with the letters NA —not applicable. This is the answer that comes from the machine when the person questioning does not have the appropriate code for further information. It is an example of what the machine has within it and from that point on, the information on this specific student was not applicable in computer terms for the person who was questioning.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But it only has to do with the grades and so on.

Mr. Nixon: You see, that is where they stopped using it. They tore the page off and brought it back.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, it may be of some interest to those who are, as they say, "learned in the law" on these matters, that some time ago and I think there was some criticism in the House on this score—my department refused to provide a file to a court of law, in which a man was being tried for murder. The defence insisted on getting this file and we were faced with a very difficult situation because our files contain a lot of information which is got together by psychiatrists and so on.

There is a lot of personal information in these files and it is felt by those who are gathering this information that it would jeopardize their position in getting this information from the wards or even in the case of adults. The people gathering this information would lose the confidence of the ward or inmate if it was felt that they—or the student, in the case of a training school—might some day let these reports see the light of day in a court. So, to protect the system and to protect these people, to protect the ability to get this information—the sociological

history of these people—we feel it is important to maintain the confidence that everyone believes is involved in these matters.

But there was some criticism of us for refusing this. We felt we had to do it, but the judge—I do not think he quite ordered—but implied that if we did not produce it there would be an order and he did not think we should put ourselves in a position to be ordered to do so. He insisted that these be produced in the court and all we could manage to do in that instance was to make an arrangement with the lawyer for the defence and a representative of our department to sit with the judge in his chambers so that he could see the whole file and decide whether there was anything in it which, in his view, would be helpful for the defence. This is precisely what we did.

Now, I just mention this in passing because of the difficulty that we get involved in with regard to information which was received on the basis which we received some of this information, that is confidentially. I really do not think that—as the hon. member for Humber pointed out, the computerization of this, is pertinent to the situation at all. Either the information is available or not. Whether it is computerized or got together in a hurry is of no consequence at all.

Mr. Nixon: I think that computerized information means that it is available and that is the consequence.

Mr. T. Reid: Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on my colleague from Humber's remarks. We have had a little discussion here, and his view is definitely that this type of collective, highly-centralized information and the access to it must be restricted. It must be spelled out so that there is a clear understanding on behalf of the people supplying information to those memory files of what the uses of that information will be.

This point was, as I understand it, that witnesses must be called as opposed to simply bringing a piece of paper into court. My feeling on this is that—and I am certainly not a lawyer—the information that a teacher supplies to a student's file is certainly not supplied under any oath, and that is one of the key things. I feel that a lot of this information that teachers do supply to these files—the principals supply to files—is not based on any sense of oath. Therefore those files are perhaps the same as the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions' files: The information he has collected, to the best of his knowledge, is accurate, but still it is not done under oath, to my knowledge.

So I would simply say this, that certainly—in terms of character witnesses as I believe the lawyers call them—the character witnesses have to come into court and testify. But I do not think that this type of information that goes on the student's record, which is not taken under oath in any sense, as I understand it, should be—I will not say blankly it should not be used, but I would say that its use must be very, very carefully scrutinized, and we should have a consistent policy on this in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman: Does the Attorney General wish to comment on this particular point? I believe the member for Sarnia has something on a different point.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I made a fair comment, Mr. Chairman, to the leader of the Opposition who raised the same point.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, yesterday evening both the hon. member for Lakeshore and myself took some refuge in the comments of the hon. Mr. McRuer. I wanted to point out to the House that, as had been pointed out slightly, I think that in chapter 62 of McRuer, the hon. gentleman therein dwells upon the functions and duties of the Attorney General. I would like to think he dwells also on the functions and duties of the Deputy Attorney General, and for that matter, all those people who follow the directions of the Attorney General in his responsibilities.

Mr. McRuer says in effect that there are four prime responsibilities of the Attorney General:

1. The supervision of the machinery of justice;

2. The supervision of law enforcement;

3. The supervision of government litigation; and

4. The supervision of legislation. Now, it is in connection with No. 2, the supervision of law enforcement, that I wish to direct my few short remarks.

On page 937, Mr. McRuer says: "Law enforcement may be divided into three main branches which have no clear lines of demarcation: investigation, policing and prosecution". And it is with respect to the first one that I want to make a comment at the present time. It is in connection with investigation. As I understand the law here in the Dominion

of Canada, and applicable here in the province of Ontario, we are somewhat unique—not entirely unique—that in our courts, evidence illegally obtained is acceptable evidence. It has probative value in the United States of America, in most of the states, and I believe decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States are otherwise. Most evidence illegally obtained is not admissible towards the prosecution of any citizen, so that here in the province of Ontario we must be very careful, because in point of fact—to bring it to the attention of my colleagues, as I understand the law—if a person is charged with drunk driving, Mr. Chairman, he could be forcibly put on the floor by the police, and blood can be extracted from him, Mr. Chairman. And if there is too high a content of alcohol in that blood it can be used to convict him.

I put it to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. Attorney General, that circumstances such as that cause a person great concern, and should cause this Legislature great concern, and should cause the Attorney General concern, and the Deputy Attorney General concern. But the judiciary has said, as I understand it, that that evidence is admissible. I put it to you therefore, that there is a keen and broad and most onerous responsibility on the Attorney General in connection with his duties relative to the directing of police investigation.

In the last few days, sir, we have had comments about wire tapping. I do not want to talk about wire tapping. We will talk about that generally again, but I do, Mr. Chairman, want to talk about the responsibility of the Attorney General in connection with the securing of evidence this way, and I point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that I believe the law of this country still to be as shown in the statutes of Canada in 1880, 43 Victoria. Section 25 of The Bell Telephone Act reads:

> Any person who shall wilfully or maliciously injure, molest or destroy any of the lines, posts or other material or property of the company, or in any way wilfully obstruct or interfere with the working of the said telephone lines, or intercept any message transmitted thereon shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

And the criminal code of Canada says, in section 372, subsection (c):

> Everyone commits mischief who wilfully obstructs, interrupts or interferes with the lawful use or enjoyment or operation of property.

Now, the point I make is this: We are going to discuss at length the question of wire tapping, but I suggest this, that I was disturbed yesterday by the fact that it has come to our attention that the Attorney General of this province has told the press, "Yes, wire tapping was used in this matter, in this case, the case of the two magistrates". We have to have a clarification of a position by the government here, and the only person who can give us that clarification is the hon. Attorney General.

I do not invite him today in any way to adversely affect the position either of that commission or enquiry, or the gentlemen involved. I support the position of the Attorney General, and always will that any matter of this nature, if it has been ruled to be *sub judice* then he should not make a comment. And I say this most respectfully, that you cannot rationalize the difference because it has been made public. Either a matter is before the court so to speak, or it is not, and because the police leak out information—and this is the only thing I can infer, as I read that edition of the newspaper. It says, "Police admit wire tapping". If there is a leak where did it come from? It seems to me it came from the police. And it seems to me, having regard to the position that I take—and that is that here in this jurisdiction, evidence illegally obtained has probative value, is relevant; I mean, subject to its relevancy, it has probative value, and it will be accepted by our courts. This is an extreme onus on the Attorney General of this province, an extreme onus, to most diligently guard the rights of the individual in connection with evidence illegally obtained, because let us hope we never get to the situation in this province, Mr. Chairman, where you and I are subject to being, so to speak, put on the floor and having our blood extracted from us by the police.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: May I ask the hon. member if this is a case that he is supposing? He is not surely talking of any case that ever happened?

Mr. Bullbrook: I am putting this position to you.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is a supposition.

Mr. Bullbrook: No, there are decisions, I believe—I cannot give it to you right now. There is a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada on this very point, that evidence of alcohol content illegally extracted while the person was unconscious was accepted as evidence.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, yes, but what I was asking the hon. member—when he talks about this example of a man being forced down on the floor, held down, and blood taken from him, this is not a case that he knows about. I never heard of such a thing.

Mr. Bullbrook: I put this to you, Mr. Attorney General—through you, Mr. Chairman—I am not saying that. Perhaps I exaggerated. I exaggerate for the purpose purely—the principle lies there. This does not warrant any laughter from the member for Lakeshore because he should be behind me 100 per cent. The principle is there. This is the principle I make, that evidence illegally obtained will be accepted by our courts, so perhaps I exaggerate in the actual manifestation of my concern.

Perhaps the police would not ever do this but if we are not the guardians of principles here in this House, then where in heaven's name in the province of Ontario are you going to find the guardians?

The point I make—and I will stop now—the point I make is this, that we must demand now a position to be taken by the hon. Attorney General in connection with the investigatory conduct of the police forces in this province. Either he is going to permit it or he is not going to permit it, either he is going to go half way with it, which seems to be the reasonable approach—there are times when justice is a two-way street. I want to protect individual rights and liberties as much as anybody else, but we also want to protect the rights of society and I can see that there are times that we require abilities to investigate, that require this type of conduct on the part of the police. But the only way we can guard this is through the courts. I exhort the Attorney General and his department—are you on a point of order? I am going to finish in a moment. I exhort the Attorney General really to take a position in this connection. I say it is his responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I thought the hon. member said just as I rose that the only thing we could do is take the rule of the court, which I think is a very sound thing. I would think he would surely go along with me when I say, surely, when our highest courts rule on these matters that is a pretty good rule to follow. I cannot think of any better body than our judiciary and particularly those of the highest courts in the land, who rule on these matters of evidence, the way on which it is obtained and the weight. We have not—in this country, in the highest court of our land—we have not followed the rule of the United States courts, that tainted evidence, they call it, is not admissible.

Our courts have said, and it is not for the Attorney General, really, to change that decision of the courts, when it reaches the highest court of the land—they have said: "We will consider how the evidence has been obtained and we will take into account all the circumstances surrounding how it was obtained, but the fact that it may have been obtained in an illegal way does not take away from its use in the court. It may have some evidentiary value."

That is the rule our highest court has laid down. And I think I have regard for the rule of our courts particularly in this field, more respect and more regard than those for the courts of our great neighbour to the south.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, my concern is not whether the Attorney General has any ability or should have any intrusion in the decisions made by the courts. My prime concern—and perhaps I have not brought it to your attention significantly enough or properly—my main concern is that, somewhere in this municipality or in this province, some police officer of his own volition, sir, might take it upon himself, through the guise of some investigation—do you follow me?—to intrude upon privacy. I feel there lies the responsibility to the Attorney General. There lies a question of direction from his office.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I might just add, Mr. Chairman, that I could cite for the hon. member a number of recent examples where we have exercised intervention, direction, reprimand, control, advice to our police forces.

These things come to our attention and quite frequently they come right to my attention—they are dealt with sometimes by myself through the Ontario police commission and through other police commissions. We have numerous instances—I should not say "numerous"—a number of instances have come to our attention and we do not hesitate to act promptly and exercise, I would say, reprimand—direction certainly. Orders go out that such things shall not occur, shall not be done. I think this is not something that is infrequent and that we neglect or that we overlook.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, following up what my colleague has said and some of the points I touched on earlier.

Would like specifically to get an answer from the Attorney General, if I can, as to whether or not, in view of the circumstances that we have already referred to at some length, he intends to take action under section 110 or 112 of The Ontario Telephone Act, under section 372, subsection 1 of the criminal code or under section 25 of The Bell Telephone Act? Either in this specific case or any other case that comes to his attention. Or, if it is not his intention to do that, what direction does the Attorney General give to the police in these matters?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I thought I made it plain that until the enquiry now going forward has been finished, I will not be taking any action in the matter. When that enquiry is completed and all the matters therein reviewed, including the matter of how the evidence was obtained, and so on, I will then consider what action, if any, should be taken.

Mr. Singer: All right, then let us leave that alone. Supposing a policeman has thrown a drunk down on the floor and put a needle in him and extracted blood. Would the Attorney General, quite apart from the admissibility of that kind of evidence at the trial, what would the Attorney General do to the policeman involved, would he initiate any proceedings, or would he say it is too bad, or would he slap him on the wrist?

What I am trying to get at, Mr. Chairman, is what the Attorney General's attitude is to evidence that has been illegally gathered by law officers. That is a very simple thing, really. There are certain actions occasionally taken by law officers that are illegal—they breach some statute or are in violation of the criminal code or they are illegal for other reasons, and occasionally that evidence is admissible under certain rules of the court. But what is the Attorney General's attitude to the gathering of evidence illegally by law officers?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would say in the case the hon. member mentions, used by the hon. member for Sarnia, throwing the man down, I would say that policeman should be charged with assault immediately. The Ellenor case is an example.

I think the policeman should not be allowed to breach the law without the law pursuing him the same as it would any other citizen.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the hon. Attorney General has said repeatedly that there is no law in this province, in this country, against wire tapping. He said, in his opinion—in *Hansard* he says that in his opinion that, where the court finds the need to use this type of investigation, the court can come and ask for permission to do so.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would point out to the member that the Attorney General has just intimated to the committee, in response to a similar question, that he does not intend to enlarge upon or discuss this particular matter until the completion of the enquiry about which we have had considerable discussion—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your ruling but it is very important to discuss this question.

Mr. Chairman: It is important to everyone and the Attorney General has indicated he will answer no further questions regarding that particular aspect. I would ask the member to abide by the Attorney General's intimation to the committee.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, could I perhaps help here? I think the member for Grey-Bruce was probably wanting to ask about wire tapping generally. Perhaps I could say to you, sir, that we did agree that the matter of wire tapping, generally, should be discussed under, I think it is, vote 210. I understand that other members will be discussing that general question at that time. Perhaps that would cover your question then.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the Chairman misunderstood the Attorney General a few moments ago. The chair then understands now that the Attorney General will entertain questions and debate pertaining to wire tapping generally, under vote 210. The member for Humber.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I rise very disturbed. I want to compliment all those who have spoken in defense of the criminal and be permitted to say a few words in the defense of the victim.

It seems that civil liberties in this province entail only the right of the criminal to escape punishment and do not entail the right of the citizen to walk freely along the streets of the city, or through the grounds of his public parks. In the United States, where civil liberties have become such an issue, where they have passed laws that you cannot use in court, evidence obtained illegally, people not only cannot walk through their

public parks any more, they cannot even walk down their streets without fear of being molested, or assaulted or even killed. This seems to be the type of government that people are endeavouring to bring into this province.

I shall fight that trend to my last breath, because I want my children to be able to walk with freedom and dignity through the parks of their country and their province and along their city streets, whether it be at day or at night.

We talk here of using so-called "illegal" means. I think a proper word may have been "improper" means, because the example that was given even by my learned friend from Sarnia, who has gone, about blood being extracted out of the person, it would not have been obtaining evidence illegally, because there was no law against doing it in such a manner. It would have been only improper.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): What about assault?

Mr. Ben: The assault is illegal, but there is no law which says that a policeman cannot—

Mr. Singer: Assault?

Mr. Ben: That is assault. Assault is improper, but there is no law which says that you cannot pin a man down and extract blood for the purpose of evidence.

Mr. Singer: Oh, do not be silly!

Mr. Ben: Well all right. We are going on the defence of the criminal. I say it is improper, and the assault is an assault and it is punishable as the Attorney General said. For instance, wire tapping, again, they want to convict the police department of wire tapping, and yet it is possible to get a court order by the police department to go and tap phones.

Mr. Singer: It is not.

Mr. Ben: It is so. They have done it in the past, and wire tapping evidence has been permitted in a court of law in this province.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 210.

Mr. Ben: The fact is, who are we going to protect? Are we going to protect the citizens or are we going to protect the criminals? How far are we going to go to permit these people to escape?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: You talked about everybody's civil rights.

Mr. Ben: I am talking about the civil rights of my children, my wife, your wife, your grandmother, your grandfather, your children, your grandchildren; those are the people whose civil rights I am talking about. Those are the ones we have to protect, not the criminal element.

In the United States, if you read the presidential commission on crime, three-quarters of the crimes are not even reported because people say it is a waste of time, you cannot get conviction. I had a complaint in my own riding—

Mr. Lawlor: That is what Barry Goldwater is saying.

Mr. Ben: —because the police said there was no sense to it; we cannot go anywhere so we are just wasting our time trying to do something.

You can go and talk about Barry Goldwater, but your people, the NDP, are the ones that encourage law-breaking. Last year we had an example when the leader of the NDP encouraged by voice the Oshawa people to break the law.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: Well, there is the element that they support and it is quite clear. I do not support that element. I say that the police ought to be entitled to use every electronic device that is conceivable to carry out their job. That is what we pay them for.

An hon. member: What does your leader say?

Mr. Ben: If my leader says differently, then I am willing to stand here and differ with him, because to me this is a question of principle; it is the question of the survival of society, or at least the decent element in society.

Now, if you want to go and protect the other element as you have been doing, go ahead, be my guest, that is what you have been doing in the past.

I shall not take that position. I say it is about time that the police in apprehending drivers need not catch the automobile in order to charge the driver with a breach of the law. Too many people escape civil liability and criminal liability that way, making our

streets dangerous. I think that the Crown attorney, rather the Attorney General, ought to supply a lawyer for every police force, paid by The Attorney General's Department, to give immediate advice. But they should not have to do down to the Crown attorney's office. They should have a lawyer on staff, especially in big cities such as we have here.

I am not against this business of identification. I think that every citizen owes it to his society to produce identification to a police officer when a police officer asks for it. That is the least that he can do as his responsibility to society.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Tattoo a number on your arm.

Mr. Ben: I am not suggesting that we tattoo as the hon. member has suggested, although I would point out to you that the SS in Germany was tattooed as a means of identification in case of a holocaust or in case they were found dead. There are different reasons for tattooing.

But a person can identify himself to assist his servant, a police officer. We have lost the thought, the idea, the concept that a policeman is our servant. We look upon him as some vile individual we have to tolerate in this society. We brought him into being; we made it necessary for him to be there; we pay him, we instruct him what to do; we control what he does. The least we can do is have some respect for the office that we created and the man we put into that position. I think that this business, as I say, civil liberties, has gone a little bit too far; it is a double-edge sword. Unfortunately, it seems to be cutting the user more than the intended victim.

Mr. Chairman: Does the Attorney General wish to reply?

The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to Royal commissions, but before I do I would just like to comment briefly that we of the NDP never suggest that laws be broken. We believe that some laws are bad laws.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: These laws should be changed, and we are going to continue to fight to have those laws changed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order: The member for High Park has the floor.

Mr. Shulman: If laws are bad, they should be changed and that is what we are here to do. We are making suggestions constantly to change the laws. There are bad laws on the books; I am sure that members on all sides of the House would agree with that. They have got there for one reason or another, they are out of date, they should be removed, and I am sure there are people in the government party and people in the Liberal Party who will make every effort to change those laws.

An hon. member: Do you advocate breaking them?

Mr. Shulman: There are certain occasions when laws should be broken. You found that in Germany and you should know that. Now, these are rare occasions; I hope they never come to Canada, but if they do come I am prepared to breach such laws.

Mr. Chairman: The member will please discontinue the discussions across the floor of the House and direct the remarks through the chair.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Why do you not tell them that?

Mr. Chairman: I called them to order in the same manner as I have called other members to order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: It is a one-sided street, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shulman: To defend the Chairman, which I should not be doing, but I must compliment him, I think he has been doing a very fair job.

To come back to Royal commissions. The thing that disturbs me about the Royal commissions is the cost, and I would like to comment briefly on that. There is no such thing as a cheap Royal commission. They are always costing up in the $50,000 plus bracket. One of them apparently is going to exceed some $1 million—one which is currently on now, very close to that figure now.

I have found by experience that this expense is partly unnecessary and I would explore this matter briefly by taking an example. Now, I do not wish to go into inquests —that will be coming up later—but I wish to compare certain inquests to certain Royal commissions as this is a rather comparable

situation, and I would like to take one specific example.

There was a disaster in Hogg's hollow a few years ago, and a Royal commission was set up to look into it. There was a similar disaster a year after that, here in the city, where a subway collapsed and a coroner's inquest was set up to look into that matter. And certain coroners' inquests, paritcularly up until last April, were very similar to Royal commissions in that they were rather exhaustive enquiries to look into every aspect of the matter which had produced the disaster, and which led to recommendations to prevent similar disasters. In that way, they were very similar to Royal commissions, Royal commissions other than the perverse type which we are also familiar with.

Now, the cost is so glaringly different it is almost impossible to understand. In the Hogg's hollow disaster, I do not have the actual figures here, but the enquiry went on for something longer than a year before the results were produced. The cost, and again I do not have the exact figure, but it was a very high figure, somewhere I believe between $50,000 and $100,000.

In an almost similar situation, the collapse of the subway, the inquest was convened within one month, and was similarily exhaustive in its enquiry, it took nine days of concentrated work, not just an hour here and an hour there that we see with so many Royal commissions. The results were, if anything, more productive in that the exhaustive enquiry discovered the cause, and made suggestions for the prevention of similar collapses in the future. The cost was considerably less than 10 per cent of the similar Royal commission.

So, I would like to go into this matter of the expense of Royal commissions, and in order to be able to do it in a more intelligent and detailed way—I am going to ask the Attorney General if he will supply me with a breakdown of a Royal commission. The one that I am particularly interested in is the one in which I have some personal knowledge, the Parker inquiry. I understand that this is now not available, but at your convenience, I would like to ask you for a breakdown of where all that money went.

If he agrees, I will discontinue my particular remarks now and resume at a later day so that I can make a detailed study of the cost of Royal commissions and try to find out just what goes wrong in them and why they have to cost so much money. Would it be agreeable to the Attorney General to supply this to me at his convenience?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say first that there is no comparison whatsoever surely between a commission of enquiry such as the Atlantic enquiry into a vast field or empire of financial institutions extending over detailed transactions and various geographical areas, and into all sorts of financial matters, there is no comparison between that and the disaster in Hogg's hollow.

And surely there is no comparison between the investigation into a labour organization, various organizations, and individuals, in the investigation into The Workmen's Compensation Act, and how it should deal with cases, and a coroner's inquest. They are not comparable at all.

Surely an enquiry such as Mr. Justice Rand is carrying on into labour relations matters for he, again, has heard briefs from hundreds, I would suggest, of individuals, labour unions, management, government, and so on. Surely this is not to be compared with a coroner's inquest? Or even an enquiry into a disaster which is a localized thing happening suddenly and which can be dealt with in a small area and time.

As to the request for the detail of the Parker Royal commission, this was not in my department at all. I do not have the accounts for that; it was handled and paid for by The Treasury Department.

Mr. Shulman: I certainly was not comparing the Atlantic enquiry with any coroner's inquest. Obviously there are many enquiries which are quite similar. Perhaps you will correct me, was there not a Royal commission into the Hogg's hollow collapse?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not in my time.

Mr. Shulman: No, of course it was before your time. I was comparing the enquiry into the Hogg's hollow collapse to the coroner's inquest into the subway collapse, which I felt was comparable. I still do not see why they are not comparable. I think many of these enquiries, which are comparable, seem to cost a great deal more money. For that reason I would like to have a more detailed breakdown of any Royal commission, if the Parker one is not available.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is not available because it was not in my department.

Mr. Shulman: Fine. Does the Attorney General have available a breakdown of any Royal enquiry? I would like to look in detail into one Royal enquiry.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would think that these would be found in the public accounts. The Atlantic enquiry is a tremendous work that is still going on, as is the Rand enquiry. The workmen's compensation one is somewhat complete. The roads commission is complete and I am sure that you will find all the detail in the public accounts. But really, and I do not want to curtail the hon. member in his comparison, every one is different. The work entailed is different and the area investigated is different; the time required is different. What benefit a comparison would be—I certainly do not think that you can compare them with a coroner's inquest which lasts a day or two, or a couple of hours in some cases.

I am sure that the public accounts will contain detailed figures of the Royal commissions that have been completed. I think that we are really wasting time, to be frank. I am prepared to discuss detail such as counsel fees. The commissioner is a Supreme Court judge and is salaried; the amount paid by the federal and provincial government covers that. I do not know what we would be gaining by a discussion of this kind. I certainly do not have the figures for the commissions which the hon. member requests.

Mr. Shulman: Right; I will pursue this with the Provincial Treasurer as he is the man who would have this breakdown. The other matter I would like to go on to is something which was touched on yesterday, rather inadvertently, when I was speaking on the question of reimbursing people who appeared in front of Royal commissions. At that time the Attorney General brought up the matter of people who are charged and subsequently found innocent. Now, I would like to pursue that matter because yesterday the Attorney General suggested that no one has ever suggested that such people should have their legal costs reimbursed.

I have been giving the matter a little thought and I find that this is very disturbing. I would like to give one or two examples to the Attorney General of how very wrong this can be, and the hardship that can develop because of this apparently commonly accepted situation.

Some six months ago, a patient of mine, Edward G.—I will not give his full name, I do not wish to embarrass him—was driving home and two rather attractive young ladies were hitch-hiking beside the road. Perhaps rather injudiciously, he stopped and picked them up and offered them a lift. Before he had proceeded very far, his car was stopped by the police and they searched these two young ladies and found some marijuana cigarettes upon them. The two girls immediately —I believe that they were 16 and 17—immediately said that Mr. G. had given them these cigarettes, whereupon he was charged, taken to the station, spent the night there and was bailed out the next morning. He hired a lawyer, who offered to defend him in court, and it appears that the lawyer advised that he should ask for a judge and jury, so he had a preliminary hearing, at which time on the evidence of these girls—who it turned out had lengthy juvenile records—he was committed for trial. He subsequently appeared and numerous people appeared on his behalf—his background as an electrician, had never been in trouble or had any breaches of the law, and has never smoked marijuana—of this I am convinced—he was bewildered by the whole series of events, and the judge in his wisdom immediately dismissed the case and said that it was obvious that the girls, in an effort to avoid trouble for themselves, had made these false statements. He was freed and walked out supposedly none the worse.

But in truth he was very much to the worse. He is an electrician and he earns $150 a week, which is a very reasonable salary in our society. His lawyer fee came to $4,000 before he was finished. His life savings consisted of a home, on which he had a mortgage; and in order to pay this $4,000 he had to borrow and he is in the process of selling the house now to pay off the finance company from whom he borrowed to pay the lawyer who insisted on money before he would go into court. He was not eligible for legal aid.

Here is a man who, literally, has been ruined financially through no fault of his own. It appears to me, and I find it amazing that no has ever suggested this before, that someone who is charged and is found innocent should have the legal costs reimbursed. It just appears common sense to me.

I have another case, which I brought up here in the House yesterday with the Minister of Reform Institutions, of Mr. Roger Whiting who, on April 13, was shopping in Simpsons. He was in the paint department when a fire started and he was arrested as a suspected arsonist. He was incarcerated in the Don jail. He was kept there for some six weeks, at the end of which time the police completed their investigation and found they had made an error. When it came to trial, they said, "We are sorry, we made a mistake. We wish to withdraw the charges." So an error had been made but no one is reimbursing Whiting;

not to mention the rather unpleasant things that happened in the Don jail; he is an epileptic who could not get his medication and proceeded to have epileptic attacks, one after the other. Leaving this aside, no one is offering to reimburse him for the loss of time or even basically, for the legal expenses.

We have had another case here which is even more glaring. It has been discussed in this House. A certain reverend is convicted in court and subsequently, the court of appeal found an error had been made, reversed that and found him innocent. No one is even reimbursing him for the time he spent in jail. I would like to suggest to the Attorney General that this a basically wrong concept. If the state makes a mistake and charges someone who is innocent and if the court, in their wisdom, find that person innocent, then they are innocent, and they should not be punished by being forced to pay their legal fees.

Now I have the three examples from my own limited experience and I am sure that every member has many others. There must be thousands of them in this province every year and I think this is a legitimate expense of the state and not of the individual who is wrongfully charged. Apparently this concept has not been discussed before and I would like to ask the Attorney General for his views on this matter. I would like to ask the official Opposition if they do not agree with the position which I have had the opportunity to discuss with the members of my party and which they agree with.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, certainly I do not agree with the proposition that we must be in a position to guarantee that in every case we make an arrest—the police force is the law enforcement force of the province—that they must be so certain before they arrest, that the person—

Mr. Shulman: That is not what I am suggesting.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It practically amounts to that, in my view, and I do not think we—

Mr. MacDonald. But what if you make a mistake?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would like to deal with it this way. Mr. McRuer, in his enquiry into civil rights, report No. 1, volume 2, in chapter 54, deals with the matter of compensation for wrongful convictions. He deals with it at length. I have read it and—

Mr. Shulman: That is another matter.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I think these things are pretty closely related surely. The point I want to make is that he points out, and I reading at page 838:

> The problem is further complicated by the fact that under our system of acquittal, whether rendered by the court of first instance or by a court of appeal, is not a judgment declaring the accused innocent. A verdict of acquittal is not a judgment declaring the accused innocent.
>
> In a criminal file, the accused is presumed to be innocent. That presumption may be rebutted only by proper evidence that establishes guilt, beyond a reasonable doubt. The verdict of not guilty merely establishes that the onus imposed upon is not met.

I think the member does not have this clearly in mind that the verdict of not guilty is not a verdict of innocence.

Mr. McRuer points out—and I am aware of this, having given this matter some consideration—that in some of the European countries particularly, Scandinavian countries and in the United States, or some of the states, I think, there is provision for compensation where a person has been wrongfully convicted and imprisoned.

Now this is particularly the way it is in the states. There has to be wrongful conviction and imprisonment. If it is established, then it is upon the person who makes the application for compensation to establish by a certificate of the court or by a pardon that he was innocent of the crime and had no connection with it, that he was not only convicted, but suffered imprisonment. Then he may claim compensation.

In short, Mr. Chairman, what I would say is that we are taking, as I have pointed out before, all the recommendations of Mr. McRuer under consideration. They are receiving study and Mr. McRuer makes recommendations on this matter. I think there is merit. I cannot say that I go all the way with some of his recommendations but these are receiving study. As you are aware, this report was received only recently so that the matter is before us and will be further considered. I have nothing more to add at this time.

Mr. Shulman: The major point which I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, is not in relation to wrongful convictions, because I understand this was dealt with by Mr. McRuer. I am sure, when you have had an opportunity to con-

sider this, that you will take action to this particular problem.

The problem which I am primarily concerned with at this moment is the one which has just come up here within the last 24 hours. That is: when a man is arrested and is found innocent. Now obviously they do not—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He is not found innocent, he is found not guilty.

Mr. Shulman: Let me say, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned if anyone is presumed innocent they are innocent until found guilty and you have just said this. Everyone is presumed innocent until found guilty. Therefore, they are found innocent if they are not found guilty. If I come back to my Mr. G., here is an obvious clear-cut case of an innocent man who, through no fault of his own, has literally lost every cent he had. I think this is an injustice and I think, as Attorney General of this province, you should be prepared to look into this particular aspect, this particular type of problem, where a man is charged and is found not guilty. As far as I am concerned, this means his presumption of innocence has been maintained and, as such, he should not be penalized, because otherwise the police or the law enforcement agencies can penalize anyone they wish by charging them and continuing to charge them whether or not the courts ever produce a guilty result.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: They do not do that.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 201.

Mr. C. G. Pilkey (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, I might point out, too, in this regard, because I think that the people who get hurt are those who can least afford it. Obviously people who are wrongfully arrested, who can afford a lawyer and legal advice, are found not guilty. I suppose it hurts them somewhat if they lose some money. But it has not got the same effect. Although I have not got it documented in front of me, I know cases of workers who have been charged wrongfully, found not guilty, had to get a lawyer, lose time from work to proceed in the courts and found not guilty. Okay, it may not be a great sum, but it could very well be, as the hon. member for High Park related. If a worker is caught in a squeeze of a $4,000 and $5,000 legal bill, then it will take a good number of years to recoup that kind of debt, particularly, if he is a wage-earner.

I think that the member for High Park has a real point in this regard, and not just at the $4,000 and $5,000 level either, but at that level where he is going to lose time. This reflects on his standard of living. It reflects on his wife and children. They have got to pay as well. So it is not just the individual who is charged wrongfully—his whole family has to bear the brunt of this wrongful charge.

I would think that this is one area that the Attorney General, through you, Mr. Chairman, ought to explore and document those areas that people have been found not guilty. He should find out the reflection on those people in terms of the debt that they acquire, on their family and children, and the whole ball of wax as you might say. I feel pretty strongly about this point because I have run into some situations—not to the extent that the member for High Park raises, but the potential is there. I have run into cases where people have had to lose time from work, and were found not guilty, had to hire a lawyer and go into the court at some cost to them. I really think, Mr. Chairman, that this is wrong, and that this whole area should be explored to find out how it does reflect on these people.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 201.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Carleton East): Mr. Chairman, may I intervene just briefly on this point, and not allow the matter to lie exactly where it is. I would like to mention, as a practising lawyer, that there is a good deal of confusion, I would judge, in the minds of some of those who have spoken —between the question of whether a person under our legal system is innocent, or, not guilty.

I can say as a practising solicitor for a number of years, and as a practising lawyer in the courts for a number of years, that there were many, many criminal cases which I won. I am sure other lawyers in this chamber will recall ones that they won, numerous ones, scores where on any moral principle your particular client was guilty, as guilty as sin, but it was not able to prove them guilty according to law.

Now I am just making a distinction here. The question as to whether or not compensation should be paid, I think, divides itself along the line as to whether or not the state has acted wrongfully or the state has acted negligently and not as to whether or not the man himself, on a technicality or otherwise, may have been able to avoid the

strict application of the law itself. This is, I would suggest, the point. As I understand it, for instance, under the Scottish system of law that existed at one time, where the state was not able to technically prove its case, there was a form of verdict which was described as, if I am correct, as "not proven." In other words, a person—it still exists, the Attorney General says.

I think there is a tremendously important principle in the English law which is one we should retain, and not water down. That is, the principle that we do not have and shall not have a form of verdict which says "not proven." Under our system, with all its ills, and even with some of the pain that has been mentioned that occurs in relation to some trials, at least a man is cleared and clean 100 per cent when he comes out of it. The only way we can vindicate, I would suggest—

Mr. Sargent: He is clean all right.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: He is clean in the most important way. His reputation, his record, is clean. That, I would suggest, is of more value to him than having a "not proven" verdict around his neck for the rest of his life, whether or not he saves legal fees.

I will not go into it any further, Mr. Chairman, but I do think that there is room for exploration and consideration by the Attorney General and by the government, insofar as the field of wrongful or negligent action by the state is concerned.

I do not think that, on any sensible ground at all, you should say that the fact that you are able to "beat a rap" means that you should get compensation from the state.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, on this particular aspect I would just like to reply to the member who just spoke.

Undoubtedly there are guilty people who beat the rap, as the member says, but the compensation which I have been suggesting is the legal fees. I would far rather see 1,000 guilty people who were found not guilty receive their legal fees back, so that the other, whatever number they are, whether it is 1,000 or one person, is not wrongfully penalized.

I think this is basically the issue. I am sure the Attorney General will agree with me. On occasion—and it is happening on not such rare occasions—innocent people are being charged, through no fault of their own, such as in just two of the cases at least which I have just listed, which have just occurred within the last very short time. Why should these people, on this particular logic, be penalized because other people who were actually or perhaps morally guilty were able to get off?

I think if a man is found not guilty he should not be penalized in the form of legal fees. This is the basis of the point I take. If some people who perhaps should not have, then have their legal fees paid, I would far rather see it that way than the way it is now, where we have innocent people—and I mean innocent in every sense of the word—are ruined financially.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, we are spending money for legal aid, some $6 million—I am not discussing legal aid, because it is not under this item. We are prepared to spend money to compensate people, who have not been proven innocent, for their legal fees. May I be so bold as to suggest that we give some consideration to compensating the victims of criminal activities?

Last year a little boy, a juvenile, got stabbed. He was in the hospital between life and death and it turns out that he is paralyzed now. The boy that stabbed him was apprehended and the whole machinery of justice started to roll to protect that boy's rights. Lawyers, when he first appeared, were ready—duty counsel paid by legal aid—and I think that is wonderful. The duty counsel can advise and, if he needs it he gets legal aid to be defended, and, through the aid of the machinery of government, through legal aid, can be acquitted.

But that little boy in the hospital, he is still paralyzed and nobody gives a tinker's damn about him.

Mr. Shulman: He should get compensation.

Mr. Ben: Certainly he should get compensation, but I did not hear the hon. member speak about compensating him. We are concerned again with the criminal.

It seems that there is a pendulum swings back and forth. At one time there used to be a third degree system, when they used to beat confessions out of people with rubber hoses. Nobody agreed with that concept and we got rid of that, thank goodness. We are not advocating putting people on the ground and extracting blood out of them either, because that went with the third degree.

The fact is that we have swung the pendulum the other way now. That, in essence, it is the victims that are being persecuted and prosecuted more than the criminal. I think it is a long time—the time is

here—in fact, long ago the time was here, that we ought to have given consideration to compensating the victims of crime.

Last year the Attorney General introduced legislation that would compensate people who were injured when they came to the assistance of a police officer. At that time I argued that anyone who was injured in upholding the law should be compensated, whether there was a policeman present or not. The Attorney General would not go along with that. I think he was wrong. I think he is still wrong. Anyone who upholds the law, and is injured or suffers loss in so doing, ought to be compensated by the state because he is exercising one of the duties imposed upon him in keeping the state and society in safety.

I think it is high time that this government gave consideration to putting some money into the estimates to compensate the victims. We go to such great extremes to protect the criminals that we give little consideration now to the victims.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, of course, I would like to associate myself, and I am sure everyone here in this House agrees with the member for Humber, that victims of crimes should be compensated.

This is a concept which is gradually being accepted across the world, certainly across the western world. I am sure it will come here. We lag behind other areas. I am sure it is in the mind of the Attorney General, he must be aware of the need for that. I would not be surprised to see such legislation before this Legislature is dissolved, but I would just like to say, since the point may have been lost, that no one is suggesting criminals be compensated.

What I was suggesting was that the legal fees of those found not guilty be reimbursed, because this may be a result of the state's error, and the state should not punish people who are not guilty, and especially they should not punish innocent people.

In regard to the other point, of course victims of crime should be compensated, whether or not they are assisting a policeman. This is a part of the 20th century world; it is a part of the socialist world, but it is a part of socialism which is now accepted by capitalism and I do not think you would find a member in this House who will not agree with that.

Of course we must have it. The only question is, when are we going to have it?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, for many years now at the time these estimates have come up, we in the Liberal Party have advocated a system of compensation for victims of crime. This matter has become much more topical and much more acceptable in recent years but we still have had no action from this government.

I have gathered together a series of remarks again in connection with this subject and I intend to put them before this House. Let me say, sir, that the time has come for the province of Ontario to recognize its responsibilities to compensate the victims of crimes of violence. Every day we hear of someone being raped, robbed, beaten up or murdered. If the offender is apprehended, he is sent to prison, where the state tries to its utmost to rehabilitate him, but that is not the end of the matter. What happens to the victim, or to his family, when he is killed? Except for the fact that they can apply for welfare aid like anyone else, we in Ontario ignore these people completely.

We are more barbaric today than were the Saxons and the Hebrews of old, who made provision for compensating victims of crime. True, a civil action for damages is available against the criminals, but alas, this right is an illusory one for seldom can these people pay any judgment secured against them.

In recent years, advanced jurisdictions—and I underline the words "advanced jurisdictions"—such as New Zealand, the United Kingdom, New South Wales, California, New York, have passed laws to help the victims of crime. Saskatchewan followed suit last year, Manitoba is seriously considering the matter and the justice and legal affairs committee of the House of Commons in the last House were holding public hearings in relation to that question. I think we can anticipate that Prime Minister Trudeau is going to bring in legislation in this regard just as soon as that federal House of Commons goes back to work.

But in Ontario the watchword is lethargy and inaction. That is the order of the day. We make these speeches year after year, we do not get any objection, as the member for High Park said, from anybody, but we do not get any action, and why not?

Why should not victims of crime be compensated? Why has such a powerful worldwide movement developed to secure reparations for victims of crime? The best reason for doing so is that the state owes a moral, if not a legal, obligation to crime victims

because it assumes the responsibility for the prevention of crime. Consequently, when someone is beaten up, raped or robbed, our police protection apparatus for which the state is responsible has failed. Ordinary citizens are helpless in the face of a criminal attack and, therefore, the state, it is contended, should reimburse the people who are victimized.

Another reason advanced is that most of the attention of the state is lavished upon the offender rather than the victim. The murderer is looked after for life and the widow of the murdered victim is left to fend for herself. This disparity of treatment strikes many people as wrong. Some argue that section 110 of the criminal code of Canada places upon all citizens the duty to assist police officers in making arrests if called upon to do so. When they do respond and are injured they should be entitled to compensation. It is not generally known that The Workmen's Compensation Act of Ontario already provides such aid, but it provides for far too narrow a protection. The staff of the workmen's compensation board can recall not a single instance of a claim under this section for financial aid.

The new Ontario Act passed in 1967 will expand this protection to anyone injured while helping a police officer with or without request, but this is still woefully inadequate.

A further reason advanced by the proponents of reform is that the state, by incarcerating the criminal, is making it even harder for injured individuals to collect in private suits from their assailants.

Some sociologists contend that it is better therapy for the criminal to feel financially responsible for his victim as well as to the state. Moreover, in the modern welfare state there is the desire to aid all victims of adversity, including the victims of crime.

Lastly, by permitting money recovery to the victims of crime it may encourage them to report many crimes which now go undetected. The profit motive may operate effectively here as it does in other areas of society.

There are, therefore, many valid reasons for helping the victims of crime. Is there a need to do this, Mr. Chairman? Is there any proof of the need? Have our present social welfare schemes like hospitalization, OMSIP, life insurance and other private insurance plans failed us?

Although there has been a substantial public debate concerning this problem, there has been little effort made to assemble the facts upon which to base a judgment. Because of this statistical lacuna, the Osgoode hall law school designed a survey to assemble some of the factual data that we now lack. With the co-operation of Metropolitan Toronto Police Chief Mackey and the Metropolitan Toronto board of police commissioners, the records of the concluded crimes of violence committed in Metropolitan Toronto in 1966 were made available to the Osgoode hall research team. The survey was executed and substantive findings are available on the basis of 172 completed questionnaires.

The survey indicated that some economic loss was suffered by 79 per cent, 79 per cent, Mr. Chairman, of all of the victims of the crime study. Surprisingly, not all of the victims of the crimes of violence incurred financial losses. For example, a rape victim might not require or seek any medical attention, and a robbed merchant might have articles taken and returned immediately. Consequently, 21 per cent of the victims had no loss.

An examination of the type of the loss in detail discloses that medical costs, for instance, were incurred by 42 per cent of the victims. Hospitalization expenses were suffered in only 29 per cent of the cases. Income losses, the most important type of loss because it is normally the least well reimbursed, occurred in 23 per cent of the cases studied. Property loss was most prevalent, transpiring in 51 per cent of the studied cases. But this can be explained by the fact that the sample included a large proportion of robbery cases. Many of the people victimized by crime, of course, suffered more than one type of loss.

One might have thought that public and private insurance with the large amount of intention lavished upon it these days would have fully covered most of the expenses suffered, but this does not appear to be the case. Of those incurring medical costs, only 36 per cent were reported as fully recompensed by the present medical coverage schemes. Even in the case of hospital cost, the recovery pattern was dismal. Of the respondents suffering such losses, only 46 per cent were shown as having been fully reimbursed.

Income expense recovery was, as expected, still worse, with only 2 per cent of those suffering such loss stating that they were completely recompensed.

In the property loss cases, finally, 7 per cent responded that they were totally reimbursed.

What role does the law of tort play in this question? A tort suit for damages, as pointed out above, is always available to the victims of crime to supplement their recovery from private and government insurance. The survey demonstrated conclusively how illusory a right this is. Only 4 per cent of the victims of crime studied actually recovered any money from the person who attacked them.

Not only did just a handful of people recover, but hardly any of the victims even considered suing, still fewer consulted lawyers with regard to their legal rights, and fewer than that attempted to secure reparation. Only 15 per cent of all the victims studied considered suing, only 5 per cent took legal advice and slightly less than 5 per cent attempted to recover.

The reasons given for this are obvious. In many cases, of course, the criminal was never apprehended at all, which would make a civil suit impossible. Many stated they just did not think of suing, and others believed, even though wrongly, that their private rights lapsed if the state punished the criminal. Still others felt it was not worth the cost and the trouble to press their civil rights.

One can state categorically that the tort suit claim for damages plays an insignificant role in supplying financial aid to the victims of crimes.

After taking into account all the receipts from non-tort and tort sources, 55 per cent of the victims of crime in the study group still have out-of-pocket loss. This means of course that 45 per cent of these people under the present system did eventually recover all of their expenses, or some of them, and thus incurred no out-of-pocket loss.

Looking more closely at the 55 per cent who ended up with out-of-pocket loss, most incurred only small amounts, and this is significant. I think that we can do this without any big cost to the people of Ontario. But at least 47 per cent of those suffering losses were out of pocket over $100, and 14 per cent lost over $500.

These statistics demonstrate that the victims of crime are in need of financial aid, despite present welfare programmes and despite the assistance of the patent right to sue. I think that the cost aspect of this is most important.

Would the cost of such a plan be prohibitive in view of the financial situation which we face in the province of Ontario? Most of the experience in Britain indicates that the payouts are usually less than 200 pounds. Only rarely have the awards been substantial.

The student in Britain who sustained brain damage recovered 15,000 pounds, and a bludgeoned boy got 13,500 pounds. The widow and two children of a man who died while chasing a house breaker received 5,500 pounds.

A similar pattern could be expected to emerge in Ontario. On the basis of some rough comparisons with the British scheme, and taking into account the population differential but no other factors, the cost of an Ontario scheme similar to the British one, and excluding administrative costs, could be estimated at approximately $400,000 a year, or a contribution of 5 cents per person in the province.

Saskatchewan budgeted only $40,000 for the first year of operation. I do not know what their experience has been, but that was what they put in the budget. There are many types of plans available. Most of the jurisdictions have utilized *ex ratia* payments by a board to victims of specified types of crimes. This means in effect that a board has the discretion to withhold aid if it so chooses. Most people object to this because it is arbitrary, and we need still another new board. Perhaps we could adopt the principle of the unsatisfied judgment fund, now used by every province in Canada in uninsured or hit-and-run motorist cases. We have had experience, and we led the way in that field. I would think that experience could be well adapted to this province. It could work like this: The injured person could sue the criminal under ordinary court law. The defendant would be found responsible, and if unable to pay or to be found, the state could pay the award up to a certain maximum, say $35,000, as is done in automobile accidents. If the criminal is not caught then the victim should be able to sue that state as it can be now sued in hit-and-run cases. Does it not seem strange that if you are killed by an uninsured driver, your widow can collect from the state; but if you are murdered by an impecunious murderer, then you get nothing.

We in this party have had this in our platform for long periods of time, and we have talked about it on many occasions every year in this House since I came into the House, and that is some ten years ago now. All over this province I think that people are convinced that this reform is necessary. It is just, and will not place an unreasonable burden on the taxpayers of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, all over the world, advanced jurisdictions are responding. How much longer must we wait for this kind of reform in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee begs to report progress and begs leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order, resuming the debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, and that the House resolve itself into the committee of ways and means.

BUDGET DEBATE
(Continued)

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to have the opportunity to speak on the Budget debate and at this point to have the right to ask questions without being admonished by the chair insofar as the scope of the question is concerned.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): And without getting any answers.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, but this week, Mr. Speaker, has seen a great lesson in democracy. Millions of Canadians went to the polls demanding something new, and I hope that they get it. But this is the feeling in Ontario today as we look at the situation here. I think it was President Roosevelt who said at a time like this that in the polling booth we are all equals; and in the polling place, as in the men's room, all men are peers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been accused of being ungenerous to the government. Generosity, I say, is part of my character and I hasten to assure this government that I would never make an allegation of dishonesty against it wherever a simple explanation of stupidity will suffice. I say "stupidity" and I mean it, in a boom time like this where every government should be looking, as far as costs are concerned, to giving its people some tax relief, this government brings in a "tax the poor" programme of legislation.

Last year, the government increased the tax on gasoline, cigarettes, beer and liquor, and hospital insurance, and already the highest tax in the nation, the sales tax, and yet we went into debt for another $450 million, ending up with a gross debenture debt of $3 billion. As I said before, we are going into debt at the rate of $1.5 million per day. So the Minister of Financial Affairs (Mr. Rowntree), the happy warrior of squandermania, goes happily along, not realizing that pay day is coming. He forgets that we are spending many millions of dollars a year on travelling expenses, consultants' fees, and such things as $2.5 million on studies on transportation that will never be read.

There was a time, Mr. Speaker, when a fool and his money were soon parted but now it happens to everybody in this province. We say it is a place to stand. Many of the people in Grey-Bruce are living on less than $3,000 per year. We hear a lot of talk from the Minister about regional development, and it is a lot of nothing insofar as the people that I am talking about are concerned. For the family that has to live on less than $3,000 a year income, is is a serious situation in this day of affluence. All I can say is that nothing was ever done so systematically as nothing is being done now.

In our Grey-Bruce tourist area we have unlicensed resort areas and we cater to the tourist trade. The Americans come across and they cannot get the things that they are used to at home in terms of the refreshment that they need at the end of the day.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Randall) has called my area, "dry gulch." Well, I have nothing against the fellow who takes a drink at all. In fact, I feel sorry for the fellow who does not take a drink. The fellow who does not take a drink, wakes up in the morning and he knows he is not going to feel better all day.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about the rules of the House here. An interesting little side thought here—a story about Winston Churchill in the House in Britain. The most extraordinary thing about the best club in Europe, as Sir Winston used to call it, is a mixture of formality and informality. To mention a few of these formalities, on each day's sitting there is a procession of the bewigged and gowned Speaker from his rooms through the central hall and the members' lobby, preceded by the white-gloved messenger and Sergeant-at-Arms, carrying the mace which embodies the authority of the House, and followed by his train bearer, the chaplain and the secretary. As this procession approaches, one hears the loud cry of "Speaker, Speaker," and everyone rises

and stands at attention. Now, during the opening prayers each day, from which the public is excluded, ancient custom and tradition require that the members turn their backs on the Speaker and his chaplain and kneel not on the floor but on the benches, as in the days when the members wore swords which precluded the kneeling in any other way.

In front of the government and Opposition front bench there are two red lines, I hear, just far enough apart that two men with drawn swords cannot, if they stay behind the lines, reach one another. That would be a very dangerous thing to have here—to have swords here. But even today, no member addressing the House may cross these lines. The member speaking in the House always refers to another member not of his own party, as the hon. gentleman or if the member referred to is the Speaker's party, an hon. friend. Now if, as do all Ministers in form, the Minister belongs to her Majesty's Privy Council, he is referred to as Right Honourable; members who are lawyers are referred to as hon. and learned; and those who have been soldiers are hon. and gallant. There are a lot of them in this House who could be termed that, I imagine. But there are rules, very few, limiting what may or may not be said in the House there. Such as one forbidding a member to call another member a liar or a fool, but even these are circumvented as Sir Winston Churchill did when he replied to a member in 1944; he said: "I should think it hardly possible to state the opposite of the truth with more precision."

Such a term they could use here and get away with quite often.

The custom of the House of Commons there, Mr. Speaker, that is most different from our operation here, and provides most of the brilliant wit, is question time. Immediately after prayers at 2:30 in the afternoon, individual members may ask any question they want of Ministers of the Crown. These questions are submitted, in advance, in writing and numbered and printed on pale green order paper. Having had notice of the question to be asked, each Minister has had an opportunity to prepare his answer.

There is no legal requirement that these questions be answered, and for reasons of security or politics, they are sometimes not answered. By tradition, however, most of them are. Also, by tradition, no question for the Prime Minister is ever put earlier on the list than number 45, in order that he may have time for as long at lunch as he wants at noon. However, at 3:15 on Tuesdays and Thursdays, the Prime Minister is fair game. I see he is in the House today and he is fair game.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something that is very important to all of us here. There are three major parties in this House here, there is another party, a fourth party called the bureaucratic party, which actually runs the government. Each session over there, you create new programmes, bills, administrations; you establish bills and everlastingly expand this sphere of work and influence and enlarge your numbers accordingly. Today, it would be virtually impossible for any one executive to be familiar, for any one of us to know all the bureaus, administrations and alphabet organizations we have.

One person could hardly know their names and certainly would not be familiar with their duties and responsibilities. There are endless cases of duplication and overlapping. Each government agency, jealous of its own prerogative, seeks to outdo all the others while some were creating the hope that they would work themselves out of a job by solving the problems which they were creating. None ever do—like Parkinson's law, they keep expanding but the system tends to develop an economy from the elected control and drifts farther from direct response and the public will.

Most of the money that we vote here today, in this Legislature, is actually spent by the bureaucrats in the various agencies elected by no one and effectively responsible to no one. Mr. Speaker, this bureaucracy represents a challenge to the democratic concept that you really understand. A suggestion is being made that government departments should be streamlined, that duplicating agencies and administrations be abolished or combined and that efficiency be introduced where now there is little more than organized confusion. We see this every day in this House; a complete lack of co-ordination on any project except the perpetuation of the agency. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, a renewed and intensified effort along the lines to have a complete enquiry or efficiency check and to have this army of bureaucrats surrender their powers.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the powers of the government in expropriation. As I mentioned in the estimates the other day to the very able Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), a case in point, known up in our Bruce peninsula way. A man,

Mr. Joe Seager, had listed his property of 119 acres with a real estate firm for $21,000. The government walked in and seized the land, expropriated the land and sent him a cheque for $645, as a compensation for the land, $145 more than last time.

Here is a man who had his savings in his land and the government sends him a cheque for $645. He will not cash the cheque; he thinks he will show this around the peninsula to show what happens on the part of the government in expropriation proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of assessment, there is great inequity being done to those of us who live in smaller parts of the province. May I say that under the present law the business assessment for retail merchants in the province is on a basis of 25 per cent of the assessed value of the property occupied, whether owned or rented, in municipalities where the population is 50,000 or under—I am sorry—50,000 or greater. These municipalities with less than 50,000 population are assessed on a basis of up to 35 per cent depending on the population. For years we have recognized the inequity of this assessment related to population density, and I repeatedly requested the government to lower all retailers to 25 per cent, regardless of population.

In 1961, the committee of the Legislature, the Beckett committee supported this stand—I recall that but unfortunately, the committee's recommendation was not acted upon by the government. The plot has thickened now. The Ontario committee on taxation—the Smith committee—has reported and is in favour of a flat assessment rate for all retail businesses. The rate suggested by the committee, however, is 50 per cent. The effect of this recommendation, if adopted by the government, is obvious—larger business taxes for all retailers, which could be twice as much for many who are now located in an area of over 50,000 population. We have seen the government's effort to redistribute the tax funds by taking $150 million and giving $60 to $2.5 million to homeowners on an across-the-board basis.

This is admission that the government is not doing the right thing by homeowners and the large taxes on real esate. This could very well have been handled by increasing the per capita grants.

Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a lot the last few days about the Myer Rush case, and his dealing with the Ontario securities commission. Mr. Speaker, nobody has lost any money in this Myer Rush case yet, but they are making a big deal out of it and the government is trying to get him back here. I understand that he was arrested in London last week without a warrant, and his lawyers in England are going to press this case when they come to Canada. Here is a man who has had attempted murder against him—I understand the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) has known, there are sworn affidavits, of six attempted murders; this is backed up by affidavits. So we have a case, a celebrated case, in front of us here.

But going back, we have had the case of British Mortgage, Atlantic Acceptance, Prudential, where millions and millions of dollars were lost by trusting citizens in Ontario and no one lost their job, and no one went to jail. And here we have the big celebrated case now of Myer Rush. No one has lost a nickel on the deal yet. The Attorney General has had evidence of these attempted murder charges; he is supposed to know the people, but no charges have been laid. We are hearing a lot of talk in the House about wire tapping. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General repeatedly has evaded my questions in the House insofar as the scope of wire tapping in Ontario is concerned.

In *Hansard*, March 16, 1967, I quoted from the Toronto *Daily Star*:

> Police are using wire tapping and electronic eavesdropping to an extent that would drastically shake public confidence if it became generally known.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, would you rule the hon. member out of order, please?

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. Minister being helpful, but I understand this is not *sub judice* at all; that I can speak freely on this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: The magnitude of what is going on insofar as our lives are concerned in this province shakes one to even think about it. They can put a dart into a gun and fire it through the wall of a building; you can eavesdrop on what is going on in that building by electronics; you can phone long distance to as far away as Los Angeles and do a wire tap from your office electronically. It shakes you by what is going on.

The Attorney General and this government are taking no steps whatsoever to protect the rights of people. I think it is getting pretty close to a police state when the police have unlimited powers to go out and

tap our freedoms, our homes, our phones, our businesses. March 16, 1967, the Attorney General said, in reply to my question: "At the moment, there is no law on wire tapping." So here we are with the police going out at random, nobody checking their activities, and heaven knows what is happening insofar as the formation of a police state in this province is concerned.

I think it is high time that the government defined policy to portect the people.

The thing that is very important to those of us in the outlying parts of the province is the right of this government to invade the Treasury to spend money which is not spent equally across he province. Mr. Speaker, I refer to the $45 million mistake we have here on University Avenue, the subway. In asking the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) last week in the House, he evaded my question by saying that for that specific subway there was no moneys in grants or subsidies.

But on searching the records of The Highways Department, I find that there was $17 million given outright by the proivince to the city of Toronto for subway construction. It is a matter very firm in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that on the estimates, the highway estimates two years ago, we questioned the right of the government to give this money for transportation, that they would not give to the rest of the province.

Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister said very definitely: "The rest of the province will get like sums of money for transportation." This is another case of the government not following through. Not one penny has gone to any city, or jurisdiction in this province that have transportation problems.

Another great inequity by this government. Mr. Speaker, I have on my desk this morning about 100 letters from teachers who are concerned about what will happen to them in the consolidation county boards education, and I am very hopeful that the Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) will take steps along this line to give these teachers a board to negotiate transfers of teachers in the outlying parts of the province.

Mr. Speaker, the matter of housing is a tough one in front of us and I think the government in this province is doing a woefully sad job on it, especially in the area of low-income housing. I suggest that the Ontario housing corporation, through the Minister, take steps to form a consortium of large companies, like they are doing in the United States, where 368 firms have gotten together to put a billion dollars in the pot for low-income housing, to give loans for housing on a low-income family basis, the same as the states.

These interest rates, Mr. Speaker, could be subsidized by the province and the federal government. The insurance companies of this country, if you approach them, and the large corporations, to lend, say, one billion dollars at 6 per cent, and the province and federal government to provide a 3 per cent annual subsidy to get this housing programme into effect now, the housing business would expand many, many times, this income from income taxes generated by this building boom would liquidate the cost of the interest subsidy.

In the area of welfare, in the United States government, Rockefeller has had a two-day conference; he met with 90 top executives of major corporations to discuss public welfare problems. Why not here?

Big business has a responsibility to do its share in our economy. Business has a stake in the soundness of our cities. But it is up to us to give leadership, to bring business into the act, to get them to do their share for our people.

Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes I have left here at my disposal, I would like to say something on behalf of the injustice being done to the small forces being taken over by the Ontario Provincial Police. There is nothing less than a complete breakdown of agreement, a breakdown of an understanding, of a letter sent out by the Ontario police commission. I have five pages here of long foolscap of the great indiscretion and the injustice being done here for these people.

The Ontario police commission has not performed its promise to these men. At this point, 50 men have lost their jobs, and another 250 will be losing their jobs shortly. Time will not permit me to develop this point at this time, because my colleague is speaking next.

But through all my submissions in this House, Mr. Speaker, I feel there is a great need for regional recognition on the part of this government to the outlying parts of the province. No one should suffer hospital care, no one should suffer educationally because of geography, and no one should suffer on their income because of geography.

We have many cases to back up each point, where there is disparity and inequity on the part of the government. I know it is all right for us to stand here and criticize the front bench there, and someone has mentioned in the House last night that most of

the legislation that you bring forth is a result of our submissions from our leader, and the New Democratic Party.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Trade and Development): Jump up on the band wagon. Is that your idea?

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that you could do an awful lot more than you are doing for the people of this province. I know that is no job that you are doing in your department. You kidded us a lot, and I think you are a great fun man for the government. Insofar as getting anything done, this does not happen.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish I had about two hours to tell you really what is on my mind, but I thank you for the privilege.

Mr. T. Reid (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about government and business today, not in the usual sense of talking about their relations with each other, but in a different sense. I am interested in the concept of modern business management techniques as applied to government departments. I think there is a lot government departments could learn from the business community in terms of capital budgeting, efficiency, setting goals, and maximizing returns. Mr. Speaker, like business, this Ontario government must be lean and fit.

The government department I would like to use as an example is The Ontario Department of Education. I would like to focus my remarks particularly on primary and secondary school education and the colleges of applied arts and technology.

Now this emphasis on education may be surprising, because hardly anyone ever seems to criticize the management of our education system. Education, Mr. Speaker, is too often assumed to be like motherhood. We are afraid to criticize it because it is so important to us. It is so necessary and so much a part of the growth and development of all of us. Education is the cornerstone of our democracy, and the key to our civilization.

But, Mr. Speaker, is this any reason why we should not get the most for our money? If there is not enough money to do everything, should not we make sure it is being allocated to the right priorities?

Yet this Conservative government seems to wait for disaster to strike before it decides to take any action. This Conservative government waits for a severe teacher shortage. A shortage that was predictable 15 years ago in this province, Mr. Speaker.

This Conservative government waits until thousands of qualified high school students apply for admission to our universities before embarking on a frantic programme of university expansion. Now that we have the buildings, there is a frantic search for qualified teachers.

This Conservative government waits for hundreds of high school students to be standing on the threshold of matriculation from the four-year arts and science programme before even building the first community college. A college, I might add, that was promised when those students started the programme four years before.

And now there are chronic problems of programme planning and development in the community colleges of this province and there is an acute shortage of qualified and relevant teachers.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have been allowing our cultural sentiment to blinker our vision where education is concerned and we fail to make a searching and businesslike study of its expenditures and results, as judged in terms of the aims of education.

I am for education, but I am also for getting full value for the money we invest in education in this province.

Mr. Speaker, there are four main reasons for my choosing education as a target for business management concepts and practices.

The most obvious one is that the present government of this province will spend over $875 million in 1968-1969 on primary and secondary education, that is the estimates of The Department of Education, and that is 23 per cent of total projected government expenditures for that year.

The second reason is this: I feel that the non-government sector of Ontario would get a great deal in return for a more efficiently-managed educational system. There would, for example, be a greater flow of better-qualified manpower at all levels. And you will remember, Mr. Speaker, the economic council of Canada repeatedly places a great deal of the blame for lower productivity in Canada and Ontario, compared to the United States, on the generally lower level of education and acquired skills of the Canadian and Ontario labour force.

The third reason, Mr. Speaker, is this: I think that departments of education and their education systems can benefit substantially from the introduction and widespread diffu-

sion of modern business management concepts and techniques.

And the final reason, Mr. Speaker, is simply that I am more familiar with The Department of Education than with some other government departments.

The management of education must be critically assessed and evaluated, just like the management of any other large enterprise. Yet such a critique of an entire education system is rarely attempted.

Now the most-frequently given argument for not doing so is that the business enterprise and the educational enterprise can simply not be compared. While they both have their expenditures, capital and operating, how can you measure the output from education? How can you measure the results of teaching, the returns to the individual and society. The doubtful thinkers claim that if expenditures are increased, there is no meaningful way of determining whether or not there is a rate of return over cost or social profit, if you like.

This argument, like some members in this Legislature, may be ten years out of date for two good reasons. The first is that we have come to understand the process of learning somewhat more clearly than before. This has been a decade of intense educational experiment involving many of the finest minds of our generation. There has been a tremendous increase in our understanding of the nature of individual mental growth. There have been profound changes in theory which have led to new techniques in measuring learning, including considerably more reliable aptitude and intelligence tests.

The second factor is that in business there has been a substantial improvement in the quality of management. There has also been a quiet revolution in the techniques of decision-making in business. For example, recent management innovations in the area of group problem-solving and decision-making techniques that include lower-level personnel participation have proved most effective in terms of increased productivity.

These techniques could be applied most creatively to The Ontario Department of Education and the entire education system, resulting, I would hope, in less bureaucratic obedience from teachers and administrators in the schools and more active participation in the decision-making process, from the formulation of goals to the techniques of teaching.

Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wonder if The Ontario Department of Education under the Conservative Party has heard of "five year critical path planning" and "programme evaluation and review techniques", commonly known as PERT—techniques used in business to avoid the costly errors of short-term *ad hoc* planning, such as the kind I noted earlier. I sometimes get the uneasy feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the planning, or really the patching-up process of this Conservative government is done on a one-year basis in response to public outcry. I sincerely hope that I am wrong. It takes from 13 to 20 years for a child to learn and to become an educated person. Long term planning, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely necessary in education. Excellence in management should be a goal in every endeavour, whether in private business or in government operations, or in some of the quips coming from the other side of the House. I firmly believe that this is an obtainable goal in the management of the public affairs of this province.

I now propose, Mr. Speaker, to give an economist's critique of this mammoth Department of Education and the Ontario education system. In case there are people who still feel I am upending a sacred cow, I would like to point out that a report in the *Globe and Mail* last year stated that the Middlesex Presbytery of the United Church of Canada called in a firm of outside management consultants to assess their internal management.

Nothing, it seems, Mr. Speaker, is sacred any longer from the business efficiency experts! The church leaders were told that the presbytery was over-governed, over-aged and had too many buildings. I quote from their report: "It appears to have an introspective, horse-and-buggy-age, prohibitionist attitude which is out of step with the present day concerns of the majority of its members". The consultants also used the term horse-and-buggy to describe its business methods.

By using this example I do not mean to imply that The Department of Education is in the horse-and-buggy age. It is not. It is in the automobile age but I will not say which year. But the products of this system will be in the space age, Mr. Speaker, and as a society and as citizens of one of the richest provinces, in one of the richest nations of less than space age education from the top to the bottom.

The Ontario formal education system resembles a large industrial enterprise in many important respects. It is a vertically integrated enterprise in the sense that there is a flow of product through the many plants

of the enterprise. The child may go to pre-kindergarten and then through kindergarten and primary school into secondary school as a teenager, and then into university or other institutions of higher learning and advanced training as a young adult. Also, in such an integrated industry, decisions made about education at one level of the enterprise have a direct, if somewhat delayed, important impact at the other levels. This makes careful planning essential.

The education system has many plants with very different operations, plants which are widely dispersed geographically around the province. It is therefore, Mr. Speaker, a multiplant enterprise.

The education system produces a varied and diversified product, as varied as the unique character of individuals. It is a multi-product enterprise.

The education system has very complex ways of producing its output; it has very complex techniques of combining factors of production, such as teachers, administrative personnel, teaching equipment, educational television, books, school buildings, and so forth. It is, therefore, Mr. Speaker, a multi-in-put enterprise. Education has, perhaps above all, a system of management and decision-making which would defy understanding by the president of the largest international oil company.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the comparison of a large provincial educational system to a large corporate enterprise reveals that an education system is a massive, complex enterprise, as massive and complex as the most sophisticated and diversified industry in the private sector and requiring the highest level of excellence in management and creative leadership at all levels in the enterprise.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to throw out some ideas on how modern business-management thinking could be profitably included in the management thinking of a department of education and an educational system.

I have already mentioned the practice of scientific "critical path planning," a technique that can be fully exploited by the intelligent use of computers. With such long-range planning, shortages and bottlenecks can be identified before they reach crisis proportions.

Another essential aspect of managerial decision-making is the rigorous choosing among "expenditure alternatives" available to the enterprise; this means the acceptance of those expenditures with the greatest forecasted results and the rejection of those expenditures with lower forecasted results. The forecasted results of each posible expenditure must be compared on a common yardstick with those of alternatives. the "opportunity" cost of each possibility must be taken into account, that is to say, each possible decision must take into account the sacrifices of alternatives required by that decision.

The objective of this process is to ensure the most efficient use of available funds. Funds must not be applied where the expected increase in effectiveness or quality is less than the expected increase in other uses. Mr. Speaker, all such allocation for budgeting systems include some kind of criterion, measuring stick or cut-off point which prevents the use of funds in areas with low returns in terms of goals desired by the management of the enterprise.

This basic approach is obvious to Ontario's top-flight businessmen. But this kind of modern management thinking has not penetrated Ontario's Department of Education over the last 25 years.

Let me give you a few examples in the field of education. The teachers of North York have said that the equivalent of 58 teachers' time is spent on supervising cafeterias, watching study periods and supervising student detentions each year—tasks that could be performed by reliable but much less expensive non-teachers.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Those were the programmes we got from the Liberal Opposition.

Mr. T. Reid: Now, just to assure the hon. members opposite that Ontario is not necessarily alone in Canada in this regard, I will give an example from outside Ontario. Last year the Manitoba teachers' society—to cast the net more broadly to give a proper perspective—estimate that as much as 40 per cent of the average teacher's total workload on the job, inside and outside the classroom, was spent on essential but menial and routine school tasks.

Since good teachers are the scarcest resource input in the educational process, and the costliest in money terms, and since such tasks could be performed by reliable and less expensive non-teachers, a rearrangement of relative expenditures to hire non-teachers for the supervisory school tasks would release qualified teaching manpower for teaching. This would go a long way in the next five or ten years to meeting the severe teacher shortage.

In economic terms, non-teaching personnel would continue to be hired until a dollar's worth of them was judged to have the same impact on the quality of learning and school experience of the pupil as a dollar's worth of teachers. This is the well-known "least cost principle." The application of such an approach would certainly improve the efficiency of the school system in this province.

Another area where business long-term planning techniques could substantially improve the quality of decision-making in the educational system in this province, lies in the area of technological invention and innovation, particularly in the field of physical capital improvements.

Today's technological revolution in education, Mr. Speaker, consists of television, film strips, tape recorders and devices for programme learning and teaching machines. A comparison between business enterprise and the public enterprise of education will indicate the gap that separates them in this area. In education, in this province, it is highly unlikely that more than 10 per cent of the total capital outlay goes for instructional equipment, the other 90 per cent being spent primarily on buildings.

In industry, Mr. Speaker, the allocation of capital funds is almost the reverse, 25 per cent going to buildings and 75 per cent for equipment.

Now, as my hon. colleague in this House, from London South (Mr. White), well knows, while education is a service industry and does not offer the scope for use of equipment and machines found in industry, there seems to be little doubt that in the long run and if properly used, advanced technology makes possible a greater use of instructional equipment and machines than a 90 to 10 per cent split between buildings and equipment would suggest.

In concluding my remarks on this one aspect of my remarks on the Budget debate, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it clear that I am not advocating, as some have in the United States, that private enterprise take over the entire educational enterprise on the profit basis. That is to say, the better education institutions as judged by the consumer getting more business and more profits and the bad schools going bankrupt. The few examples I have given where the application of business techniques would result in a better use of expenditures, indicate that the waste is substantial in the one department of the present Ontario government I have chosen to analyze.

The waste is likely high in other departments of this government and in my opinion, the onus is on the departments of government to prove otherwise. As citizens and taxpayers, I think we should lend every effort to closing the gap between our knowledge of the best available techniques and their application in the decision-making process in government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to another aspect of criticism which I have in the Budget debate and commence my remarks, perhaps for the next five minutes. I have entitled my remarks "The sham—the Conservaties have created the health services shortage in Ontario."

The Treasurer of the Conservative government of this province stated that the Budget that he brought down earlier in this year places "major emphasis on programmes in the health field." He went on to say, in his Budget, that the reason for this major emphasis is to avoid a serious bottleneck in the supply of health manpower and health services in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, merely by using these strong adjectives, "major" and "serious", he himself, the Treasurer of this province, has condemned the efforts of the Conservative government in this province over the last quarter of a century. He has condemned the Conservative government's lack of foresight and planning to ensure an adequate supply of health manpower and services to meet the health needs of this so-called province of opportunity.

I will give the facts of this failure in a moment. This government, Mr. Speaker, likes to propagate the myth that this province offers all the people of Ontario "a place to stand and grow." I suggest that this government commission the same talented movie producer to do a film about the thousands of sick people in Ontario and entitle the film "No Place to Lie Down". Why is there a bottleneck in the supply of health manpower and services in Ontario today and a real and present danger of a more serious bottleneck in the months and years ahead?

I will give you one example of the failure of the Conservatives to avoid this bottleneck. I had hoped that this government would understand what preventative medicine is all about. It is not only better medicine in human terms, it is a lot less expensive than the patching-up medicine that this government believes in. Here is what the Hall Royal commission on health services said about an important aspect of Ontario's

performance in the health field between April 1, 1948, and March 31, 1962. This is a direct quote from that commission report:

> All told, the federal government made $603.5 million available for [health] grants during the 14-year period [to all the provinces]. Of this, $443.8 million or about 74 per cent, was taken up and used by the provinces. The usual criticism of matching grants, that they put pressures on the treasuries of less well endowed fiscal units and ease the financial condition of wealthier ones which can readily take advantage of such grants, cannot be applied. For example, Ontraio which has the highest per capita personal income in Canada, spent only two-thirds of its allotment. The federal government has introduced increasingly flexible features in recent years, and thus grants not used for one purpose may be transferred to another programme.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I must object to that—

Mr. T. Reid: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No—

Mr. Speaker: It must be a point of order, or personal privilege.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, it is not a point of order I would just like to put the hon. member straight. If he does not wish it, fine.

Mr. T. Reid: All but one provincial government in Canada, Mr. Speaker, invested more of its allotment than Ontario to health programmes such as "professional training", "hospital construction grants", "surveys of health facilities", to mention only a few.

For example, Saskatchewan used 81 per cent of its allotment; British Columbia, 81 per cent of its allotment; Manitoba, 79 per cent of its allotment; Alberta, 78 per cent; Quebec and Prince Edward Island, 77 per cent; New Brunswick, 74 per cent; and Nova Scotia, 73 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, should I continue with the remarks now?

Mr. Speaker: Since the member is not going to complete today, I think that he might move the adjournment of the debate, and commence the next time.

Mr. T. Reid moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Before the Minister moves the adjournment of the House, I would like to call to the attention of the members that we finally have a group of students who have come a long way, from Montague public school, Smith Falls. They are in the west gallery.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 2, we will return to the estimates of The Department of the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General; and following that, the estimates of The Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 2:00 o'clock, p.m.

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCEDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2